



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/25/3359986

Springhill, Old Blandford Road, Salisbury SP2 8DE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Maidment against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/03723.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the planning application, the subject of this appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals and therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of Havendale with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located along Old Blandford Road which comprises generally low density residential development of an Arcadian nature with a mix of architecture, albeit predominantly traditional two, and two and a half storey detached houses set within generous plots.
5. The appeal site is set behind high, but relatively thin boundary vegetation and due to the fall in levels away from the road, the host dwelling is quite unassuming in the street scene.
6. The proposed extensions would substantially increase the scale of the dwelling, more than doubling its footprint through extending it forwards towards the road and by raising its overall height quite considerably. With an increased depth and roof

- span the resultant dwelling over two and a half storeys, combined with its design, would run counter to the prevailing pattern of development in the locality.
7. I note that the proposal was amended during the processing period of the planning application, but nonetheless the scale of the resultant proposal remains substantial. Further, I acknowledge that the Case Officer for the application was supportive of the proposal, but nonetheless Members of the Planning Committee are not duty bound to follow a recommendation to approve planning permission.
 8. The plot within which Springhill sits is quite sizable and I agree that it could accommodate a much larger dwelling than the existing without appearing as an overdevelopment of the site or having adverse impacts on the character of the area. However, I am not convinced that the appeal proposal before me is the right option.
 9. I accept that the dwelling currently on the site is of little architectural merit and whilst it has a number of extensions to the side and rear, I consider them to be subordinate. However, notwithstanding the aforementioned front boundary vegetation, the property is visible from Old Blandford Road and whilst the existing house does not have a significant impact on the sense of place and local distinctiveness, nor does it represent a valuable feature or characteristic of the area which should be protected or enhanced, that does not mean that 'anything goes' in respect of future proposals to extend/redevelop the site.
 10. I have had regard to a number of other applications approved on the road for extensions to existing houses, although I have not been provided with the full details of those and ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits. Further, whilst I note that the Council did not take issue with the detailed design per se, it cannot be viewed in isolation when a more vernacular form of development may be more appropriate here.
 11. I have had regard to the proposed refurbishment and extension of the house with the aim being that it could be used for multi-generational living in what amounts to a relatively sustainable location whilst supporting working from home, but these matters in favour of the scheme do not outweigh the harm that I find in respect to the impact that the proposal would have upon the character and appearance of the area alone. I say this having regard to the fact that there would still remain a reasonable distance between the proposed principal elevation and that of the public highway.
 12. Overall, I find that the proposal, by reason of its scale and design, would create a large incongruous, unsympathetic and dominating addition to the host dwelling and would not take into account the local context. It is contrary to Core Policy 57 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy which requires a high standard of design in all new developments, including extensions and alterations of existing buildings which are expected to create a strong sense of place and be complementary to the locality; and with respect to its criterion iii. I find that the proposal does not respond positively to the existing townscape in terms of built form, height, mass, scale or elevational design.

Living Conditions

13. I acknowledge that the eastern element of the proposal has been reduced from two storeys to one and a half storeys where adjacent to Havendale, however that

neighbouring property has a conservatory on its rear elevation adjacent to the existing garage over which this element would effectively be built.

14. There is presently close boarded fencing to the boundary and shrubbery on the side of the appeal site, but nonetheless, as indicated by the proposed East elevation, there would be a substantial increase in built form that would loom over the conservatory and immediate rear sitting out area of the neighbouring house, such that it would give rise to an overbearing impact.
15. I acknowledge that due to the position of the appeal scheme that the proposals would not increase the footprint of the property to the rear and therefore would not impact the wider rear garden of Havendale through the introduction of built form in that area.
16. There can be no guarantee that the vegetation within the appeal site would be maintained in the long term and I consider that there would be demonstrable loss of outlook to the occupiers of the neighbouring property, also contrary to Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and specifically its Criterion vii. which requires proposals to have regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses and the impact upon the amenities of existing occupants.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR