



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/25/3362084

1 Greenway Avenue, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN15 1AH

- 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 Mrs Tracey Rogers against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/09833.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form contained a small grammatical error in the description of development. For the purposes of this report, that error has been corrected in the header.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling which occupies a corner plot at the junction of Greenway Avenue with Greenway Lane, in a residential neighbourhood of 'between the wars' houses. The surrounding dwellings are in the main semi-detached, some of which have been extended in more recent times, and which are generally sited parallel to the highway.
5. The appeal property sits at a 45-degree angle to Greenway Avenue, a design device for turning the corner at junctions, which is also present in properties at the 90-degree junctions of Greenway Gardens with Greenway Lane. However, at the location of the appeal site, Greenway Lane is not at 90-degrees to Greenway Avenue, it is an acute angle of around 75-degrees. Because of this, the appeal property is more prominent in the street-scene, with all four elevations of the property being visible from the public footpaths and highways in the surrounding public realm.
6. The existing property is symmetrical in design and sits slightly to the south-east of the centre of the plot. As a result, and because of the angle of the property, the surrounding garden areas are of irregular triangle shapes, of varying sizes, making extension of the property more difficult.

7. The proposal would introduce a two-storey extension to the east side of the property, projecting in front of the line of the principal elevation and extending close to the residential boundary with the footpath, together with a single-storey linking extension to the south-east. The roof of the two-storey extension, as a double hip, forms a pyramidal shape that makes no attempt to integrate with the existing roof, drawing the eye to the extension as an 'appendage' rather than an integrated element of the enlarged dwelling.
8. Whilst the proposal would make use of materials which are complimentary to the existing dwelling, using pitched and hipped roof forms, the siting and format of the design does not integrate with the existing dwelling, resulting in a scheme which does not respect the overall form and balance of the host dwelling.
9. The proposal would not follow the guidance contained in Appendix D – Design Guidance for Householder Extensions of the Wiltshire Design Guide. This guidance requires that 'proposed extensions and alterations should not dominate the existing building: in other words, they should be subservient and appear as additions in a 'supporting role'. I am mindful of the previous scheme¹ that was considered at appeal, and whilst this forms a material planning consideration, it does not contain anything that would alter my findings on the proposal before me. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be an incongruous and dominant form of development which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It follows therefore, that I find the proposal would be contrary to policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) (the Local Plan), and Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide, which require, among other things, development to deliver a high standard of design which enhances local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the historic environment, and which respects the existing dwelling, neighbouring properties and fits within the street scene. The proposal would also fail to accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), particularly paragraphs 135 and 139.

Other Matters

11. I note one of the appellants' reasons for pursuing the application is to provide accommodation for an elderly parent, with increasingly complex mobility needs. I have therefore, given due regard to the public sector equality duty for a person with protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, and have attributed some weight to this matter. However, I have found conflict with the Local Plan otherwise, and harm to the character and appearance of the area. I am satisfied that dismissing the appeal would be a proportionate response in this regard.
12. There is agreement between the main appeal parties that the development is not considered to result in any harm to the significance of the nearby heritage assets, which includes the Chippenham Conservation Area and a number of Listed Buildings, including views towards the Grade II* Church of St Paul. In accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), I have paid special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

¹ APP/Y3940/D/24/3338532

13. I find that the proposal would conserve the heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance in line with the Framework, due to the intervening buildings and the overall distances maintained. I therefore agree with the Council's observations and those of the Inspector on the previous scheme.

Conclusion

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and that there are no material considerations, including policies in the Framework, that would justify determining other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR