



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/25/3364557

56 Sadlers Mead, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 3PD

- 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 A McNally against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/10682.
 - The development proposed is for “minor revisions to approved application PL/2024/07217 for a loft conversion, front porch and alterations (see revised plans)”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for minor revisions to approved application PL/2024/07217 for a loft conversion, front porch and alterations at 56 Sadlers Mead, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 3PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/10682, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced: ‘Elevations and Floorplans’, Drawing No 1033/CAM/2024/2 Rev B.
 - 2) The dormer windows in the south elevation shall be fitted with obscured glazing only and shall be fixed with a window restrictor which limits the opening dimension of the window to no more than 100mm and shall be maintained as such in perpetuity.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed above ground floor level in the east elevation and on the south roof slope of the development.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states that the development was started in September 2024. I saw during my visit that a loft extension with a half hip style roof, dormers and porch have been completed. However, amendments are being proposed to remove two rooflights. Since the development on the ground is not the same as that shown on the plans, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that permission is being sought for the proposed development shown on the plans.
3. As the proposed development seeks to make changes to the loft extension scheme approved under application reference PL/2024/07217 (‘the consented scheme’)

comprising changes to the roof, so it is half-hipped rather than gabled, changes to the front dormers, fenestration and the porch, I have considered the differences between the proposed development and the consented scheme, given that the latter represents a lawful fallback development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow located on a 90-degree bend on Sadlers Mead which is next to the entrance to a turning which leads to Brake Mead. At this point on Sadlers Mead there is a change in the style of properties with detached, two and single-storey dwellings with gable, hipped and half hipped roofs to the northwest and homogeneous gabled bungalows to the northeast.
6. With the eaves and ridge height unchanged from the consented scheme, the upward loft extension retains the appearance of a bungalow with the half-hipped roof lessening the overall bulk and mass. Consequently, the appeal proposal's roof form remains proportionate to the building. Also, by reason of siting, the appeal property has the option to replicate the gable roof design prevalent to the northeast or the half-hipped and hipped roofs to the northwest. In this respect, it follows the design cues of 40 Sadlers Mead (and its half-hipped roof), therefore is not out of keeping with the street scene.
7. Whilst it has been suggested that a gable roof would be more in keeping because this style is more prevalent locally, given that I could see 40 Sadlers Mead and the hipped roofs 34 and 36 Sadlers Mead in the same views of the appeal site I disagree. Instead, the appeal site's position at the point of transition in house type and style, means that there is greater freedom architecturally for the roof design to deviate from the prevailing trend. The half-hipped roof does this, and in turn it punctuates the bend, which increases the area's legibility.
8. With regards to fenestration, the front dormers remain symmetrically spaced, set in from the sides and down from the main ridge and well contained within the body of the roof. Whilst they extend slightly lower vertically than the consented scheme, a reasonable degree of setback remains from the eaves, which prevents an unduly prominent appearance in front and side views. As the proposed top light windows are of a similar style to the original property and other fenestration in the locality they do not detract from the design of the original dwelling and the locality.
9. The proposed gabled porch is modest in scale, subservient, and in character with the scale of the appeal dwelling. The repositioning of the doorway to the porch's front face is consistent with the bungalow's original opening, as such it is not out of place in the street.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development in cumulative form would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy or the Wiltshire Design Guide 2024, Shaping the future: My Place, Your Place, Our Place. This policy and guidance require

extensions to respect the original building and the neighbouring properties by being subservient and positively responding to the existing townscape.

Other Matters

11. The Council has not raised any objections to the proposal in respect of its effect on the living conditions of neighbours subject to the imposition of the previous conditions attached to the consented scheme which I discuss below. Nor has the Council raised any objections with regards to access, parking and highway safety. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns raised by local residents with regards to these matters, based on the evidence before me, and my observations at the site visit, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions.
12. I have considered the argument that the current proposal would set a precedent for similar developments in the street. Whilst I can appreciate the neighbours concern that the approval of this proposal could be used in support of similar schemes, given that it is the individual positioning on the 90-degree bend, next to detached two storey housing that has led to me allowing the proposed development, it would not support planning applications for similar developments at other points in the street. Were they to come forward, they would be determined on their own merits.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event this appeal succeeded. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the National Planning Policy Framework and where necessary I have amended the wording in the interests of effectiveness and precision.
14. As the development has already taken place, it is not necessary to impose the three-year commencement condition.
15. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary to provide certainty as to the scope of the development, including materials, and to enable the Council to negotiate and if necessary, enforce such matters, including the removal of the rooflights from the south roof slope.
16. A condition revoking permitted development rights to ensure that no window other than those shown on the plans be inserted above ground floor level in the east and south roof slope is necessary to prevent overlooking and safeguard the privacy of the occupants of neighbouring properties.
17. Similarly, a condition that the dormer windows in the south elevation shall be obscure glazed, with their opening permanently restricted, is necessary to prevent overlooking and safeguard privacy. For the purpose of its effectiveness and enforceability I have included a dimension for its restricted opening.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR