



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/25/3372555

64 High Street, Watchfield, Swindon, Oxfordshire, SN6 8SW

- 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 and Mrs Browne against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/V2722/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey rear extension, one-storey side extension, minor internal works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. My decision is based upon the revised plans that were submitted to the Council prior to the determination of the original planning application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions at 62 High Street, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey dwelling at one end of a short terrace of four, and set within a residential neighbourhood comprising similar type properties at this point along the east side of High Street. Each terraced row is effectively 'bookended' by the side properties stepping slightly forward of their attached neighbours at two-storey with a hipped roof over, and with a similar but deeper projection to the rear. The appeal property sits forward of No 62 and projects deeper to the rear. The proposal would add a single-storey wrap-around side and rear extension, projecting just under 3m along the shared boundary with No 62, with a first-floor addition across the full width of the dwelling to a depth of 1.8m.
5. The Council's *Joint Design Guide* was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in 2022. When dealing with householder extensions, it advises that no extension should go beyond a 45-degree line taken from the centre point of the nearest habitable room window in order to avoid impact upon neighbouring development (the 45-degree rule).

6. During my visit I observed that 62 High Street is unextended to the rear and has a pair of glazed patio doors set nearest to the appeal property at ground floor, and a first-floor bedroom window immediately above. The existing arrangement between Nos 62 and 64, as was originally built, means that a 45-degree line projected from the nearest window openings at No 62 is broken by the two-storey rear projecting form of the appeal property.
7. The proposal itself would not introduce a new infringement of the 45-degree rule. However, it would exacerbate the visual dominance of No 64. In my judgement the extension to the rear would impose itself, especially at first-floor level and at close quarters, upon the outlook from the neighbour's ground and first-floor living spaces, as well as from their immediately adjoining rear garden space, as an overbearing and intrusive presence. By so doing, it would introduce a harmful form of development that would be detrimental to the living conditions at No 62, and one which the SPD specifically seeks to avoid.
8. The appellants have directed me to three examples where planning permissions have apparently been given for similar development¹ and two appeal decisions². Both appeal decisions relate to cases within a different local planning authority (Oxford City Council). Other than planning reference numbers, I have no further details relating to the three planning applications. In all cases, I have nothing before me to demonstrate how the examples compare in terms of the size, position, or appearance of the specific proposal, how it relates to any neighbouring properties, or the relevance of any guidance and local planning policy. As such, I am unable to extract any information that may be relevant to the case before me, which in any event has been considered on its own merits.
9. The harm that I have identified means that there would be conflict with Development Policy 23 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 – Detailed Policies and Additional Sites, adopted in 2019. This seeks to ensure that development does not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses, including through dominance or visual intrusion.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions at 62 High Street. I recognise that the proposal would blend with the existing building, and that it would contribute to the renovation of the property to modern standards but these factors do not alter my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR

¹Refs 19/00704/PAC, 19/02796/FUL and 20/00224/FUL

²Refs APP/G3110/D/19/3220799 and APP/G3110/D/23/3331152