The Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line:
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: RT1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Development Services
Wiltshire Council
Development Services
County Hall
Trowbridge
BA14 8JF

Your Ref: PL/2023/05301
Our Ref: APP/Y3940/D/24/3341962

18 September 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Oliver Smith
Site Address: The Bungalow, Milbourne Lane West To Stop End At A429, Milbourne, Wiltshire, SN16 9JA

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

*Emily Pearce*
Emily Pearce

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notices

*Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is -* https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate

The Planning Inspectorate

**Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 3 September 2024

**by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 September 2024**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/24/3341962**

**The Bungalow, Milbourne Lane West To Stop End At A429, Milbourne, Wiltshire, SN16 9JA**

- 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 Oliver Smith against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref is PL/2023/05301.
- The development proposed is Extension to the west side of the existing property and associated works.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey bungalow adjacent and to the rear of Milbourne Park, a housing estate comprising mainly bungalows close to the appeal site and surrounded by countryside. The property fronts onto a lane that other houses within the estate back onto. Other housing further along the lane, away from the housing estate and the appeal site, is sporadic and set back from the lane and consequently have a more rural character. Although the appeal site differs from the estate housing because of its orientation and access, the bungalows on the estate form the immediate backdrop to it and thus define the character around it.

4. One side of the appeal property has a front projecting section with a hipped roof that extends below the main roof and contains the kitchen. It is joined to a flat roofed section above the front door and hallway. On the other side a hipped roof extension projects forward of the main house at an angle. It is the same height as the main roof and has a flat roofed dormer serving a first floor home office. Along the side of the house a close board wooden fence separates it from the main garden area to the side which contains outbuildings, some of which would be removed to make way for the proposed extension.

5. The proposed development would extend to the side of the kitchen and then project forward of it and the existing side extension. It would form a side wing which would be higher than the main roof and contain dormer windows at the rear and sides. It would dominate, and fail to integrate with, the host property because of its difference in height and depth. It would also lengthen the frontage such that it would appear substantially larger and out of character with other bungalow development in the adjacent estate. In combination with the existing extension, it would result in overdevelopment that would subsume the original bungalow and thus harm its character and appearance. The proposal would therefore conflict with the relevant criteria of Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and section 12 and paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which seek high quality design that maintains local character.

**Other Matters**

6. The appellant has referred to amended drawings which were sent to the Council but were not assessed as part of the application. Extracts of the drawings were included in the appellant's statement of case, but no detailed plans submitted for my consideration. I have therefore based my decision on the planning merits and impacts of the proposed development as submitted and I have reached my decision on that basis. Issues relating to the processing of the planning application must remain a matter between the main parties.

7. I understand that the proposed development would provide benefits in terms of meeting the needs of the appellant's family. However, no evidence has been provided to me that such needs could not be met by an alternative and less harmful design.

8. The appellant has provided examples of other larger houses within the local area. However, they do not contribute to the street scene of which the appeal site is part. As noted above, that is provided by housing on Milbourne Park to the rear and side of the appeal site which share common characteristics in terms of plot size, density, type and scale of development and are therefore more relevant to an assessment of the impact of the proposal.

**Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*P D Sedgwick*

INSPECTOR