

Bathroom Challenges - Special Circumstances.

Existing Building Condition and Need for Modernisation

5 The Tynings is a typical late 19th-century Victorian terrace that has not been upgraded to modern building standards. The property currently suffers from significant damp issues and comprises solid brick walls with no modern damp proof course or thermal lining to the floors or walls. Issues include rising damp, condensation within the roof and wall spaces and dry rot. In addition, the roof structures lack insulation and an effective weatherproof / breathable membrane to combat damp issues

To bring the property up to current building regulation standards and to ensure its continued viable use as a family home, a series of essential modernisation works are proposed. These works primarily affect the first-floor accommodation and are outlined below:

1. Ground Floor Damp Proofing and Insulation:

The ground floor requires a new damp proof course and membrane, together with modern thermal insulation. Underfloor heating will also be installed to improve energy efficiency. These measures will result in an increase in the finished floor level within the ground floor utility room.

2. Impact on First-Floor Bathroom:

As a consequence of the raised ground floor level, the bathroom floor at first-floor level will need to be raised by approximately 150mm to maintain structural integrity and alignment. This will, however, result in a reduction of head height within the first floor bathroom.

3. Roof and Wall Upgrades:

To comply with current building regulations, insulation and a breathable membrane will be introduced within the roof structure. In addition, the west wall will be rebuilt due to structural movement and to prevent further water ingress affecting the adjoining property at No. 4 The Tynings (as referenced in comments submitted by the neighbouring owner, Ms. Yvette Roberts, on the planning portal).

4. Resulting Design Challenges:

These essential modernisation works inevitably reduce available head height within the first-floor rooms, limiting the effective use of internal space. The accompanying drawings and images illustrate the impact of the proposed floor level changes, with the black horizontal tape indicating the new height of the bath, WC, and basin once the floor is raised. ***Redacted for Personal Data Protection***

Overall, the proposed interventions are considered necessary to ensure the building meets modern living and energy performance standards while preserving the character of this traditional Victorian terrace.

The images below show the first floor ceiling height prior to installation of damp proof, insulation and floor heating. Be aware the floor height would be 150mm higher making headroom a greater issue. ***Redacted for Personal Data Protection***

Raising the Bathroom Roof – Harm

Planning History and Officer Engagement

During the early stages of the proposal, the then-appointed Case Officer, **Mr James Webster**, undertook a site visit to assess the existing condition of the property and to consider any potential impacts arising from the proposed works. Mr Webster acknowledged the poor condition of the dwelling and recognised that the proposed development was necessary to facilitate the building's improvement in line with modern building standards.

Following initial consultation, the original submission included a roof dormer; however, this element was subsequently removed in agreement with Mr Webster. There were also discussions regarding the design of the side extension roofline. Overall, Mr Webster expressed satisfaction with the revised proposals and raised no objection to the first-floor extension. Throughout these discussions, Mr Webster informed the applicant that he was validating his assumptions with his line manager 'Simon'.

Subsequently, **Ms Isobella Wise** assumed responsibility for the application following Mr Webster's ill health. While Ms Wise raised concerns relating to the outbuilding and elements of the side extension, she did not identify any issues in relation to the first-floor rear extension.

The application was later reviewed at appeal by **Inspector Mr C. Creswell**, who also expressed reservations regarding the side extension and outbuilding but confirmed that the first-floor rear extension would not give rise to any undue harm. The Inspector stated:

'18. Although the proposed extensions to the rear would be partly visible from public vantage points, they would not be especially conspicuous from the front of the property. Likewise, the proposed outbuilding would be set relatively deep into the site and would not be a prominent feature from within the street. These aspects of the development would therefore have relatively little impact on how the terrace is appreciated within its local setting.'

Design Justification

The current proposal seeks to raise the roof height of the first-floor bathroom to address the specific challenges arising from essential modernisation works (as outlined previously). This modification is necessary to achieve compliance with current building regulations and to ensure the dwelling functions effectively as a family home.

It is also relevant to note that there are several examples of similar first-floor extensions within the immediate locality, including at the adjoining property, **Tisbut House**. The proposed design takes clear reference from these precedents, ensuring consistency with the established

architectural character of the terrace and surrounding area. The accompanying photographs illustrate the prevalence of comparable extensions locally, including that of the neighbouring property.



Tisbut House



Alma Cottage (foreground) flat roof. Ebury Cottage (behind), Large roof Dormer, Pitched first floor roof, flat roof extension. Box Hill



Upway Cottages, Box Hill

The image below shows 1 The High Street which is a very similar property to 5 The Tynings. This is a very prominent property in the heart of Box opposite a listed building. The rear of 1 The High Street has a large flat roofed extension, whilst 3 and 6 The High Street have dissimilar first floor gabled extensions. These can be well observed within the village and recreational area



1 The High Street Box



This images shows the flat roof next to the post office, which also has a first floor extension to the rear



This image shows 4 and 6 The High Street with dissimilar gabled extensions



Post Office, opposite a Listed building with first floor extension

Below are further images within Box Village of similar extensions. These are not exhaustive and only represent a small number of similar extensions.



Non-designated Heritage Asset

The Inspector Mr C Creswell made the following observation.

17. I understand that the terrace in which the appeal property is situated is not formally registered as a non-designated heritage.

The property does not reside on any local heritage lists, local plans, or neighbourhood plans.

A local authority search prior to purchase did not highlight the property as NDHA or a Listed property

Final Points

Throughout the development of this proposal, the applicant has engaged constructively with the Wiltshire Council Planning Department to address design and policy considerations. Several substantive amendments have been made in response to officer feedback, including the removal of a roof dormer, amendments to the roofline of the side extension, and the withdrawal of the previously proposed outbuilding.

The applicant remains committed to maintaining a positive dialogue with the Council to ensure the scheme aligns with local planning objectives. However, it is considered that the proposed first-floor extension is compliant with relevant national and local planning policies, including the principles set out within current government design guidance. The proposal represents a proportionate and contextually appropriate form of development that will facilitate the sympathetic modernisation of the property, significantly improving its visual appearance and condition, and thereby contributing positively to the character of the surrounding area.