



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2026

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007945

1 Douglas Haig Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3NB

- 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 & Miss McHale & Ambler against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/08882.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension, pitched roof to ground floor rear, and new rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions at 3 Douglas Haig Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modest two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, set within a residential neighbourhood comprising similar type and aged properties. The appeal property has an existing single-storey flat roof extension to the rear across the full width of the dwelling. The proposal would add a first-floor over part of the existing ground floor extension to an equivalent depth and which would be set adjacent to the shared boundary with the attached property at No 3. There would be a new, lean-to roof over the residual part of the ground floor extension to the side of the new first-floor addition.
4. Appendix D of the *Wiltshire Design Guide 2024* (WDG) provides guidance for householder extensions. Amongst other things, it advises that extensions should be carefully considered to respect neighbouring properties by being neither unduly overbearing nor obtrusive.
5. During my visit I observed that 3 Douglas Haig Road is unextended to the rear with a tall, close-boarded fence separating both properties along the shared side boundary. Undisputed information provided by the appellants within their Daylight and Sunlight Survey, along with its addendum, show the nearest ground floor window to No 3 serves a bathroom with a bedroom window above.
6. The survey concluded that the proposed extension would not adversely affect the adjoining property at No 3 in terms of daylight or sunlight to internal habitable rooms or to private amenity space. I have no reason to disagree with the survey's

methodology or findings. However, the first-floor extension would run along the shared boundary, projecting beyond the rear elevation of No 3 by almost 3.5m. In my judgement it would impose itself at unacceptably close quarters upon the outlook from the neighbour's nearest first-floor bedroom window, and from their outdoor amenity space immediately to the rear of the dwelling, as a towering and overbearing presence that would be both visually dominant and obtrusive. By so doing, it would introduce a form of development which the WDG specifically seeks to avoid and one which would be harmful to the living conditions at No 3.

7. The appellants have pointed to other similar semi-detached properties that have been extended at two-storey to the rear along this side of Douglas Haig Road. No direct details of these have been provided although I was able to glimpse the roof forms of some two-storey extensions to others from a vantage point within the rear garden of the appeal property. Based upon my observations and the information available to me, I am unable to draw any direct comparisons between any of the other examples and the context of the appeal proposal, particularly in relation to the position of the first-floor elements and the relationships they have with any attached neighbouring property.
8. I recognise that the proposal would improve upon the internal layout and level of accommodation within the appeal property to meet the appellants' family needs, and that the siting of the extension has been considered having regard to the position and orientation of the unattached neighbouring property to the opposite side at 82 Hulse Road. However, these factors do not diminish the level of harm that I have identified to the living conditions at No 3 having regard to the specific circumstances of the case. Neither does the absence of any neighbour objections to the proposal.
9. The harm that I have identified means that there would be conflict with Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, adopted in 2015, as far as it seeks to ensure development is compatible with adjoining buildings and uses, including having regard to the impact upon the amenities of existing occupants. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's policy requirements for achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR