



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: 6007926

43 Oak Road, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN14 0XJ

- 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 L Bell against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2026/00549.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension, demolish garage and increase parking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached dwelling tucked into a corner location at the terminal end of a short limb of cul-de-sac leading from Oak Road and set within a wider residential estate development. There is existing space between the north-east side gabled wall of No 43 and the plot's side boundary, which is shared in common with the rear boundary of 3 Truro Walk beyond. No 3 is a chalet style detached dwelling with first-floor accommodation within its roof space and is orientated perpendicular to the appeal property.
4. 3 Truro Walk has a short, but wide, rear garden with a conservatory extension across part of its rear elevation and which sits approximately to the side of No 43. During my visit I was struck by the close-knit relationships between dwellings set immediately within this part of Oak Road and those beyond along Truro Walk. From the appeal site I was able to clearly see the proximity of the low-level roof form of No 3 above the fence line which separates both plots, along with the glazed hipped roof of the conservatory addition, which sits close to the shared boundary.
5. The proposal would add a two-storey extension to No 43 which would simply project the form of the existing dwelling sideways but with a cat-slide roof with a side eaves line approximately one and a half storeys tall. The flank wall of the extension would be set away from the boundary with No 3 by around 1.72m.
6. 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.

7. I recognise the appellant's attempts to reduce the scale and bulk of the extension's side elevation through the hipped design of the roof and its lower eaves. However, in my judgement the new flank wall would impose itself at unacceptably close quarters upon the outlook from the rear of No 3, including from within their conservatory and from their remaining outdoor amenity space, which is already constrained by the tightly enclosed pattern of surrounding development. It would appear as a considerable expanse of overbearing built form that would be both visually dominant and obtrusive. By so doing, it would introduce a form of development the WDG specifically advises against and one which would have a further enclosing impact to the detriment of the living conditions at 3 Truro Walk.
8. I am mindful that there is an extant planning permission (Ref PL/2025/00170) for development at No 43 described as '*side and front extensions, demolish garage and increase parking area*', involving a part two-storey, part single-storey side extension. Notwithstanding, in comparison, the proposal that is before me would present itself as a greater bulk and imposing form of development when viewed from the adjoining property at No 3.
9. Whilst I accept that there is no substantive evidence to show that existing levels of daylight or sunlight to No 3 would be directly affected, and that there would be no impact in terms of privacy, the visual 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