



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by K Dryden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010079

7 Sadlers Mead, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 3PA

- 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 S Jughard against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application reference is PL/2026/00302.
 - The development proposed is revisions to approved application PL/2025/05574 - extensions to side and rear, raise roof with adaptations to provide rooms in roofspace, render Bradstone walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The above description of development is taken from the application form. The Council has used a different description on its decision notice but there is no evidence that this was formally agreed. The description of development used by the appellant is sufficiently accurate to describe the proposal.
3. A previous planning application¹ was approved at the appeal site for 'extensions to side and rear, raise roof with adaptations to provide rooms in roof space'. The proposal, subject to this appeal, seeks amendments to this scheme and was submitted as a full planning application.

Main Issues

4. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the increase in ridge height at the property, side and rear extensions, or inclusion of roof lights to the front roof slope. Based on my observations at the site visit I have no reason to take a different view. The main issues in dispute are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. No 7 Sadlers Mead (No 7) is located within a residential area characterised by single-storey and 1.5-storey dwellings set within spacious plots, typically with low

¹ PL/2025/05574.

boundary treatments and prominent front gable projections of varying styles and proportions. Towards the junction with Esmead, the prevailing height increases to two-storey dwellings. There is a general consistency in building lines, architectural detailing and materials within the locality, and this overall uniformity makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal seeks to introduce a dormer window to the front elevation of the property. At my site visit, I observed that within the locality there are examples² of roof level alterations to provide additional living accommodation; however, these largely comprise roof lights within the roof slope.
7. The removal of the front gable projection would result in the property appearing out of keeping with the surrounding area, where such features are a defining characteristic. Although the proposed dormer would be of a pitched design and not excessive in size, it would introduce an incongruous feature to the prominent front roof slope that would be at odds with the immediate neighbouring properties. When taken together with the increased ridge height, the alterations would give the property a greater perceived scale and appear discordant within its context.
8. The appellant has provided an example of a pitched-roof dormer window at 20 Sadlers Mead (No 20), which is similar in design and appearance to the proposed dormer at the appeal property. However, at my site visit it was evident that No 20 retains its front gable projections and is located some distance from No 7, opposite the junction with Esmead. As such, it does not share the same site context, and the example is not directly comparable.
9. The appellant refers to a recent appeal decision at 56 Sadlers Mead³, which allowed 'minor revisions to approved application PL/2024/07217 for a loft conversion, front porch and alterations'. Whilst the scheme includes dormer windows to the front elevation, the property is located a considerable distance from No 7 and falls outside the immediate site context. Accordingly, this example does not compensate for the harm that I have found and does not lead me to a different finding overall.
10. Consequently, the proposed front alterations are unacceptable. In particular, the loss of the front gable projection and the introduction of a front dormer would appear discordant, to the detriment of both the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.
11. The Council has raised concerns regarding the proposed render finish to the ground floor elevations. However, given that render is present on neighbouring properties, this material finish would not appear out of place or discordant within the wider street scene.
12. The Council has referred to the Wiltshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2024) (SPD) in reason for refusal 1 of the decision notice. Whilst the above guidance does not have the status of policy, the document is a material consideration. Appendix D of the SPD advises that proposed extensions should be carefully considered to respect the original building and the neighbouring properties. I find that the proposal conflicts with this guidance, which reinforces my findings.

² 2, 9, 12 and 20 Sadlers Mead.

³ Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/25/3364557.

13. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) (WCS) which seeks a high standard of design in all new developments, including extensions and alterations of existing buildings. It further requires proposals to respond positively to the existing townscape in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting.

Living Conditions - Adjoining Occupiers

14. The appeal property is detached and set within a spacious plot, with a significant separation distance between the building and neighbouring dwellings.
15. The Council has raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the adjacent property, 9 Sadlers Mead (No 9), in relation to outlook. Given the considerable separation distance between the properties and that the front elevations are broadly aligned, the addition of a modestly sized dormer window, set within the plane of the roof slope and not projecting prominently, would not result in an overbearing impact on the adjoining property. As such, the proposal would not unacceptably harm the outlook of adjoining occupiers at No 9.
16. Additionally, whilst the proposed dormer window would be visible to occupants on the opposite side of the road at No 6 Sadlers Mead (No 6), the separation distance between the properties is sufficient to ensure that the development would not result in a harmful loss of privacy through overlooking. Moreover, there would be no appreciable additional harm than the existing situation where openings are present to the ground floor of the appeal property.
17. I have had regard to the SPD insofar as it provides guidance and is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal. Appendix D of the SPD advises that extensions should not be unduly overbearing or unduly obtrusive to neighbouring properties. These considerations have been accounted for in my reasoning, and I find that the proposal would not give rise to such harm.
18. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and privacy. The proposal is in accordance with Policy CP57 of the WCS which requires proposals to have regard to the impact on amenities of existing occupants.

Other Matters

19. Whilst I note that no representations have been received from adjoining interested parties objecting to the proposal, this does not make the scheme acceptable or justify the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
20. The appellant has stated that the properties are set back from the street with front gardens, thereby reducing the prominence of the proposal in public views. However, I find the alterations to the front of the property would remain prominent in views along Sadlers Mead, due to the low boundary treatments at the appeal site and adjoining properties. Moreover, this does not alter my overall conclusion.

21. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal may provide benefits through modernisation of the property for current and future occupants and there are temporary economic benefits arising from construction, these considerations do not compensate for the harm that I have found and do not lead me to a different finding overall.

Conclusion

22. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to outlook and privacy. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above in relation to the first main issue, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Dryden

INSPECTOR