

8th July 2026

RESPONSE TO PLANNING OBJECTION FROM No 7 THE BEECHES.

21 THE BEECHES, LYDIARD MILLICENT, NEAR SWINDON, WILTS. SN5 3LT PROPOSED SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT EXTENSION.

PLANNING APPLICATION NO PL/2026/03076

We note from the council planning portal that an objection to the above planning application has been received from the owners of No 7 The Beeches, which is located South of the application site / backs onto the rear garden.

The objection is not totally factual, so we have copied the objection below in Red, with our comments / factual responses in Black ink.

The terminology used throughout this objection suggests that the content may not have been written by someone with a detailed understanding of planning matters. A number of technical terms appear to have been used in a manner that does not reflect their usual meaning or application within the planning system. This gives the impression that it may have been generated by an AI tool rather than being based on direct expertise in planning matters.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This representation is submitted in objection to the above planning application on behalf of an interested local resident at No. 7 The Beeches.

The proposal represents a substantial enlargement and reconfiguration of the existing dwelling through a full roof replacement to create first-floor accommodation, significant side and rear extensions, and a detached outbuilding. The resulting development would be materially larger and more visually dominant than the existing bungalow.

For the record, the side and rear extensions are replacement extensions only, the same size as the existing extensions. The existing lean-to and the existing garage are built in single brick only; these will be replaced with cavity wall construction.

The existing conservatory is to be taken down because it is South-facing and simply too hot, more so in the recent extreme weather. Again, to be replaced by a cavity wall constructed building.

The total footprint will be smaller than the existing as the hexagonal end to the existing conservatory is not to be reinstated for the proposed extension.

The outbuilding is insignificant, and if it was a little further away from the boundaries, it would not need planning permission, so my clients could build this anyway, although it will need relocating.

The roof is to be replaced with a 45-degree pitched roof. All the roofs in the Beeches are various pitches (including 45 degrees, as is no 19). Some are gabled, some are hipped, some are two storeys, some are bungalows, and many bungalows have been extended upwards with room-in-the-roof construction; as this application now seeks.

The resultant roof will still be lower than the neighbouring property. This is simple geometry, the span of No 19 is greater, the roof pitch is the same; the ridge height is therefore naturally higher. The ground level to No.19 is also elevated above my clients.

It is considered that the proposal fails to accord with Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 and relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) relating to high-quality design, local distinctiveness, and protection of residential character.

We clearly disagree.

2. SITE CONTEXT AND SETTLEMENT PATTERN

The application site forms part of The Beeches, a residential cul-de-sac characterised by a defined and coherent spatial structure.

A key characteristic of this development is that 7 of the properties, including the application site (No. 21), lie within the inner arc of a horseshoe-shaped layout of dwellings, where properties:

- * do not have rear or side boundaries forming the outer perimeter of the estate;
- * instead face inward toward a central enclosed residential arrangement;
- * share a consistent building rhythm and enclosure pattern within the street layout.

Within this inner horseshoe arrangement, dwellings typically read as part of a continuous and visually coherent residential group, rather than as individually prominent or heavily enlarged structures projecting outward into the wider settlement edge.

As such, changes to roof form, scale and massing within this inner group have a greater potential to disrupt the visual balance, enclosure, and uniformity of the estate layout.

On some of the previous applications on this estate, the residents on occasions have referred to the properties on the left side of the access road (when accessing the site), as the outer circle, and those properties on the right side of the access road, as the inner circle (in this case the inner horseshoe as mentioned above.).

Residents have referred to an apparent distinction between the "inner circle" and the "outer circle" within the estate, with different rules applying to properties depending on their position. I have been unable to find any planning policy or recognised planning principle that establishes such a distinction.

To my knowledge, there is no planning concept that identifies an "inner circle" and an "outer circle" of an estate and applies different extension rights or planning considerations solely on that basis.

Despite reviewing the planning history available to me, I have been unable to locate any evidence supporting the existence of an "inner circle" designation or any policy that would restrict development for one group of properties while permitting it for another solely because of their position within the same estate layout.

3. PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT DECISIONS

Recent planning decisions within The Beeches are directly relevant:

13 The Beeches – PL/2025/08765

Refused on the basis that the proposed development:

“by reason of its siting, scale, height, bulk, mass and design, would introduce an incongruous and dominant built form that would unbalance the simple and harmonious appearance of the dwelling and fail to integrate with the single storey and consistent building lines in the immediate street scene...”

The proposal was found to conflict with Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 and the National Planning Policy Framework design provisions.

We agree. Two applications have been refused for 13 The Beeches, and in both cases the proposals were dominant extensions that were out of character with the street scene. However, there is no reason that if a more sensitive approach and design is submitted, that it will not be acceptable for this site.

19 The Beeches – PL/2024/00649

This application was only considered acceptable following amendment to reduce roof height and massing, demonstrating clear planning sensitivity within The Beeches to:

- * roof enlargement,
- * bulk and scale,
- * and visual impact within the street scene.

These decisions establish a clear planning context in which significant roof alterations have previously required reduction or have been refused where harm to character arises.

As I was the agent for this application, the facts were that the roof was amended to lessen the effect on No 17 The Beeches. Clearly acceptable as it now has planning permission and has subsequently been built.

4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application proposes:

- * demolition of existing garage and conservatory;

These are substandard additions and are to be rebuilt with a cavity wall, the same size.

- * substantial side and rear extensions;

As mentioned above, the side extensions are being rebuilt the same size (footprint), this does not represent a substantial extension.

- * replacement roof structure forming first-floor accommodation;

The proposed roof extension is a 45 degree pitched roof which mimics many other roof extensions in the Beeches, including No.19 next door. The roof span is less than No.19, using simple geometry the ridge height will be less than its neighbour.

- * additional bedrooms, bathrooms and dressing room;

The use of the rooms is irrelevant and not of concern to any of the neighbours.

- * detached outbuilding in the rear garden.

My clients can build an outbuilding 3 to 4 times the size of the proposed without planning permission if it were 2 metres from all boundaries. This is an irrelevant addition to this application.

The development increases floor area from approximately 168.9m² to 280.6m², representing a circa 66% increase in built form.

This scale of enlargement represents a fundamental transformation of the original bungalow.

There are no defined rules and regulations about extending upwards to form a room in the roof construction, providing the proposal does not affect neighboring properties or has an adverse appearance in the street scene.

This design has been carefully thought out to fit into the street scene, as does the many other room-in-the-roof extensions that have taken place in The Beeches over the years.

The addition of velux roof lights do not offer a direct over-view of a neighbours garden, but a view of the adjacent roof.

I might add at this stage that No.19 has velux roof lights in the roof facing my clients property; and as the agent for that application, I know that this was not considered a problem at that time.

5. DESIGN, SCALE AND MASSING IMPACT

The proposal results in a significant increase in:

- * roof height and overall bulk;

Covered this in our comments above.

- * building footprint;

The total footprint is less than existing which is NOT a significant increase.

- * and visual mass within the street scene.

Raising the roof a little to accord with all the other room-in-the-roof extensions in the Beeches does not form a visual mass, but brings this property into line with so many others; all approved by Wiltshire Council.

The cumulative effect is a dwelling that would appear substantially larger and more dominant than its original form and surrounding properties.

Exaggerated comments, and covered in previous comments above.

The proposal is not considered subservient to the original dwelling and would materially alter the established rhythm and uniformity of development within The Beeches.

A small addition in height is a subservient addition.

An established rhythm in The Beeches is that so many other properties have extended upwards to form room in the roof extensions and this is proven by the history files on Wiltshire councils planning portal. Together with a few houses that have been extended from bungalows, upwards to form two storey houses.

6. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY – NO. 7 THE BEECHES

From No. 7 The Beeches, the introduction of first-floor accommodation materially changes the relationship between the properties.

The existing bungalow form provides a limited degree of overlooking due to its single-storey scale. The introduction of first-floor habitable rooms and windows results in:

- * increased overlooking of neighbouring residential gardens;

- * a more elevated and direct visual relationship between properties;

- * and a reduction in perceived privacy compared with the existing arrangement.

These impacts should be considered as part of the overall planning balance.

Following the above comments, please see some photographs showing the height of the existing foliage and how this addition will not affect the privacy.

0342: stood on a stool directly in line with the peak of the roof



0343: showing the height of the trees



0344: Distance of the house from the boundary



7. OUTBUILDING

The proposed detached outbuilding is described as ancillary accommodation/games room.

However, given its scale, it is important that the Local Planning Authority ensures it remains genuinely incidental to the main dwelling and does not facilitate independent residential occupation.

Appropriate planning conditions should be imposed if permission is granted.

As explained previously, my clients can build an outbuilding much larger than this without planning permission, if kept 2 metres away from the boundaries.

The intended use shown on the plans is the intended use, and it is no concern to any of the neighbours.

8. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is considered unacceptable for the following reasons:

- * it represents a substantial and disproportionate increase in scale and massing;
- * it is harmful to the established character and spatial coherence of The Beeches;
- * it conflicts with recent planning decisions within the same street, including PL/2025/08765 and

PL/2024/00649;

* it results in increased overlooking and reduced residential amenity for neighbouring properties, including No. 7;

* and it is contrary to Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57 and national planning policy relating to design quality.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that planning permission is refused.

These are reiterated comments already contained in this objection. I have covered all of these points in my responses.

All applications should be determined on their own merits and other poorly designed refusals for other properties should NOT be suggested as a support for a decision to refuse this application.

Many thanks

Regards

Neil Armstrong (Agent)