

APPLICATION FOR HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING PERMISSION DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/04683
APPLICATION TYPE:	Householder planning permission
SITE ADDRESS:	1 Astute Place, Corsham, SN13 0EP
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Loft conversion with rear flat roof dormer and two front dormers
RECOMMENDATION:	That Planning Permission be REFUSED

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the loft conversion of a domestic dwellinghouse. The development consists of a flat roof, box-type dormer that effectively fills the rear roof slope and two smaller flat-roof dormer insertions to the front roof slope. Those two front facing dormer windows are of unequal size.

The application was submitted with a description of development which included the adjective “decorative” with reference to the front facing dormers. Since this word does not describe operational development, it has not been given any weight in the determination process and has not been included in the decision notice.

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

The dwelling is located within a relatively recently constructed residential estate on the edge of Corsham.

The property is of buff reconstituted stone/grey tiles, with surrounding properties being a mix of similar materials and contrasting light coloured render.

Dormer type insertions in roofs and breaks in eave lines are present on the wider estate, but are few in number and cannot be seen in any property near to the application site.

RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Wiltshire Core Strategy

- Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping

Corsham Neighbourhood Plan

- CNP HE1: Good quality design, and the Corsham Design Guide

Wiltshire Design Guide

- Appendix D – Design Guidance for Householder extensions

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The Planning Practice Guidance

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PL/2026/03994- Certificate of Lawful Development. Refused. Proposal did not meet the criteria for permitted development.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Corsham Town Council: No objection.

REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received.

ASSESSMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

In accordance with this statutory requirement, this application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Development Plan, including the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and, in this case, the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan.

Principle of development

In most householder applications, the principle of development is not a matter for detailed assessment, as the residential use of the site is already established and the proposal typically involves minor works within the curtilage of a lawful dwelling.

As such, the principle of development is considered acceptable, subject to the detailed assessment of design, amenity, and other material considerations set out below.

Design and appearance

Core Policy 57 to the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that all new development is of high design quality, reflecting local context, character, and distinctiveness. Policy HE1 to the

Corsham Neighbourhood Plan requires all new development to demonstrate good quality design.

Policies DP3 and DP4 of the National Planning Policy Framework require development to achieve a high standard of design that responds positively to local character and context. In assessing design quality, regard should be had to matters including scale, siting, form, appearance, materials and the relationship of development to its surroundings.

The proposed rear dormer will effectively fill the rear roof plane and extend to a point near to the front elevation. This results in a substantial, bulky addition that fundamentally alters the appearance of the property. Windows are of a reasonably substantial size, exceeding that of the windows at ground and first floor, and serve to accentuate the outsized appearance of the new dormer. The drawings also appear to position the rear dormer off-centre in the roof, which whilst perhaps not being in and of itself objectionable, does add to the awkwardness of the addition high up on the rear elevation. Some form of proprietary edpm roofing system is specified on the application form, which cannot be considered to be of a high quality. Overall, the box dormer is of a very poor design and appearance.

The front facing dormers are of a smaller scale than that of the rear facing box dormer, but are unequal size and position on the roof as well as being of squat, wide proportions. Although it is acknowledged that the existing windows at ground and first floor are also off-centred, it remains the case that the proposed new dormers will be of awkward proportions and set high up on the roofslope. For these reasons, the front dormers cannot be regarded as demonstrating high-quality design.

The wider housing estate demonstrates a high degree of design consistency, with dormer insertions into the roof, or other forms of broken eave projections being uncommon; largely restricted to “feature” or corner properties. Those few dormer additions which can be found on the estate are of slender proportions and with leaded-cheeks (compared to the tile hanging proposed in this application), and are positioned much lower down on the roofslope; often at eaves level. There are no large box-dormer type additions to be found on the estate.

Whilst the housing estate is not historic or part of any heritage designation, it can be described as being well-designed and laid out. The proportions of the properties and their design features are well-considered and it appears to have been well founded to impose a condition on the reserved matters consent for the site which removed permitted development rights for a variety of extensions, including dormers and other additions to the roof (consents 15/11882/REM, as later amended by 17/11945/VAR). For clarity and future reference, those reserved matters decisions notices are appended to this delegated report.

In their own right, and especially when seen in the context of the well design estate in which the property sits, the proposed development is unambiguously of a poor quality and would not respond to their context nor assist with creating a visually attractive development or strong sense of place and pride. For these reasons, the development will conflict with policy CP57 tot eh Wiltshire Core Strategy, policy HE1 to the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, the Wiltshire and Corsham design guides, as well as policy DP3 to the NPPF, especially subsections 1. and 2.g and 3.

Amenity

Point vii of Core Policy 57 - Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping of the Wiltshire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that developments do not adversely affect neighbouring properties. Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be appropriate for its location, taking account of its likely effects on health, living conditions and the environment. In particular, Policy P3(2)(b) requires development to avoid giving rise to unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and occupiers. In assessing amenity impacts, regard should be had to matters including daylight and sunlight, outlook, privacy, overbearing impacts and other effects on residential amenity.

In this case, the proposal will see the introduction of new windows high up at second floor level, with the windows in the rear facing dormer being approximately 10-12m from the immediately adjoining property (No 2 Duke Crescent) – with both properties being served by relatively short rear gardens and a simple wall and what appears to be garden fence comprising the common boundary. Those new windows are to serve new bedrooms, where it can be reasonably expected to receive light and be able to look out of a window.

Due to the height of the new windows in the rear elevation and the proximity of the garden and facing windows of the neighbour at No.2 Duke Crescent, it is likely that there would be a significant amount of overlooking into the neighbouring property and private space. Due to the height of the new windows, the wall and garden fence to the common boundary is not considered likely to sufficiently mitigate that overlooking.

With regard to the front facing dormers, the property fronts the public highway and is positioned a sufficient distance away from opposing neighbouring dwellings and for that reason, are not considered to result in any unacceptable impact on amenity of living conditions.

Accordingly, and as a result of their relationship with the immediately adjoining neighbour, the proposed rear facing box dormer window is a poor form of development which will result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity, living conditions and privacy of the residential occupiers of No.2 Duke Close. Such a situation would be contrary to the requirements of policy CP57(vii) to the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the guidance contained within Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, as well as Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework

Biodiversity Net Gain

Householder planning applications are exempt from the requirement to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain under Schedule 7A, Section 4(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as inserted by the Environment Act 2021.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is a poor form of development whilst will not meet with the requirements of policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, policy HE1 of the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, the Wiltshire and Corsham design guides as well as policies DP3 and P3 to the NPPF.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the development may provide benefits in respect of the diversification of housing stock and economic benefit associated with development, due to the scale of the proposals, those benefits are considered extremely limited and would not outweigh the considerable identified harm to the character and appearance of the locality and the living conditions and wellbeing of the neighbour residential occupier.

RECOMMENDATION: That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. By reason of its scale, form, design, proportions and materials the proposed development is of an unambiguously poor quality and would not respond to their context nor assist with creating a visually attractive development or strong sense of place and pride. For these reasons, the development will conflict with policy CP57 to the Wiltshire Core Strategy, policy HE1 to the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan, the Wiltshire and Corsham design guides, as well as policy DP3 to the National Planning Policy Framework, especially subsections 1., 2.g and 3.
2. As a result of their relationship with the immediately adjoining neighbour, the proposed rear facing box dormer window is a poor form of development which will result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenity, living conditions and privacy of the residential occupiers of No.2 Duke Close. Such a situation would be contrary to the requirements of policy CP57(vii) to the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the guidance contained within Appendix D of the Wiltshire Design Guide SPD, as well as Policy P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPENDICES

Reserved Matters decision notices – 15/11882/REM and 17/11945/VAR