

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/16/3161443

Southcoates, 35 Hundred Acres Lane, Amersham, HP7 9EA.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Shawn & Dawn Butcher against Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2016/1064/FA, is dated 8 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is to render existing front and side elevation. Replace existing single storey porch with new porch and en-suite bathroom over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the host dwelling and the surrounding locality.

Reasons

3. The area in which the Appeal site is located is characterised by a diverse range of detached and semi-detached family houses, some of which are symmetrical in design, whilst others are asymmetrical. The external walls of the dwellings are primarily red brick, brick and render, or render, although a number of houses are constructed from yellow brick.
 4. The Appeal property is one of a pair of symmetrically designed semi-detached dwellings constructed from uncharacteristic cream coloured bricks. Both dwellings have been extended and are no longer fully symmetrical. More importantly, the precise colour of the bricks used in the extensions and additions fail to accurately match that of the host dwellings. As a consequence, the pair of dwellings have lost their sense of uniformity and have a fragmented and uncharacteristic appearance in the street scene.
 5. Together and amongst other things the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), policies GC1& H15 of the Adopted Chiltern District Local Plan 2001 (Local Plan) and policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that development reflects, respects and is in scale with its surroundings. It should add to the quality of the area and should not have
-

an adverse impact on the locality. Extensions should respect the scale and proportions and be in keeping with the host dwelling. The Councils Residential Extensions and Householder Development – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has similar objectives.

6. The first element of the proposed scheme is that the front and side elevations of the existing house would be rendered and painted cream. This would be in keeping with other dwellings in the locality and would result in a consistent external finish to the host dwelling. Whilst it would be subtly different to the brick finishes of the adjoining dwelling the proposed render would improve the appearance of the host dwelling and the setting of the adjoining dwelling, reducing the fragmented appearance of the pair of houses.
7. Due to the proposed extension's combined width, depth and height it would dominate the front of the host dwelling. Its relationship with the windows on either side would be visually cramped and the use of vertical timber cladding would be totally out of keeping with the host dwelling and the pair of dwellings. In addition, due to its height, form and the introduction of a lantern roof light, the roof of the proposed extension would be visually incongruous and would fail to respect or relate satisfactorily to the host building and the street scene.
8. The SPD advises that the roofs of extensions should be of a style and pitch which matches the original roofs and disjointed roof forms should be avoided. As stated in the NPPF although planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles and should not stifle innovation, it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
9. Overall, the benefits resulting from the rendering of the host property and the additional accommodation for the Appellant and their family would be outweighed by the visual harm that would be caused by the proposed front extension. Further, it is not a matter that could be adequately dealt with by condition.
10. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding locality, contrary to policy GC1 of the Local Plan, policy CS20 of the Core Strategy, the NPPF and the SPD.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR