

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/16/3163637

11 Somerset Way, Iver, Buckinghamshire SL0 9AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs S Appelbe against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01734/FUL, dated 16 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the rear at ground and first floor level, a first floor side extension & roof remodelling to provide second floor accommodation, including raising the ridge 600mm.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a detached house and is located in a predominantly residential area. The Council's Refusal Notice describes the proposed development as a part single/part 2 storey/part 1st floor side extension, roof alterations incorporating an increase in ridge height and a rear Juliette balcony along with alterations to the vehicular access.
 4. I note that the Council considered that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree. However, the Council is concerned that the proposed roof alterations would harmfully detract from the street-scene.
 5. The existing dwelling has a hipped roof to the front. The proposal would replace this with a large gabled style roof with a flattened top section rather than an apex. The gable would incorporate a large window with a horizontal emphasis and would be timber clad. In my judgement, notwithstanding the variety of roofing styles to be found in the general area, the proposal would give the front elevation of the dwelling a stark and imposing appearance that would detract from the character and appearance of the host and the surrounding area.
-

6. The present hipped roof has a receding effect when viewed from the street which reduces its visual impact whereas the proposal in contrast, when seen from Somerset Way in conjunction with neighbouring dwellings, would appear visually dominant and incongruous. Accordingly, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with saved Policies EP3 and H11 of the adopted South Bucks Local Plan.
7. The appellant drew my attention to the variety of building and roof styles in the area, including front gables and the difference in scale between the appeal site dwelling and some of its neighbours. Be that as it may, the presence of these developments would not justify granting approval for a further development that I consider would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although neither party has invited me to consider a split decision I note that the Council has not raised any objections in respect of the proposed rear and side extensions. However, from the submitted details I am unable to be sure that the various parts of the proposal are clearly severable, both physically and functionally in terms of the rear and side extensions being capable of being built and then used for their intended purpose without the roof alterations. For that reason I have not issued a split decision.

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, while I find that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in my view this is outweighed by the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, and noting that there were no objections raised by the Parish Council or neighbours to the design of the proposal and the appellant's frustration with how the Council handled the application, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR