

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/17/3170025

Rosemont, 23 Dukes Close, Gerrards Cross SL9 7LH

- 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 D Allen against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application, Ref. 16/01936/FUL, dated 9 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear, part two storey rear extension; loft conversion involving raising the ridge; internal alterations. Change of use of brickwork to render and tudor detail to front aspect.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the 'street scene' of Dukes Close.

Reasons

3. The proposal is an amended scheme that attempts to overcome the Council's previous concerns in respect of its design and appearance as a three-storey dwelling. This notwithstanding, the Council's view is that the effect of the roof reconstruction on the dwelling would be such as to make it appear as over-dominant and incongruous with an adverse effect on the street scene.
 4. The grounds of appeal argue that the proposed 0.5m increase in the ridge height compared to the existing building would be nominal and that the proposed flat crown roof would create visual interest, whilst at the same time be acceptable in the light of the varied design and style of surrounding development.
 5. However, I saw on my visit that No. 23 sits between houses of a conventional design style with relatively shallow pitched and unadorned roofs that read clearly as being of two storey accommodation. As such they blend seamlessly into the street scene.
 6. The appeal scheme, with its higher ridge, flat crown roof and with both flanks built as gable ends, appears to me to be a somewhat contrived design that does nothing to disguise the attempt to achieve the maximum possible amount of loft accommodation as living space. This is further emphasised by the row of five
-

roof lights on the front elevation just below the ridge line and the elongated box dormer to the rear, albeit that the latter would not be in public view.

7. I consider that the effect of this would be a dwelling that would not sit comfortably with its immediate neighbours and in particular with a roof that would draw the eye as being of one of excessive bulk and of a design harmfully out of keeping with its context. The scale and design would such that Rosemont would be perceived as more one of a three storey than a two storey building, and overall I consider that it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Dukes Close street scene.
8. This would be in conflict with Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks Local Plan 1999 and Section 7: 'Requiring Good Design' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. I have paid careful attention to all the points made in the grounds of appeal but have found nothing to alter my view that, for the reasons stated, the appeal should not succeed.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR