
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 8th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/17/3180974

Waynflete Lodge, 25 South Park Drive, Gerrards Cross, Bucks SL9 8JJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Denyse Leschhorn against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00646/OUT, dated 4 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the outline application for a new dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description as set out in the decision notice as this more accurately reflects the proposal subject to this appeal.
3. The proposal is in outline form with all matters reserved. Plans have been submitted for indicative purposes and I have used them as such.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with regard to the conservation area, and on the living conditions of future occupiers and neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The area exhibits a number of large detached houses, some of which have been subdivided. The properties are generally set within generous gardens. The topography displays the host dwelling, Waynflete Lodge, at the base of a gentle slope, it is seen on the approach along North Park, South Park Drive, and Lower Road. Due to its prominent location, Waynflete Lodge is an important element of the streetscene, creating an interesting and diverse element to the character to the area.
6. The proposal would result in an additional dwelling to the rear of Waynflete Lodge. Although the garden is relatively generous, there are already a number of small outbuildings currently located in the garden. The proposal would sit

alongside these, at a lower level. The introduction of a dwelling to this location would significantly increase the level of built form on the site.

7. Taking into account the size of the appeal site, the resultant built form, the associated parking and access areas, and the residential paraphernalia associated with a dwelling, the proposal would result in a cramped and overdeveloped site. This would be at odds with the spacious nature of the area in general, and would detract from the siting of Waynflete Lodge.
8. The appeal site falls within the Gerrards Cross Centenary conservation area, it is one of two lodges, and due to its location it is a prominent and interesting dwellinghouse, which enhances the character of the area. The space around the dwelling is an important aspect as it provides a generous and spacious setting to the dwelling house. The proposal would significantly encroach into this space. It would introduce a level of built form that would appear at odds with the existing lodge and its spacious garden, and as a result it would detract from the character of the conservation area.
9. Development has been approved in the vicinity of the Lodge house on the Oxford Road, along with permission granted for development elsewhere in the area, namely along South Park Drive. The grant of permission means that the character of a site, and an area, may change in perpetuity. The fact that permission has been allowed elsewhere does not automatically set a precedent for further development. As required by law, I have determined this appeal on the basis of its own merits.
10. Consequently I find that the proposal would fail to enhance the character of the area, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. As such it would conflict with EP3, H9 and C1 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (1999) with regards to development being designed to respect the layout and character of the area, and in ensuring that development preserves or enhances the conservation area.

Living conditions

11. The plans indicate that the proposed bungalow would be sited to the rear of the plot, with access onto Lower Road. The properties within the immediate vicinity are Waynflete Lodge and No 49 North Park. Due to the limited size of the appeal site, and the raised level of Waynflete Lodge in comparison to the appeal site, I am not convinced that Waynflete Lodge would not have an overbearing impact on future occupants of the proposal.
12. The proposed bungalow would be significantly lower than No 49. There is limited planting along the boundary with No 49, and it is likely that the occupiers of No 49 would have views over the proposed bungalow and quite possibly into the amenity area of the proposed bungalow. This level of overlooking would have a significantly overbearing impact on the occupiers of the proposal. Although the view from No 49 would change should the appeal site be developed, due to the significant change in land levels, and the indicated positioning of the bungalow, I find it highly unlikely that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the privacy of those at No 49, nor would the proposal have an overbearing impact on that property.
13. Taking into account the size of the plot, I am not convinced that the appeal site would accommodate the proposed bungalow, adequate parking and turning

space, and an appropriate level of amenity space for future occupants of the proposal.

14. As such, I find that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of future occupants of the bungalow. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would conflict with policies EP3 and H9 of the Local Plan in respect of preserving amenity of occupiers

Other Matters

15. The appellant states that they have lived in the area for a considerable period of time, and wish to remain in the area, whilst providing an additional dwelling that would contribute towards the Council's supply of homes. I appreciate that the appellant would like to remain in the local area. However, based on the evidence before me, the desire to remain in this specific location does not outweigh the conflict that the proposal has with the development plan.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR