



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019 by John Gunn DipTP DipDBE MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/19/3226690

Land at 23 Burlington Road, Burnham, Slough, SL1 7BQ

- 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 Loyd Denisson against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/18/4655/FA, dated 19 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2019.
 - The development is proposed new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. Although the application was made by Mr and Mrs Loyd Denisson the appeal was submitted by Mr Loyd Denisson and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. The Council's decision notice amends the description of the proposal to read 'Erection of dwelling within curtilage of existing dwelling following demolition of garage'. The appellant has used the same description used by the Council, on his appeal form, and therefore it is assumed that both parties are content with the amended description. Consequently, the appeal has been determined based on the revised description.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 23 Burlington Road.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site comprises the curtilage of No 23 Burlington Road, a semi-detached property linked, by a canopy behind a high wall, to a single garage. Car parking for the retained dwelling at No 23 and the new dwelling, would take the form of a forecourt fronting Burlington Road.
7. The area is characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings and maisonettes set parallel to the roads. Individual dwellings have medium sized front gardens, the majority of which are enclosed by mature evergreen hedges. The staggered frontages of properties, combined with a varied roofscapes and gaps between dwellings, defines the character of the area. Where parking is provided within the curtilage of existing properties it is generally alongside the dwelling with garages to the rear.
8. The appeal proposal would result in a narrow fronted dwelling on a smaller plot than other properties in the road. It would be sited very close to No 23 and would result in a cramped form of development, out of keeping with the more spacious properties nearby. Whilst the proposal maintains a similar building line to its neighbours its bland design, which incorporates few of the design characteristics of other properties in the road, would not improve the character and quality of the area. The parking proposed would dominate the frontage of the properties removing landscaped areas causing further harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to infill developments in other local roads, including Eastfield Road and Bayley Crescent. Whilst noting these matters, I have not been provided with detailed drawings of the developments, or the individual circumstances of those cases. Accordingly, I can therefore only attach very limited weight to this matter in my consideration of this appeal. Each planning application and appeal is determined on its merits.
10. Given my findings above I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with Policies EP3 and H9 of South Bucks District Local Plan (LP) which require, amongst other matters, for new housing to be of a scale, density, layout and design that respects and harmonises with surrounding properties, and paragraph 3.5 of the South Bucks Townscape Character Study Part 2 which seeks to maintain consistent building lines, building spacing and plot proportions with parking integrated into the development so that gardens remain planted and hard landscaped frontages are avoided.
11. Policy H11 of the LP was referred to in the Council's decision notice. This policy relates to alterations and extensions to dwellings and is not relevant to the development being considered in this appeal.

Living Conditions

12. The appeal proposal would lie close to No 23 and project several metres beyond its rear wall. It would be much closer and larger in scale than the existing garage upon the site. No 23 has windows in the gable end and rear elevation with an outlook towards the new dwelling. The siting of the proposal would result in a tall brick wall in close proximity to these windows, and the pleasant outlook from them would be significantly diminished once the new dwelling was constructed. Moreover, the height and position of the new dwelling would enclose the space to the rear of No 23 and would be likely to reduce the amount of light that the rear rooms and garden benefit from. Having regard to the above findings, there would be a high probability that the rear rooms and garden would be less pleasant places to use as a result of the new dwelling.
13. In light of the foregoing I conclude that harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 23 would occur as a result of the proposal. This would be in conflict with Policies EP3 and EP5 of the LP which collectively require development to not adversely affect the amenities of nearby properties and provide adequate daylight to them.

Other Matters

14. I have considered the other matters raised by the appellant and I acknowledge that the appeal development could be constructed of materials matching other properties within the road and would meet the Council's requirements in terms of amenity space and car parking. However, these factors carry neutral weight in my overall consideration and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

J Gunn

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR