



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/19/3230397

2 Gurneys Meadow, Holmer Green HP15 6TW

- 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 Mrs R Duggan against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/19/0356/FA, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a "two storey extension and replacing existing flat roof to front elevations with pitched roof".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a detached dwelling that is sited on the corner of Gurneys Meadow and Sheepcote Dell Road. The property is constructed over two storeys and is located within a predominantly residential area. Gurneys Meadow contains a number of properties that have a similar external appearance. In this particular instance, as the appeal site sits on a corner plot, it benefits from a side garden area to the north of the property which is bound by a mature hedge. The area has a pleasing sense of rhythm and a degree of uniformity and spaciousness which is reinforced by the similar layout and appearance of dwellings on Gurneys Meadow. The side garden area of the site contributes to the open character of the area, which is reflected in similar side garden spaces on corner plots in the vicinity, such as those on Winters Way and Sheepcote Dell Road close to the site.
4. The proposed development would see the single storey element stepped to the two storey element so that the overall bulk of the extension would be broken up. However, the scale of the proposed extension would almost double the footprint of the existing dwelling, filling the entire width of the plot with a gap of some 0.5m remaining to the boundary at its closest point. The scale of the development would reduce the space at the site, thereby eroding the openness at this part of Gurneys Meadow Road. It would result in a cramped form of development that would fail to respond positively to the more spacious character that exists in the area. This harm would be clearly visible from the surrounding properties.

5. I accept that there is no indication from the appellant that the existing hedge would be removed. I have also carefully considered the suggestion that a condition could be imposed to ensure that the hedge is retained. Nevertheless, even if the hedge was to be retained, the harm to the character and appearance of the area resulting from the development would still be visible from Gurneys Meadow and Sheepcote Dell Road.
6. Thus, the development would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H17 of the Chiltern District Council Local Plan 1997, Policy CS20 of the Chiltern District Council Core Strategy 2011 and the Chiltern District Council Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2013 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design which reflects the character of the surrounding area, is not obtrusive and does not adversely affect the street scene in the vicinity.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that the appellant amended the proposed development in line with comments received by the Council during the course of its consideration of the planning application. I also accept that suitable materials to match the existing property would be employed and that the development would assist in supporting home working at the site. However, neither this, nor any other material consideration that has been advanced outweighs the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR