



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/19/3234713

6 Lincoln Hatch Lane, Burnham, Slough SL1 7HD

- 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 C R Moore against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/19/1115/FA, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the continuation of existing ground side extension to form new first floor bathroom and extend existing bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the continuation of the existing ground side extension to form new first floor bathroom and extend existing bedroom at 6 Lincoln Hatch Lane, Burnham, Slough SL1 7HD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/19/1115/FA, dated 18 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 001 (existing ground floor plan); Drawing No 003 (existing first floor plan); Drawing No 004 (proposed first floor plan); Drawing No 005 (existing elevations); Drawing No 006 (proposed elevations); Drawing No 008 (location plan); Drawing No 010 (block plans).
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The rooflights in the eastern elevation of the extension hereby permitted, shall be of a high-level type with the sill height a minimum of 1.7 metres above the floor level of the room they serve.

Procedural Matter

2. In issuing this decision I have used the development description given by the Appellant on the application form. This differs from the Council's description in their refusal notice, nevertheless I am satisfied that it accurately reflects the proposed development.

3. The Application form displays a different name to the Appeal form, with different initials being used. The Appellant has confirmed that the correct name is that shown on the Appeal form, and I have referred to this in the banner heading.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The street consists of primarily detached dwellings built in a mix of styles and set within generous plots. There is no consistency or uniformity in terms of the spaces between the first-floor portion of the dwellings and their side boundaries. Although clearly obvious, the spaces between dwellings are not significant in terms of their distance and range from side walkways, vehicle driveways, and single storey attached garages. This results in gaps between dwellings that subtly contract and expand along the street.
6. No 6 is a dormer style bungalow. The proposal would result in an alteration to its roof that would extend into the space above the existing flat roof side extension that lies adjacent to the dwelling's boundary with No 6A. This would give the dwelling a new asymmetrical roof profile, whilst also partially filling the existing gap between the two dwellings. No 6A, is a chalet style bungalow with a low eaves level and a tall pitched roof. The main two storey portion of this dwelling is set in from the boundary, with a single storey flat roof attached garage occupying the intervening space. Planning permission has been granted to increase the height of the garage by 0.9m. Whilst moderately developing the space between the two dwellings, the proposed extension would maintain a clear gap when viewed from the street.
7. Policy H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (Adopted 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011) (SBDP) specifically refers to separation distances between first floor extensions and plot boundaries. The proposed extension would be positioned within the 1m that should be maintained from the flank boundary of the site. Such gaps, the Council explain, are necessary to maintain the relative spaciousness of development, to prevent an over dominant building and any terracing effect with a neighbouring property.
8. Although the proposal would partially develop the existing gap between the appeal dwelling and its side boundary, the sloping profile of the roof and the comparatively low first floor eaves height of the extension would ensure that the space close to the boundary is not unacceptably dominated and filled by the proposal. The opposing roof slope of No 6A, would also angle away from the proposal and maintain an acceptable gap that would not be inconsistent with the general pattern of spaces between dwellings in the street. This would still be the case, following the construction of the roof extension above the garage of No 6A which would be comparatively modest in scale and height.
9. I note the Council's concerns that a possible terracing effect could occur if No 6A were to extend from the side elevation facing the proposal. However, I have received no details that the neighbour intends to extend the property. Nevertheless, and, in any event, I consider that the roof profile of the proposal

helps to maintain an acceptable gap between the boundary with No 6A that would safeguard any unacceptable impacts in this respect.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Despite technical breaches of policy H11, the specific circumstances of this appeal mean that the scheme would still comply with the overall aims of Policies H11 and EP3 of the SBDP and Policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy Development Plan Document, adopted 2011, in respecting and protecting local character.

Other Matter

11. The Council's submission includes details of the Burnham Conservation Area (BCA), which immediately abuts the appeal property boundary. Given the position of the extension to the east of the existing dwelling, its modest scale and its acceptable integration into the design of the dwelling's roof, there would be no harm to the setting of the BCA.

Conditions

12. It is necessary that planning permission is granted subject to conditions that relate to the standard time limit for commencement of development and a schedule of plans that the development relates to. These are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. Conditions relating to the placing of rooflights and construction in materials to match are respectively necessary to safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR