



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/19/3236802

Denmead, Old Mill Road, Denham, UB9 5AW

- 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 M Hear against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref: PL/19/1222/FA, dated 7 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey corner, part rear and part side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The site is located within the Green Belt and Paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt is inappropriate, with certain exceptions. One such exception is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. In this regard, saved policies GB1 and GB10 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, 1999 (LP) are consistent with the Framework, in that they require that proposed extensions, together with existing extensions to dwellings to be of a small scale in relation to the size of the original dwelling.
3. The officer report indicates that the site falls within a Green Belt settlement and as such an increase of a little larger than 50% may be allowed. The Council state that the dwelling has not previously been extended and the current proposals would result in an addition amounting to 16% of the original floorspace of the dwelling. Neither the appellant, nor any other parties, have disputed the Council's calculations and I see no reason to disagree with them based on the evidence before me. On this basis the proposal would not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a detached two-storey dwelling which forms part of a small cul-de-sac of four properties, accessed from Old Mill Road. The rear boundary of the site adjoins the footpath on Oxford Road and is defined by a brick wall with piers and fence panel inserts. The dwelling itself is set back from the boundary with Oxford Road and, although slightly closer to the highway, it largely follows the alignment of the adjacent dwelling, Willows End and properties further to the north which front on to Oxford Road.
6. The proposal involves a single storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear elevations of the existing property. It would extend up to the site boundary with Oxford Road and fill the south-west corner of the site. Due to its proximity to the site boundary and overall depth the extension would be a prominent feature in the street scene. Its positioning relative to Oxford Road would result in a built form that would be out of kilter with the present consistency in the arrangement of buildings within the street.
7. Furthermore, the extension would have a shallow hipped roof and, whilst this may keep the overall height of the extension low, it would be at odds with the design of the host property. Considering this, its wrap around design and overall size it would compete visually with the existing property.
8. The appellant has indicated that the existing boundary treatment would be retained, and this may provide some screening. However due to its height the extension would still be visible above the boundary treatment. From the street there would be a clear appreciation of its overall size and design, especially of its roof design which, with its squat appearance, would be particularly discordant.
9. Consequently, the extension would be a prominent and incongruous addition within the street scene, at odds with the established character of the dwelling and pattern of development along Oxford Road.
10. Whilst the development would utilise appropriate materials and not result in any undue overlooking of adjacent properties, I consider these matters would have a neutral effect, and therefore do not weigh in favour of the appeal.
11. The proposals would therefore have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and host dwelling. On this basis I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to LP Policies EP3 and H11 which seek to ensure the scale, layout, height and design of developments harmonise with the existing building and are compatible with the character of the site, adjoining development and the locality in general.
12. In addition, the proposal would fail to achieve the design principles set out in the Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study Part 3, 2017 which states that development within the area identified as, Inconsistent Suburban, should create a more consistent character and relate closely to adjacent development in terms of materials, form or height with set backs being consistent with adjacent development.

Other Matter

13. The appellant has stated that the extension would accommodate a disabled family member, with an increase in manoeuvring to the kitchen and dining area being provided. However, there is little in the evidence before me to detail the accessibility needs that are required to be accommodated. Furthermore, there is nothing to demonstrate that the extension proposed would be the only way to achieve this. Therefore, whilst I am mindful that personal requirements may exist, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified. This other matter does not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR