



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

**by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/19/3238745**

**13 Pennington Road, Chalfont St Peter, Gerrards Cross SL9 9PH**

- 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 Fitzgerald against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
  - The application Ref PL/19/2394/FA, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2019.
  - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached and is located within a residential area. The area is characterised by red brick properties typically of semi-detached and terraced form. The spacing between properties at first floor level is a feature of the street scene which contributes to its character and appearance. Two storey extensions built up to the side boundary of properties are not a common feature in the street scene along Pennington Road.
4. The property is located in a row of staggered semi-detached properties and positioned at an angle to Pennington Road. To the south of the appeal property is a row of terraced properties fronting the road and the appeal property is at an angle to these and set at a slightly higher level. There currently exists a visual separation between the appeal property and that of the adjacent property (No.11) in this terraced row allowing views through providing a degree of visual separation between them.
5. The Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD) states that in areas where there are modest spaces between buildings, an extension should be set in from the side boundary by at least 1 metre. The SPD further identifies that side extensions should be designed to respect prevailing gaps and spaces between buildings and existing patterns of development and to ensure they blend into the street scene.

6. The appeal property is on a different building line to No.11 and given the angled plot boundary, there would be no direct terracing effect as it is normally understood. However, the proposal is for a two-storey extension which visually, from head-on, would fill the gap to the neighbouring plot. Whilst the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation at first floor level and would be set back from the side boundary on its front elevation its staggered side elevation would nevertheless abut the plot boundary at two points. It would be uncharacteristic of development in the locality and would not respect the spacing between buildings at first floor level in the immediate street scene, which are a significant contributor to the character of the locality. The effect of the extension would also make it appear cramped within the plot. Consequently, it would create an intrusive feature that would be out of character with the local area and accordingly it would fail to integrate successfully into the street scene.
7. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would conflict with Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H16 of the Adopted Chiltern District Local Plan 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011, Policy CS20 of the Chiltern District Council Core Strategy for Chiltern District (2011) and the SPD. Together these amongst other matters seek that the character and appearance of the street scene would not be adversely affected by development, the siting of the extension should relate well to the adjoining street scene and should not be obtrusive and that development is of a high standard of design which reflects and respects the character of the surrounding area.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

*Stephen Thomas*

INSPECTOR