
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/19/3240444

51 Orchardville, Burnham SL1 7BD

- 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 Alicia Walker against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/19/1226/FA, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey part side and rear extension, loft extension and conversion including raising ridge height by 600mm.
-

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. The application was made by Mr and Mrs Walker, whilst the appeal has been submitted by Mrs Alicia Walker. I have proceeded on the basis Mrs Alice Walker was an original applicant.
4. During the course of the application the description of development was revised to reflect the development that required planning permission. The Council describe the proposal as 'single storey side extension, part single part two storey rear extension, loft extension with increased ridge height incorporating first floor, dormer window to side elevation, insertion of rooflights and alterations to doors and windows'. I note that this is how the appellant describes the proposal in her appeal statement and in the appeal form and I have assessed the appeal on this basis.
5. The drawings that have been submitted with the appeal do not correlate with those quoted in the appeal statement. However, both parties have confirmed that the submitted drawings are those that were assessed by the Council. For the avoidance of doubt I have considered this appeal on the basis of the following plans: 7132/01 (quoted as Job No) – Existing Plans, 7132/02 (quoted as Job No) – Existing Elevations, 7132/03 Rev B (quoted as Job No) – Proposed Plans, 7132/04 Rev B (quoted as Job No) – Proposed Elevations and 05 – Location and Block Plans.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow, which includes accommodation in the roof, set within a long rectangular plot on the north side of Orchardville. There is a mix of property styles in the immediate area, including two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, as well as other bungalows. The proposal involves a number of works, although the Council's refusal reason refers specifically to the proposed dormer and rear extension.
8. The proposed side dormer would be located towards the rear of the main roof. It would have a box like design with no fenestration, save for a window to the rear. Thus, due to its size, utilitarian form and design and location within the roof slope, the dormer would appear as a dominant and discordant addition which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. The dormer would also be visible from the public realm to the front of the property. As a result of its poor design and relationship to the host dwelling, the dormer would have a deleterious effect on the contribution that the bungalow makes to the character and appearance of the area. It would also appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscene, thus resulting in harm to the streetscene and the area.
9. My attention has been drawn to the presence of a side facing dormer window at the neighbouring property. However, that dormer is different to the appeal proposal. Further, no details have been provided as to the planning history of this dormer and each case must be considered on its merits. Consequently, the presence of the dormer on the neighbouring property does not justify the appeal proposal.
10. The proposed rear extension would incorporate flat roofed areas to the single storey elements and a centrally located two storey section. Due to its size, form and design the proposal would appear as a bulky, disjointed and dominant feature. It would feature varying roof pitches and would fail to relate well to the host dwelling. As such, it would cause harm to its character and appearance. While the extension is unlikely to be visible from the public realm, it would be seen from the rear gardens of neighbouring and nearby properties and would likely reduce the appreciation of the quality of the environment in which nearby occupiers live. As such, harm, albeit limited, would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. In reaching this conclusion, I note that the property currently benefits from a large single storey flat roofed extension. While this appears to be an unsympathetic addition, the proposed rear extension would be larger and more visible and so would have effects over and above the existing situation.
11. I have been referred to the two storey rear extensions at No's 53 and 53A Orchardville. However, these are to the rear of existing two storey dwellings and are seen in a different context than the appeal proposal. The appellant has also referred me to a first floor side extension at No 66 Orchardville, which again is viewed in a different context. Further, I do not have the full planning history of any of these extensions before me. Consequently, their presence do

not justify the unacceptable development proposed in this case, which I have assessed on its own merits.

12. The proposal also includes a side extension. The ridge of this element would be set down from the ridge of the main dwelling, although this is predicated on the increased roof height. Further, the eaves would be at a different level to the main dwelling and the proposed extension would add significant bulk and mass. As a consequence, the proposed side extension would fail to relate appropriately to the host dwelling and would compete with it visually, resulting in harm to its character and appearance. While I note that the property at 66 Orchardville has different eaves heights, this is viewed in a different context and does not justify the unacceptable development proposed. There would be a gap retained between the side elevation of the proposed side extension and the side boundary. This would ensure a satisfactory degree of visual separation with the neighbouring property. However, due to its poor visual relationship with the host dwelling, which would be visible from the public realm to the front, the proposed side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
13. In conclusion, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. There would be conflict with Saved Policies EP3 and H9 of the South Bucks District Local Plan Written Statement Adopted March 1999, Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011 and Core Policy 8 of the South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted February 2011. These seek, among other things, to ensure that proposed extensions to existing buildings should reflect the form and design of those buildings, that proposals would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area in terms of design, scale and form and would not adversely affect the character or amenities of nearby properties or the locality in general. Further, all new development must be of a high standard of design and make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area. The proposal also conflicts with South Bucks District Council Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document October 2008, which states that dormer windows should respect the size and design of the roof of the dwellinghouse.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR