



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/20/3246517

Ti Soleil, Lincoln Road, Chalfont St Peter, SL9 9TG

- 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 Lance Jordan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council – Chiltern Area.
 - The application Ref: PL/19/3580/FA dated 10 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is two-storey front and rear extensions and single storey rear extension (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 1 April 2020, Chiltern District Council was one of several local planning authorities to merge into a single Unitary Authority called Buckinghamshire Council. Accordingly, although the original decision (PL/19/3580/FA) was made by Chiltern District Council, it is proceeding as an appeal under the newly formed authority.
3. The appeal property has planning permission¹ for two-storey front extensions, part two-storey/part single storey rear extension, replacement rear and front dormers which was approved in March 2016 and renewed in 2019. The approved plans were not adhered to. Planning permission was refused for an amended scheme and dismissed on appeal². A subsequent planning application further amending the scheme was refused in December 2019³ and is the subject of this appeal.
4. Some elements of the proposed development have been implemented. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amendments to the approved scheme.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

¹ CH/2016/0177/FA (2016 permission) and PL/19/3117/FA (2019 permission)

² APP/X0415/D/18/3196370

³ PL/19/3580/FA

Reasons

6. The appeal property is located within a residential area, defined as an Established Residential Area of Special Character (ERASC). The area is characterised by large detached houses set within generous plots, with houses following a range of different styles and designs with some variation to roof forms. The appeal site slopes quite steeply down from the road. The house was originally a chalet style building featuring a long-pitched roof and dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes, characteristic of many properties within the ERASC.
7. The approved scheme proposed two storey gable projections either side of a recessed front door with a substantial dormer window centrally positioned within the retained roof slope. The scheme before me would replace the central dormer with an infill first floor extension with a crown roof set between the projecting gables.
8. The first-floor infill extension, whilst set back from the front gable projections and with a roof height that would be lower than the adjoining gables and main roof ridge, would be a bulky addition. Due to its eaves being set above the eaves of the projecting gables and having a crown roof shape it would appear as an incongruous and alien feature within the front elevation. Furthermore, whilst the front elevation would have a symmetrical appearance, the roof scape would appear visually cluttered. It would lack harmony due to the variety of roof shapes incorporated within it including projecting gables and part of the original pitched roof visible behind the proposed crown roof. This would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
9. At the rear, the approved scheme proposed a pair of gables either side of two centrally positioned dormer windows within the original pitched roof. The proposed scheme would replace these dormer windows with a first-floor extension which would be set in slightly from the rear elevation of the projecting rear gable. It would have a crown roof. When viewed from the rear, very little of the original dwelling house with its characteristic long roof slope would remain. The first-floor extension, despite a set back from the rearmost elevation of the property, would appear as a bulky addition. The crown roof would fail to integrate with the appearance of the property and would appear as a discordant element that would not respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling.
10. I observed on my site visit that views of the appeal property can be gained on the approach in either direction from Lincoln Road, although there is some limited screening provided by vegetation. Nevertheless, due to the sloping nature of the site, the front elevation including the proposed crown roof, even though it would be positioned between the gables, would be prominent from Lincoln Road. I accept that the rear extension would not be visible from the public realm. Its impact on the character of the street scene would therefore be very limited. This does not, however, overcome the harm to the host property I have identified.
11. I appreciate that house styles in the area vary, and some have an understated appearance which make a minimal contribution to the character and appearance of the area. However, paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should be refused if it fails to take the opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area and the way

it functions. In this regard, the proposed development which would result in the loss of the characteristic long sloped pitched roof from the original house and its replacement with bulky extensions would be harmful to the character of the area.

12. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore not comply with Saved Policies GC1, H13, H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan⁴ and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District 2011 and Policy H7 of the Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2028. These policies together seek to ensure development is of a high standard of design, that maintains or enhances the design, character and quality of the building and that it does not harm the character and appearance of the locality. It would also not accord with the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2013 which discourages the use of crown roofs and seeks development that harmonises with the host building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objection from neighbouring residents and the Parish Council, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR

⁴ Chiltern District Local Plan Adopted 1 September 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011