
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2020

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/20/3255884

20 Pomeroy Close, Amersham HP7 9BW

- 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 & Mrs Patel against the decision of Chiltern District Council (now Buckinghamshire Council).
 - The application Ref PL/20/1329/FA, dated 25 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 'first floor front extension and single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling in its context as half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, and on the character and appearance of the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling which sits within a group of similar properties which have a broadly uniform appearance. It is located on a corner plot and enjoys an exposed and prominent position within the street scene.
 4. The proposal seeks planning permission for a two storey extension to the side with a gable which would project beyond the principal elevation of the host dwelling by some 1.8 metres, along with a single storey extension to the rear.
 5. Planning permission has been granted for a two storey side extension and rear extension (Ref. PL/20/0567/FA). I understand that the only material difference between the approved scheme and the proposal before me is the projecting gable. Accordingly, my consideration of the scheme need only focus on this element.
 6. When viewed in isolation, I accept the Appellants' assertion that the gable feature is attractively designed and would add some visual interest. However, it would project noticeably beyond the principal elevation of the property. Whilst the original symmetry of the semi-detached pair of No. 20 and 22 has been altered by the existing additions at the front of the appeal property, their overall form retains its balance.
-

7. I appreciate that this balance would be altered if the approved two storey side extension was built. Nevertheless, the two storey gable element of the scheme before me would be noticeably larger and more prominent than the approved two storey extension. Although the ridge of the proposed gable would sit well below that of the host dwelling and the extension would be built in matching external materials, I am of the view that the additional bulk and degree of forward projection would harmfully imbalance the overall form of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. This visual harm would be exacerbated by the exposed and prominent corner position of the pair and it would detract from a well ordered street scene.
8. The Appellants refer to the presence of a similar projecting two storey extension at No. 15 Pomeroy Close and the fact that planning permission has been granted for a projecting gable at No. 12 which would be proportionately wider when considered against the width of its host dwelling. However, these properties sit within a row of other dwellings and do not have such an exposed and prominent position within the street scene. The visual effect is therefore not directly comparable and I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits, taking into account the specific context within which it would sit.
9. The Appellants assert that the proposal amounts to sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and I have explained why, in this particular case, the design of the proposed extension is not appropriate. It therefore does not amount to sustainable development in the widest sense of the definition.
10. I agree with the Appellants that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of nearby residents in any way and this is reflected, to a degree, in an absence of any formal objections from third parties. I also note that it would not affect the level of on-site parking provision. However, these are neutral factors in the overall planning balance.

Overall Conclusion

11. The proposed projecting two storey gable would be an overly prominent addition which would unduly imbalance the pair of semi-detached houses of which the appeal dwelling is a part and it would harm the character and appearance of the street scene as a result. In such terms, it conflicts with saved policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the adopted Chiltern District Local Plan, policy CS20 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy for Chiltern District and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Residential Extensions and Householder Development*'; all of which promote high quality design which is appropriate to its context.
12. The arguments advanced by the Appellants in favour of the proposal do not outweigh the identified harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR