



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2021

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0350/D/20/3262269

Tudor House Dukes Wood Drive Gerrards Cross SL9 7LN

- 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 A Purewal against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref. PL/20/1679/FA, dated 29 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey front, part single part two rear extensions, front porch canopy, single storey side, rear dormer and insertion of windows and 3 rooflights to sides.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front, part single part two rear extensions, front porch canopy, single storey side, rear dormer and insertion of windows and 3 rooflights to side at Tudor House Dukes Wood Drive Gerrards Cross SL9 7LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. PL/20/1679/FA, dated 29 May 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PA.01 and PA.02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the first floor window in the northern and southern elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing and any part of the window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening. The windows shall be retained in that condition unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - 5) No further windows shall be installed at or above first floor level in the northern and southern elevations of the extensions hereby permitted.
 - 6) No development shall take place above ground level until a scheme of ecological enhancements shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to ensure a net gain in biodiversity will be

achieved. The scheme will include details of new landscape planting of known benefit to wildlife and provision of artificial roost features, including bird and bat boxes and other appropriate features. Any new fencing will have holes suitable for safe passage of hedgehogs.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the applicant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have adopted the Council's description of the development as this provides a more succinct description.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

1. The appeal property (Tudor House) is a detached property situate in a residential area where the predominant form is of large detached dwellings in spacious grounds set back from the road. There is a large detached garage to the front of the property which obscures in part direct views of the front elevation. The area as a whole is highly varied in terms of the design and appearance of dwellings. Tudor House is within a group of four dwellings, of which only the two neighbouring properties to its north share a similar appearance. It is not within a Conservation area, nor is there any special architectural merit to its design.
2. The proposed design of the front, rear and side extensions and increase in footprint would materially alter the appearance of Tudor House and the resultant dwelling would be substantially larger than the existing dwelling. However, this does not automatically equate to harm. I note the concern of the Council that the proposed design would result in a Georgian style dwelling and not in keeping with the existing dwelling. However the proposed principal front extension of Tudor House would be symmetrical providing balance and be of good design. I noted that there are several dwellings of similar style within the vicinity and so it would not be out of context in the wider area.
3. The proposal would also see a redesign of the roof profile to accommodate a crown roof with a shallower hipped roof over a full two storey front extension. However the same eaves height would be maintained and the ridge would not be higher than the existing. Tudor House is of a scale able to accommodate the crown roof and the resulting roof profile would not be incompatible with the overall design of the dwelling. Given Tudor House is set well back from the highway, it would not draw the eye nor be perceived negatively as disproportionate or incongruous to the existing building. Nor would the proposed crown roof detract from the character and appearance of the area given the variety of roof forms within the locality observed on my site visit.
4. There is substantial mature vegetation in this location. This, and Tudor House's set back from the highway and juxtaposition with adjacent properties, is such that the extended flank elevations, broken up by varying roof lines and side windows, would not be readily visible in wider views along Dukes Wood Drive. As such they would not appear as an unduly prominent feature.

5. Reference has been made to extant permissions to neighbouring dwellings, Templewood and Kingsclere, both sited opposite to Tudor House. I take account of these permissions which in general have allowed for large extensions with roof alterations. I note that the Council say that the extant permission at Templewood is for a more traditional design and would not project further within the plot. Nonetheless, on the information before me it appears that the appeal proposal would not be dissimilar to these other approvals for substantial extensions and remodelling to large properties.
6. Accordingly, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of Tudor House and the area. As such it would not be in conflict with Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted 1999) and Policies CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (2011). These policies, amongst other matters, aim for a high standard of design and for development not to adversely affect the character of the locality. It would also not be in conflict with the National Planning Policy nor the National Design Guide which encourages good design and seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

7. I note that the Council has no concerns in relation as to the amenity or privacy of the occupiers of the adjacent property and I would agree with this assessment.

Conditions

8. Conditions in respect of timescales and specifying the approved plans are necessary as this provides certainty. A condition regarding the materials to be used is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory. A condition for a scheme for ecological enhancements is required to protect biodiversity. Finally, I also attach conditions regarding the glazing of windows and prohibiting installation of further windows in the interests of privacy of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given and having taken all other matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR