



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2021

**by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 May 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/20/3263134**

**Ashleigh, 10 Layters Way, Gerrards Cross, SL9 7QY**

- 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 and Mrs Parker against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
  - The application Ref PL/20/0956/FA, dated 19 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gerrards Cross Centenary Conservation Area ('CA') having regard to a non-designated heritage asset.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey house with a roof level second floor bedroom, located within a substantial plot. This property lies on the western edge of the designated CA. This part of the CA is characterised by its garden village residential zone. Layters Way reflects the prevailing garden city and garden suburb influence of the early C20. In particular, the appeal property forms part of a cohesive grouping to the northeast side of Layters Way which adhere to the predominant Arts and Crafts influenced architectural style with high quality materials and detailing.
4. The appeal property is largely faced in white painted pebbledash render, with timber detailing to gables and facing brick on the front and side elevations at ground floor level. The roof is clad in plain tiles. Its notable features include a front two-storey gabled projection with a two-storey bay window, separate two storey side projections, one gabled and one hipped. The latter side projection incorporates a distinct two-storey bay window feature along the northeast corner of this property. In terms of its design, this corner feature complements the front bay window and its orientation takes advantage of views over its extensive garden. As such, this is a distinct and bespoke design feature of the property and an integral part of its architectural vision.

5. Most notably, on the information before me, the appeal property is identified in the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal document as an 'Unlisted building that makes a positive contribution' to the CA, which was designed by named architect HW Moore and was built in 1910.
6. Consequently, the appeal property carries significance through its aesthetic value because of its Arts and Crafts form, detailing and finishes. Historic value, through its grouping forming part of an important phase in the evolution of the settlement and street scene. As such, the appeal property positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area and the significance of the CA. Because the appeal property is a non-designated heritage asset, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') this also merits consideration in the determination of this appeal.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would extend the existing two storey side projection which incorporates the two-storey corner feature. The height of this side extension would be similar to the existing side projection and would extend into the side garden. Despite its overall scale, this extension would be appreciably set back from the front of the dwelling and plot and therefore would not be unduly dominant. In particular, it would not detract from the original proportions and composition of the principal elevation of this property, which includes the front gable and main entrance.
8. Nevertheless, as a consequence of the proposed side extension the existing two-storey corner feature would be lost. Notwithstanding that this feature is not specified in the Conservation Area Appraisal or readily appreciable from the front of the site, it is still a distinct feature of the appeal property which positively contributes to its design and the significance of the CA, for the reasons set out above. Furthermore, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA applies whether or not the proposal is in public view or not.
9. Therefore, and despite some features of the appeal property being retained, including its front gable projection, bay window and the jettied side bay projection, the proposal would result in the significant and permanent erosion of part of its detailing and design quality. Therefore, overall, the proposal represents an incompatible design which would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the CA.
10. The harm the proposal would cause to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, no such benefits have been identified.
11. Having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA<sup>1</sup>, despite finding the harm to be less than substantial, this still carries significant weight.
12. Drawing on the above reasons, the proposed development would harm a non-designated heritage asset and also fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies EP3 and H11 of South Bucks District Local Plan (LP). Together, these

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

policies seek to secure developments which are compatible with the site and the surroundings in terms of design. I also find conflict with Policy C1 of the LP which states that development within a CA that fails to preserve or enhance its character or appearance will not be permitted. Accordingly, the proposal also fails to accord with the relevant provisions of the Framework with regard to protecting the historic environment.

### **Other Matters**

13. The appellants have raised a number of matters in relation to the processing of their planning application. Such matters are for the Council and do not alter my findings on the planning merits of the proposal. Also, while I acknowledge that there is scope to extend the appeal property, the proposal before me is unacceptable for the reasons already given.

### **Conclusion**

14. In light of above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Aqbal*

INSPECTOR