



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/21/3272442

11 Penn Meadow, Stoke Poges, Bucks SL2 4EB

- 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 Sajad Mohidin against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Bucks Area.
 - The application Ref PL/20/3069/FA, dated 30 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 1 April 2020, South Bucks District Council ceased to exist and became part of a new Unitary Authority known as Buckinghamshire Council. The development plans for the merged Local Planning Authorities will remain in place for the area within the new Unitary Authority they relate to until such time as they are revoked or replaced. I shall therefore determine the appeal having regard to the policies of South Bucks District Core Strategy 2011 (the Core Strategy) and the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999 (the Local Plan).

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Sajad Mohidin against South Bucks District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. Penn Meadow is a small residential estate of two-storey semi-detached properties laid out behind deep front gardens within spacious plots. Pairs of properties are generally separated from each other by a generous gap, often occupied by single-storey garages which link pairs of houses. Some properties have modest front porch extensions which provides some variation in the appearance of individual buildings. However, the overall character and appearance of the area is of a uniform and distinctive estate of spaciouly arranged properties.

6. Number 11 (No 11) is positioned on a corner of Penn Meadow where it opens up into a central area of open space surrounded by houses. It is a generously sized plot but does not appear significantly greater than other nearby plots. It has a single-storey side extension and a modest detached single-storey garage adjacent to that. Despite these additions, the overall appearance of the property is characteristic of the wider estate.
7. The appeal scheme seeks to demolish the single-storey extension and garage and replace it with a two-storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would be the same height and nearly as wide as the existing dwelling, extending most of the width of the plot. The height, width and bulk of the extension would result in a visually obtrusive addition to the existing dwelling that would almost double its size. It would be a bulky addition which would not appear subordinate due to its large size. This would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
8. Both the side and rear proposed extensions would be visually prominent due to the corner position of the appeal site. Due to their size, they would erode the open and spacious character on this corner of Penn Road, enclosing the street and reducing views towards the central green. Furthermore, the proposal would significantly extend the pair of semi-detached properties which would be out of keeping with the uniform appearance of the wider estate. This would adversely affect the distinctive character and appearance of the area. This would not be sufficiently screened by trees within the green opposite. The use of matching materials would not overcome this harm.
9. The appellant has suggested that No 11 has a greater separation from nearby properties than others within the estate. However, No 11 occupies a particularly prominent position at the corner of Penn Meadow where it opens up onto the green. Irrespective of how this distance compares with other properties, the enclosure at this corner of the estate would be harmful.
10. Built development extends across much of the width of the site already. However, much of this is single-storey and therefore does not have the same effect on the spacious character of the area.
11. My attention has been drawn to other properties, namely Numbers 3-5, 25, 30 and 31, within the estate that have been extended to the side. I observed that these extensions were either limited to approximately half the width of the host property, set back from the front elevation or at a lower height to the main ridge which makes them subordinate. The appeal proposal is for a much larger and dominant form of extension to a more prominently positioned house. For this reason, I do not find these other developments provide justification for the scheme before me.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies EP3 and H11 of the Local Plan. These policies together require new development to be a high standard of design, to make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area, to be of a scale compatible with surrounding development and for extensions to residential dwellings to harmonise with existing building.

Other Matters

13. The appellant's extended family live in the existing house and have connections with the community including local schools. They desire to remain where they live but need additional space to accommodate their growing family. I recognise the appellant has accommodation needs. However, I am mindful of the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. The development brings about a permanent alteration to the building, whereas it is likely that the appellant's family's needs will change over the longer term.
14. The appellant has submitted a revised scheme¹ for which pre-application advice was obtained from the Council. The appellant has sought a recommendation on that pre-application scheme as part of this appeal. However, the appeal relates to the scheme for which the Council refused planning permission. It is not the role of the appeal process to evolve a scheme. It is open to the appellant to submit an application for a revised scheme. However, I give no view on the acceptability of that scheme.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Ref: PQ/21/40040/PREAPP