



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 November 2021

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PgDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/21/3281767

28A Thorney Lane South, Iver SL0 9AE

- 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 Ravinder Singh Babbra against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/1611/FA, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of loft conversion on existing building incorporating a new roof to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since determination of the planning application, the 2019 iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been superseded. I am satisfied that the updates to the Framework do not materially affect its content insofar as it is relevant to the main issue of this appeal. I have therefore determined this appeal with regard to the current version, published in July 2021.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated in the built-up area of Iver, and sits within a parade of commercial units which accommodate residential units above. Whilst many of these units have been extended at the back, the pitched roof along the parade remains largely unaltered, which gives it a sense of uniformity and cohesion which contributes positively to its appearance.
5. The appeal property has a two-storey flat roof extension which currently extends out from the rear of the property. The proposed development would introduce an additional storey over this extension, by incorporating a flat roofed dormer style extension from the main roof pitch. Although attempts have been made to incorporate a degree of subservience between the proposed extension and the existing roof, the inset distance of approximately 0.2m from the ridge and sides would be marginal. As a result, the extension would appear bulky and disproportionate to the rest of the property, and would dominate the main roof form. Moreover, given the other units in the parade have not been

developed in the same way, the extension would interrupt the prevailing uniformity and cohesion between the properties, thereby exacerbating its prominence and incongruity.

6. For these reasons, the proposed development harm the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted 1999) and Policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (adopted 2011), which require development to achieve improvement of the area through high quality design, which harmonises with the host and neighbouring properties in terms of scale, height, form and design. The development would also conflict with the overarching design objectives of the National Design Guide and the Framework.

Other Matters

7. Whilst I acknowledge the examples of properties along Bathurst Walk which have incorporated similar extensions, the proposed development would appear more prominent and incongruous than these examples, as none of the neighbouring properties within the parade have been developed in the same way. In any event, I consider that these examples do not assimilate properly with the character and appearance of the area, and therefore would not justify further development of a similar style which contravenes the development plan.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR