



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/21/3286334
26 Crabtree Close, Beaconsfield, HP9 1UQ

- 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 Pav Nijjer against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/2503/FA, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Part single storey/part two storey side/rear extensions, double storey front porch, roof alterations 6 rooflights. Amendment to approved application PL/21/0164/FA."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey detached house in a residential street. House designs vary and many appear to have been altered or extended. Nonetheless, the host property is similarly designed to the neighbouring house and houses opposite it. Shared characteristics include 2 storey projecting canted bays on the front elevation, up to eaves height, with clay hanging tiles between the first floor and ground floor windows. Roofs are dual pitched with brick chimney stacks on the gable end. Front entrances are to the side of the front elevations, with attached garages on the opposite side. The host property has an existing single storey rear extension across the back of the house and garage.
4. The proposed development is for a 2 storey rear extension and a side extension above the garage. The pitched roof would be replaced by a crown roof and the 2 storey canted bay would be replaced by a 2 storey pitched roof gable projection. This would provide a new front entrance at ground floor level and an extension to the first floor hallway, with windows rising from floor level to the apex of the roof which would be above the eaves level on the main roof.
5. The proposal is described as an amendment to a previous application which was permitted. I have not been provided with copies of the approved plans, but it is clear from the Council officer's report that the Council's concerns relate to the

increased scale of the crown roof and the siting and design of the front extension.

6. The host property is relatively prominent when approaching from Mayflower Way because it is located on a bend in the road and sits forward of the adjacent church. Neighbouring houses further along the road sit slightly forward of it such that their pitched roofed gable ends are visible. A crown roof would be at odds with the prevailing roof form and particularly obtrusive because of the building's position. The proposed central porch and large vertical windows on the first floor above it would dominate the front elevation. It would replace the canted bays, which I have noted are a common feature of neighbouring houses, and shift the entrance to the house from the side to the centre. It would also introduce large vertical windows which would be out of keeping with the existing horizontal emphasis windows on the host property and its neighbours. The overall appearance of the house would be significantly altered such that its design would no longer reflect that of the original building or neighbouring houses. As a result, the proposed development would be incongruous and harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
7. The appellant has referred to front gable projections on other properties within Crabtree Close and a crown roof structure at No 21, and to the varied design of houses in the surrounding area. However, none of the examples provided are directly comparable to the appeal proposal before me. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The proposal would therefore conflict with saved Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (Adopted March 1999 Consolidated September 2007 and February 2011), Policy CP8 of the South Bucks District Core Strategy (Adopted February 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which require high quality development that harmonises with existing buildings and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.

Conclusion

9. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the processing of the planning application and the absence of public representations. However, for the reasons above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR