



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

by L Page BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/22/3291050

7 Bracken Close, Farnham Common SL2 3JP

- 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 Mrs I Purewal against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/3606/FA, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - (a) character and appearance of the area; and
 - (b) living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in relation to overbearing.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The site is located on a corner plot at 7 Bracken Close. Whilst the site may have a lesser degree of prominence from the junction with Templewood Lane, it clearly has an appreciable degree of prominence when travelling along Bracken Close and adjoining spur road, whether or not footfall is limited, the site is clearly visible in the public domain.
4. The existing dwelling is two storeys in height with a single storey garage. The plot is well landscaped and relatively spacious, which is in keeping with the site's location within an area identified in the Chiltern & South Bucks Townscape Character Study, Part 3 2017 as being open plan and suburban.
5. The proposal would introduce a two storey side and rear extension, which would add considerable scale to the existing dwelling. Whilst it is acknowledged that planning permission has been previously granted for the existing dwelling to be extended, the proposal in this case is larger in scale and in particular lacks subservience to the existing dwelling.
6. For example, the ridge height of the two storey side extension would be a continuation of the existing main ridge. There would also be a substantial increase in scale directly adjacent to the spur road, which because of its proximity and crowding of the boundary would be imposing in the street scene.

7. Altogether, the scale of the proposal and lack of subservience would subsume the original form of the existing dwelling, harming its appearance in the street scene. This harm would be exacerbated by the prominent location of the site on a corner plot and proximity to the spur road.
8. Without a detailed comparison between the first planning application and the second planning application subject to this appeal, in addition to other dwellings on the street and elsewhere, it is not possible to properly assess contended similarities or whether they are relevant.
9. The Council does not appear to dispute the materials in use as part of the proposal or contend that this would harm the character or appearance of the area, and the matter has not been determinative under the main issue.
10. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy CSP8 of the South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999.

Living Conditions

11. The site is separated from its neighbours to the east by a spur road off Bracken Close and the distance in between is appreciable. Whilst the proposal would introduce an additional storey along its eastern flank, it would not extend beyond the existing building line of the garage.
12. In my view, the combination of intervening spur road and distance between the neighbours is sufficient to mitigate overbearing effects of the proposal. Indeed, there is little evidence that the outlook from the neighbouring dwellings is so acute that the proposal would have a harmful effect.
13. Overall, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in relation to overbearing and would not conflict with Policy CSP8 of the South Bucks Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999.

Other Matter

14. I have paid due regard to the appellant's statement that the purpose of the proposal is to facilitate caring responsibilities for family members with disabilities. However, the floor areas of the proposal would appear similar to the floor areas associated with the extensions already approved and the issue at hand in this case is a matter of design. Therefore, I cannot conclude that dismissing the appeal would be harmful in this context.

Conclusion

15. Whilst the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in relation to overbearing, it would still harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the development plan as a whole. Consequently, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Liam Page

INSPECTOR