

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/22/3291948

4 Upper Hollis, Great Missenden, HP16 9HP

- 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 Derek Bradbury against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council (Chiltern Area).
 - The application Ref PL/21/3781/FA, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension and alterations, first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision notice describes the proposed development as "infill extensions to front and rear, roof alterations to accommodate first floor living space including raising the ridge height, front gables and rear dormer windows."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a single storey detached bungalow located in a residential area. The dwelling is of brick and tile construction with some timber decoration. It is set back from the road behind a driveway and front garden area and has a garden to the side and rear.
 5. Upper Hollis is notable in this location for the strong sense of uniformity achieved by the presence of bungalows and two storey dwellings with very similar design characteristics. These include the common use of brick and tile materials; the use of timber decoration to bungalows and tile-effect decoration to two storey dwellings; open front garden areas to bungalows; significant landscaping; and uniform roofscapes to bungalows, with attractive small-scale front gable features.
 6. As well as a strong sense of uniformity, these features combine to create a spacious environment, the verdant nature of which is a dominant characteristic.
-

7. The proposed gables to the front would result in a significant increase in the height of the appeal dwelling. This combined with their overall scale and an eaves height considerably taller than that of the host property, would result in them appearing as unduly dominant features, out of scale and proportion with the existing dwelling.
8. Further to the above, the proposed gables would appear in stark contrast to the small-scale gables common to bungalows in this location and as such, would appear as incongruous features, detracting from the area's attractive sense of uniformity.
9. The proposal would also involve the introduction of very large flat-roof dormers to the front and rear roof slopes. The scale and design of these two features would combine to create dormers of such overall massing as to appear as bulky additions disproportionate to the host property.
10. Further, their prominent first floor location would result in the large, bulky dormers drawing attention to themselves as unduly dominant features. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed aluminium cladding, which would not appear in keeping with neighbouring dwellings, but which would add to the alien and discordant appearance of the dormers.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposal would comprise a visually intrusive form of development, out of keeping with its surroundings. It would detract significantly from the area's distinctive and attractive sense of uniformity and draw attention away from its verdant qualities.
12. Whilst the appellant, in support of his case, draws attention to the appearance of other dwellings, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm to the appeal property and its surroundings and this is not a factor outweighed by other forms of development elsewhere.
13. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Local Plan¹ Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H18; and to Core Strategy² Policy CS20, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Chiltern District Local Plan (1997) (including Adopted Alterations May 2001 and July 2004).

² Chiltern District Core Strategy (2011).