
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/21/3285685

Jos, Hollybush Lane, Denham, Buckinghamshire UB9 4HH

- 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 & Mrs Tommy Stephen / Sarah Louise Brodice / Pitt against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application Ref PL/21/2188/FA, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of existing garage into habitable room and first floor side extension incorporating front and rear dormers with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling with an attached single storey flat roofed garage, extending to the side southeast boundary. The dwelling sits within a short row of six detached dwellings, on the northeast side of Hollybush Lane. On the opposite side of Hollybush Lane is a terrace of four dwellings with hipped roofs. The immediate neighbouring properties sit within rectangular shaped plots; however, the southeast boundary of the appeal site sits diagonal to the road, with the plot narrowing towards the rear and the dwelling sitting right up to the boundary. There are examples of flat roofs at ground floor level, but they are not a significant characteristic of the area at second floor level, including where two storey extensions have been provided.
5. The proposal includes the conversion of the existing garage to living space and a first-floor side extension, incorporating front and rear dormers, and a roof level window to the existing front elevation. The first-floor side extension would extend up to the flank boundary of the existing ground floor side wall. The proposed roof of the side extension would incorporate a crown roof and is such that small areas of flat roof would be created at second floor level, close to the boundary, both to the front and rear.

6. The appeal site is more constrained by its shape than the neighbouring properties. As the neighbouring properties to the southeast are set further back in their plots, the relatively wide area of crown roof, the chamfered nature of the extension and the front flat roof at the second-floor level would be visible when heading northwest along Hollybush Lane. The shape of the extension and these flat roof elements at second floor and roof level would be at odds with the simple form and pitched roofs seen in the immediate area. This would result in the extension appearing as an incongruous addition to the street scene. The large roof level gable window would be out of character with the simple nature of the fenestration on the appeal property and its neighbours. The harm from the development would be exacerbated by its relatively prominent position, sitting forward of the dwellings to the southeast.
7. The development would not result in a full terracing effect with the neighbouring properties, but this would not mitigate the harm that would result from the form and design of the extension. The proposal would adhere to some of the design guidance within Appendix 8 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (Local Plan). However, it would not meet all the guidance, including where it advises that flat roofs for two storey extensions will usually be unacceptable.
8. Within the immediate area there are examples of two storey side extensions and where accommodation has been provided in the roof space with the provision of dormer windows. However, I did not observe any examples which were comparable to this appeal scheme with the inclusion of flat roof elements.
9. There would be benefits associated with the provision of extra space to provide additional accommodation for a growing family. However, this would be a private benefit and as such carries only limited weight. This would not outweigh the harm identified.
10. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policies EP3 and H11 of the Local Plan which require that extensions do not have an adverse impact on the character of the site itself, adjoining development and the locality in general, and would harmonise with the existing building in terms of layout, form and design and conform to the guidelines set out in Appendix 8. The proposal would also conflict with the National Design Guide which seeks well designed new development to understand and relate well to the site, its local and wider context. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to resist development of poor design.

Other Matter

11. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt and Policies GB1 and GB10 of the Local Plan outline that limited extensions to existing dwellings are allowed. They require that the extension, together with any earlier extensions, would be integral to, and of a small scale, in relation to the size of the original dwelling. In addition, the dwelling, as enlarged, should be of a small scale in relation to the size of the residential curtilage. The Framework allows for extensions to buildings in a Green Belt provided it would not be a disproportionate addition over the size of the original building.
12. The submitted evidence indicates that the proposed extension would add a little over 40% floorspace which would primarily be located to the side of the

dwelling and would appear as relatively small in scale. The extension would not be disproportionate to the original dwelling. The development would therefore not be inappropriate development and there would be no conflict with Policies GB1 and GB10 of the Local Plan or the Green Belt policy in the Framework. This lack of conflict does not minimise or outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

13. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR