



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/22/3299773

11 Cedar Grove, Amersham, HP7 9BG

- 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 Ms G Kirby against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/4707/FA, dated 9 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, erection of single storey front and rear extensions and formation of hardstanding and ramps to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage, erection of single storey front and rear extensions and formation of hardstanding and ramps to front and rear at 11 Cedar Grove, Amersham, HP7 9BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/21/4707/FA, dated 9 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15513B 01A and 15513B 02B.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall only be occupied as part of the existing dwelling on the site and shall at no time be occupied as an independent dwelling unit.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the banner heading as it fully describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and

- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Cedar Grove, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling with a simple pitch roof design with side gables. It also has a flat roof, detached double garage to the front which is located on the side boundary of the site with 10 Cedar Grove. The surrounding area comprises dwellings of a similar character and appearance although several of these have been altered and extended, including some which have large front extensions.
5. The appeal property has a staggered siting in relation to the adjoining dwellings. Its front elevation is significantly forward of No 12 to the east, whilst No 10 to the west is located forward of the appeal property such that its front elevation is broadly level with the front elevation of the detached garage of the appeal property.
6. The appeal proposal is for single storey front and rear extensions to the existing property. The proposed front extension would project a similar distance forward of the main dwelling as the existing garage to be demolished. The proposed extension would not be as wide as the existing garage and would be sited around 0.8m from the side boundary with No 10.
7. The Council's 'Residential Extensions and Householder Development' Supplementary Planning Document (September 2013) (SPD) states that an important goal for any extension should be to harmonise with a building, striking a balanced visual relationship with its existing features and integrating in such a way that it does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality.
8. I note that Council's concern regarding the roof design of the proposed extension which introduces a hipped roof form rather than a flat roof or pitch roof form which are more commonly displayed in Cedar Grove. However, given the narrow width of the proposed extension I consider that it would remain subservient in appearance to the host dwelling which has a wide frontage. Although it would project forward of the host property, the proposed extension would be read against the flank wall of No 10 and would not be an unduly prominent feature in the street scene. I consider that the proposal would integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling and would not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the wider area which is characterised in part, by forward projecting extensions and garages that are to the front of the main dwelling.
9. The Council also raise concern regarding the overall depth of the proposal extensions. However, it is also important to acknowledge the presence of the existing double garage to be demolished and the existing side /rear extension in assessing the overall impact of the proposal.
10. I have already found that the front extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. A single storey rear extension is also proposed which would extend the depth of an existing extension by around 5 metres. Whilst the proposed extension would have a rather elongated appearance, it would be relatively narrow in relation to the

overall width of the plot such that it would not significantly detract from the existing dwelling or dominate its rear garden which is also of considerable depth.

11. Furthermore, the combined depth of the extensions would not be readily apparent when viewed from outside the site. Whilst glimpses of the extensions would be obtained from Cedar Grove, these views would be largely obscured by No 10, the existing 1.8 metre high boundary fence and the large garages that serve Nos 9 and 10 Cedar Grove. Accordingly, I do not consider that the proposal would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in this regard.
12. The proposed extensions and ramps and hardstanding would provide suitable accommodation and facilities for a severely disabled person who resides at the property. I have had regard to the various medical reports which explain the need for ongoing support and care which would be best provided within a home setting. This is also a matter which I afford weight.
13. I therefore conclude, on balance, that the proposed development would not have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Thus, it complies with Policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (as altered and consolidated)¹(LP) Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (November 2011) (CS), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the SPD, which collectively seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design that would not adversely affect the street scene.

Living conditions

14. In respect of this issue, the Council's main concern is in relation to the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the dwelling to the west, 10 Cedar Grove.
15. 10 Cedar Grove is a two storey detached dwelling which has a single storey flat roof garage on the side, adjacent to the appeal property. It is located within a wide plot, with a large, open plan front garden and a shallower rear garden. There is also a further large detached garage to the rear of No 10, accessed directly from Cedar Grove.
16. The proposed front extension would replace the existing detached garage to the front of the appeal property which is sited on the boundary with 10 Cedar Grove. Whilst the existing garage to be demolished extends to the boundary of the appeal site, the proposed extension would be around 0.8 metres off the shared boundary which would be a benefit of the scheme. Most of the front extension would be adjacent to the flank elevation of the single storey garage attached to No 10 and would not result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling.
17. The proposed extension would also infill a small gap that currently exists between the rear of the existing garage and the front / side of the existing extension to No 11. A single storey extension is also proposed to the rear of the existing single storey extension.

¹ Chiltern District Local Plan – 1997 (including alterations Adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011

18. The closest part of No 10 to the proposed extension is single storey, with garage doors on the front elevation and a window and door on the rear. There is an existing 1.8m high fence along the boundary which would be retained. The eaves height of the proposed extension would be similar to that of the existing flat roof extension. Whilst the proposed extension would have a shallow hipped roof with a maximum height of about 3.29 metres, it would slope up from the boundary of the site with No 10.
19. From my observations on site, the closest habitable room windows are on the main two storey rear elevation of No 10, several metres away from the boundary with the appeal site. No 10 also benefits from a relatively wide garden and given the siting of the extension at least 0.8m off the boundary, together with its low eaves height and shallow hipped roof design, I do not consider that the proposed extension would be particularly overbearing on No 10, or its rear garden. Furthermore, having regard to the orientation of the proposed development, any additional loss of light that may occur would, in my view, be minor and would be unlikely to have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No 10.
20. Whilst the proposed extension would extend deeper into the garden of the host property than the existing rear extension, this part of the extension would be adjacent to the rear wall of No 10's double garage and would not have any adverse effect on the occupant's living conditions.
21. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal complies with the advice contained within the SPD and would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Cedar Grove, with particular reference to outlook and light. Thus, I find that the proposal would also comply with Policies GC2, GC3 and H14 of the LP and the Framework which, among other things, seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring users.

Conditions

22. In addition to the standard 3 years implementation condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in matching materials to ensure a satisfactory external appearance. The approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have imposed a condition relating to the future occupancy of the extension in order to protect the character of the area.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR