



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/22/3310908

2 The Spinney, Beaconsfield HP9 1SB

- 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 Stephen Innes against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council -South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application PL/22/2078/FA, dated 08 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Ground and first floor rear extension, first floor side extension and conversion of attic including 4 no. front/rear dormer windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form was amended following submission of the application. I have referred to the amended description for the purposes of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling at the western end of The Spinney, a suburban residential street. The appeal scheme would raise the roof height and introduce single and two-storey side extensions.
5. The overall form of the two-storey side and single storey rear extensions are simple and functional. They would respect the form, proportions and design of the host dwelling. Moreover, the first-floor extension would be set down from the main ridgeline and set back from the plane of the front elevation, resulting in a subordinate and proportionate addition.
6. The plot coverage, design and extent of extension would not appear incongruous with the sprawling and extended dwellings which form the built context of The Spinney. The first-floor extension element would not adversely affect the sense of openness within the street as the flank of the site bounds the rear garden of the neighbouring property, which fronts Wattleton Road; creating an unusually large gap. In any case, the sense of openness within The

Spinney also arises from the set-back of dwellings and the width of grass verges on either side of the road, which would not be affected by the proposal.

7. There are several successful examples of raised roofs in the vicinity. These do not appear uncharacteristically massive in the context due to the gradually changing topography, gaps between dwellings and somewhat inconsistent building line. The appeal scheme would thus integrate well within the street scene and would not appear unduly high, massive or out of scale in this respect. The whole roof would be raised and therefore the pitch of the roof would not appear out of keeping with the shallow roof pitches which are typical of The Spinney.
8. However, whilst there is variation in the design and overall height of the dwellings and their extensions in The Spinney, a sense of place and consistency arises from the contemporaneous nature of most of the dwellings, as well as use of common architectural features such as a large two storey front gable, gabled porch, large windows, and a long ridgeline with a relatively shallow roof pitch. The appeal site is not easily viewed within the wider street scene due to a curve in the road, however, its layout and the appearance are typical of the street and it contributes to this sense of place. The proposed two small gabled dormers to the front elevation would interrupt the simple roof form and would also appear out of scale with the large gabled elements and the overall simple, large fenestration details of the host dwelling and street. Although there are some front dormers in surrounding streets, they are not a feature of The Spinney.
9. Moreover, the addition of front dormers would appear incongruous with the strong predominance of two-storey dwellings in The Spinney. The dormers would create a vertical emphasis which would be out of character with the low profile, sprawling dwellings of The Spinney. It is possible to glimpse rear box dormers at several properties, however, these do not interfere with the common design of simple, undisturbed front roof slopes and do not draw intrusive attention to the second storey. Similarly, the front rooflights on a few dwellings do not interrupt the simple low profile of roofs. It must be acknowledged that one dwelling visible within the street scene has a half-pitched roof, with a roof slope to the front elevation and a full second storey to the rear, however, this does not integrate well with the prevailing character of the area.
10. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would conflict with saved policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, adopted 1999, CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy, adopted 2011, and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, high standards of design which make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area.

Other Considerations

11. The appeal site benefits from an extant planning permission for a similar form of roof, side, and rear extension, less the dormer windows and with a raised chimney to extend beyond the ridge of the extended roof (Council ref. PL/22/4042/FA). Given that the permission is extant and there is no reason to believe that the permitted scheme would not be implemented, I consider it constitutes a realistic 'fallback'. However, given that the permitted scheme

does not feature the elements of the appeal scheme which make it unacceptable, the 'fallback' scheme would not justify allowing this appeal.

12. The Appellant has indicated that they would accept a permission for the extensions less the dormer windows and has amended plans at Appendix 5 of their Grounds of Appeal. Unfortunately, I am not satisfied that the amended scheme has met the relevant requirements for amendments at appeal¹. In any case, the extant permission provides for a similar scheme less the dormer windows.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR

¹ Wheatcroft Principles- *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE* [JPL 1982 P37].