



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/23/3319317

2 Forge Close, Holmer Green, Buckinghamshire HP15 6PY

- 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 & Ms J Ransley against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/23/0165/FA, dated 13 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is single & two storey front, side & rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The parties agree that the appeal scheme is similar to the previously approved schemes with decision notices dated 12 December 2022¹ and 15 March 2023². The appeal drawings indicate an increase in first floor area compared to the originally approved scheme, with the addition of two gable projections, one to the rear and one to the side.
3. Works have already begun on site but have not been completed. For the avoidance of doubt, the appeal has been determined based on the appeal drawings.

Main Issues

4. Having regard to the above, the main issues are the effect of the proposed gable projections on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Forge Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The area is predominantly residential, characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached properties consistent in design and form with various extensions visible. The host property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a gable ended roof form and tiled frontage. The previously approved rear

¹ PL/22/3383/FA

² PL/23/0167/FA

extension would extend the property significantly, nearly doubling its' depth while the first-floor projection would be set in from the side elevations.

6. Whilst the proposed gable projections would have subservient ridge lines, the side projection would extend fully from the previously approved rear extension to the southwest elevation, and when viewed as a whole, the proposal would dominate the host property and appear disproportionate. Although small in scale, the gable projections would result in an unnecessarily complicated mass with a staggered elevation and numerous, discordant roof forms.
7. Although the proposal would not be visible within the street scene and would be sufficiently spaced to prevent visual coalescence with the neighbouring dwelling, it would be clearly visible from surrounding commercial and residential properties. In these views, the proposal would be prominent and would be an unattractive addition to the host property.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, in conflict with Saved Policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan Written Statement (September 1997) including alternations adopted 29 May 2001, Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011 (CDLP) and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (November 2011) (CDCS) which collectively seek to ensure that extensions are of a high standard of design and respect the scale and proportions of host dwellings, whilst reflecting their existing form and design details.
9. The proposal would also conflict with the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (September 2013) (SPD) where it advises that extensions should respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling, avoiding the use of clumsy roof junctions or disjointed roof forms.
10. Similarly, the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraph 130 where it requires that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Living conditions

11. No 4 benefits from an open outlook across its' rear garden. The original rear building line of the host property is marginally set back from the rear building line of No 4. The bulk of the previously approved two-storey rear extension, would be set in from the southwest elevation, however the proposed side gable projection would align with the existing southwest elevation.
12. The proposal would not impinge upon the 45- and 60-degree lines from the mid-point of the neighbouring windows and doors; however, the proposal would introduce a substantial two-storey built form in close proximity to the boundary. Despite the size of No 4's garden, the proposal would be a dominant feature when viewed from the habitable rooms nearest the proposal and from No 4's patio area. The proposal would not disrupt the private views from No 4 towards the rear boundary, nevertheless, due to its position adjacent the boundary and its overall scale, it would have an enclosing effect, ultimately harming the open outlook of No 4.
13. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Forge Close, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would conflict with Policies GC3, H13 and H14 of the CDLP, where they require

that development protects the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties and does not result in an overbearing appearance. There would also be conflict with the SPD where it asserts that development should not dominate neighbouring properties or appear overbearing.

14. The Council have reference Policy GC2 CDLP in their reason for refusal, however this policy relates to the effect of development on light. The Council have not raised concerns regarding a loss of light and having visited the site I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policy GC2 of the of the CDLP where is requires that development protects adjoining land and buildings from significant loss of light.

Other Matters

15. I note that the proposal would provide spacious, flexible accommodation to meet the needs of modern family life, including ample outdoor space and that there have been no objections from neighbours or the Parish Council, however these are neutral factors which neither weigh in favour of or, against the proposal.

Conclusion.

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR