



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/23/3321378

Falcon Field, 14 Highlands Close, Chalfont St. Peter, Buckinghamshire, SL9 0DR

- 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 Sukhdev Singh against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/23/0363/FA, dated 31 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is part two, part single storey rear, two storey side and single storey front extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is at the end of a cul de sac comprising detached houses built around the 1960s. House designs, sizes and orientation vary with some having gable ends facing the street and others with pitched roofs side on to it, consequently house frontage widths vary. All houses are set back from the pavement edge with enough space to park cars and most have attached garages. The gaps between houses at the end of the cul de sac is larger than elsewhere along the road and houses generally have larger forecourts giving a more spacious appearance and open character at this end of the Close. The appeal property has a wider front elevation than other houses, which is broken up by the front porch and its half hipped roof. The attached garage joins that of the neighbouring house, No 12A, leaving a significant gap between the 2 properties at first floor level, which also contributes to the more open character around the appeal site.

5. The proposed side extension above the garage would reduce the first floor gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring house and the sense of space around the appeal site that I have identified as characteristic of this end of the road. The increased width of the front elevation would appear excessive and out of proportion with other houses, particularly as the proposed extended porch would be flat roofed and therefore no longer break up the façade at first floor level.
6. A rear projecting wing contains the kitchen on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor and has 2 pitched roof gable ends. The proposed rear extensions would extend to the sides of the existing wing across the full width of the house and at first floor level replace the 2 gable ends with a crown roof. Trees and hedges to the rear and side of the appeal site would provide some screening. Nonetheless, the roof would be visible from some neighbouring gardens from which it would appear bulky and out of keeping with the existing house design and that of neighbouring houses which have pitched roof gable ends to their rear. In this regard it would conflict with guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2013).
7. I note that the appellant has consent for rear extensions which includes a section of crown roof, but that is to the side of the existing gabled ends which are retained. Also, it does not include a side extension or extensions and alterations to the front porch. It is therefore a more sympathetic design than the appeal proposal and not comparable. Overall I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the house and wider area and thus conflict with Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (2011), Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H16 of the Chiltern Local Plan (1997) (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001, Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the National Design Guide (2019) which require high quality design which is in keeping with the existing building and does not adversely affect the street scene.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR