



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/24/3346404

57 Stanley Hill Avenue, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP7 9BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adam Gregory against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - East Area (Chiltern).
 - The application Ref is PL/24/0498/FA.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed loft conversion".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as "proposed loft conversion" at 57 Stanley Hill Avenue, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP7 9BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/24/0498/FA, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan numbers 157/23/102 and 157/23/103.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The above description is taken from the application form. The appeal form refers to the elements thereof which are shown on the plans. This includes dormer windows to the side and rear as well rooflights. I have considered the appeal scheme on this basis. In addition, the Council refer to a front rooflight not forming the description albeit I am satisfied that it has been assessed, is shown on the plans and is thus part of the scheme. Further, the Council do not object to the rear dormer, and I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the side dormer and rooflights and specifically their effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a detached building which has been previously extended, with units of a similar nature surrounding the site. Many local dwellings retain their original form and are typically two storeys in height, but some have been extended with rooflights visible. Typically, the houses are set back from their frontage and partially screened by well-established greenery which, in combination with the aforementioned originality and consistency, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The side dormer would be seen from the street; however, its overall effect would be limited due to the set back of the building and the shielding from the existing chimney. Moreover, the dormer itself would be set back from the front elevation, well contained within the roof slope and visually subservient to other past alterations. As a result, the proposal would not be seen to be an over-dominant or bulky addition.
6. The Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study seeks for development to be generally no more than two storeys high. In this regard, the dormer is to sit in line with the existing ridgeline and the house would still appear as two-storeys. The installation of a rooflight would be a minimal addition to the relatively glazed front elevation and would not represent a substantive additional storey. Particularly in the context of other buildings displaying similar.
7. With these matters in mind, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H18 of the Chiltern Local Plan 1997, Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District 2011, the Council's Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document, the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 and the National Design Guide 2021 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard amongst other things.

Conditions

8. The standard time limit condition and reference to the approved plans is necessary for enforcement purposes. In addition, it is necessary to ensure that the materials used are to match the host dwelling to be in keeping with the dwelling and the area. The Council have suggested a condition limiting windows on the side dormer. However, this would not be reasonable due to the separation distance between the dwellings and the dormer's modest height.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR