



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/24/3352181

16 Duffield Lane, Stoke Poges SL2 4AB

- 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 & Mrs Bhuie against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council (South Bucks Area).
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1004/FA.
 - The development proposed is rear and side extensions and internal reconfigurations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has referred to the submission of amended plans during the application process; my decision is based on the plans as determined by the Council as I am required to do.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling on the east side of Duffield Lane, between Hazell Way and Wakefield Crescent, with open green space on the western side of Duffield Lane. It is situated within a predominantly residential area, with mainly detached properties.
5. The proposal would seek to convert the existing garage to residential accommodation together with a two storey rear extension and rear dormer and roof lights in the side roof planes within a crown roof and part two, part single storey front extensions.
6. The buildings along this part of Duffield Lane date from the same period and although of different designs, including subsequent alterations, most are of similar proportions, mainly with gable ends and regular roof pitches. The properties are well spaced and set back behind grass verges and together with the landscaping to front gardens and the green space opposite, there is a verdant appearance to the street scene.

7. The proposed depth and overall scale of the proposed extensions and in particular the introduction of a crown roof to the property would result in a much bulkier building in comparison with the existing building and the surrounding properties. The proposed crown roof would be at distinct variance with the more traditional pitch and gable ends which are predominant in the street scene. In addition, the removal of the cat slide roof with its modest dormer and replacement with the extended bay at first floor level with a gable front would further increase the bulk and massing of the property as well as its dominance in relation to its neighbours.
8. Taken together, the proposals would appear as an unsympathetic and over dominant enlargement in relation both to the scale and proportions of the existing property and as a result, the dwelling as proposed to be enlarged would be over prominent and harmfully obtrusive within the street scene. The increased massing and bulk of the property, particularly in relation to surrounding properties, would be a discordant feature within the street scene, including when approaching from the north-west or south-east along Duffield Lane. The property, as proposed to be extended, would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the local area.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property as well as the local area. The proposals would conflict with Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999), Policy CP8 of the South Bucks District Core Strategy (Adopted February 2011), and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, and Part 2 of the National Design Guide, all of which amongst other matters, seek a high standard of design which respects the local context.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments with flat roofs and / or where in the opinion of the appellant the proposed extensions are indistinguishable from the existing property, that have been permitted in the wider area. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, none of them appear directly comparable to the proposal before me; a number of the flat roofs relate to single storey extensions and do not therefore compare with the crown roof proposed in the appeal before me. These other examples do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Other Considerations

11. Representations were received at the application stage raising concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on the amenities of neighbours. However, given the depth of built form at adjoining properties, particularly at the rear, together with the spacing between properties, I am satisfied that there would be no material harm to the surrounding neighbours as a result of overlooking and loss of privacy as well as light and outlook. The Council also raised no concerns in this regard.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR