



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/24/3354376

Greeneaves, 4 Chestnut Road, Beaconsfield HP9 1EY

- 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 Elle Slade against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council (South Bucks area).
 - The application Ref is PL/24/2351/FA.
 - The development proposed is two storey front, first floor front over existing garage. Two storey side/ rear extension, single storey rear, front porch, raised roof to facilitate loft conversion raised rear decking (as approved under PL/24/1452/FA).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2024. I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.
3. There are references in the documentation to the name of the property as both Greeneaves and Greensleeves. I have referred to Greeneaves in the header above to reflect the address as shown on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached property with a detached double garage in front, on the northern side of Chestnut Road and within a predominantly residential area, comprising a variety of detached properties on good sized plots and generally within a verdant setting.
6. Planning permission was granted under the Council's Ref: PL/24/1452/FA for two storey side/rear/front extensions, single storey rear, front porch, raised roof ridge with 3 front, 1 side and 1 rear dormer and rear and side rooflights to facilitate loft conversion and raised rear decking. This proposal seeks permission for those works together with a two storey front extension, which

- would link and step down to the existing garage which would be extended with a first floor addition.
7. Although there are a small number of exceptions, the predominant pattern of development in the vicinity of the site includes detached properties with separate detached garages in front. The separation distances between the main properties and the detached garages vary but the separate form of the garages and their more modest scale and form in relation to the main dwellings, which are set further back from the front boundaries, form part of the predominant pattern of development and are characteristic features in the street scene.
 8. Whilst the proposed forward extension would be lower than the ridge height of the main roof to the dwelling, and then would step down further over the existing garage, it would result in a significant forward extension to the existing property and would create a very substantial mass of built development both across the site and forwards of the main house. I consider that the overall composition would appear very large and bulky within the plot, and the forward projecting development would be overly dominant both in relation to the proportions of the main property and more particularly in the street scene.
 9. Although built development would come no closer to the front boundary than as existing, the increased scale of the garage, and continuous form of forward extension from the front of the house would appear discordant when approaching from either direction along Chestnut Road, and particularly approaching from the east. The forward massing of development would therefore be very noticeable in the street scene and would be overly prominent and harmful to the predominant pattern of development comprising the main houses with their separate and smaller detached garages. The separate form of these garages even when the separation distances are relatively modest helps to reduce the mass of built development within individual plots and retain the verdant character and appearance of the local area. The forward extension of the main house through to the garage would be harmful to the characteristic pattern of development in the local area.
 10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the character and appearance of the existing property as well as of the local area. This would conflict with Policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, including the guidance at Appendix 8, Policy CP8 of the South Bucks District Core Strategy, as well as Policy C1 of the National Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
 11. In the decision notice the Council has referred to its Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study which was undertaken in 2017 but I am not aware of whether it has any formal status, being referenced in the Officer's report under Design Advice Leaflets and Guidance Notes.

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