



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2018

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/W/17/3182498

Hullavington, Burtons Lane, Little Chalfont HP8 4BA

- 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 Emiliios Lemoniatis against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2016/2222/FA, dated 26 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a beech wood hut.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for beech wood hut at Hullavington, Burtons Lane, Little Chalfont HP8 4BA on accordance with the terms of application, Ref CH/2016/FUL, dated 26 November 2016, and the accompanying submitted plans.

Procedural Matters

2. The outbuilding, a beech wood hut, has been built and the appeal has been considered on this basis. The application description has been shortened to accurately reflect the built nature of the scheme in the banner heading above. The Appellant's application description contained justification for the hut which has been considered in the reasoning within this decision.

Main Issues

3. The site is within the Green Belt and so the main issues are:
 - Whether the scheme would be inappropriate development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan;
 - The openness of the Green Belt;
 - If the scheme is inappropriate development, whether harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. Policy GB2 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (LP) 1997 (with alterations 2001) states most development on the Green Belt is inappropriate and there is a general presumption against such development. However, exceptions are made for certain categories of development. LP policy GB15 states that the construction of ancillary non-habitable buildings within domestic curtilages are permitted separate from the main dwelling where such buildings are both small and also subordinate in scale to the original dwelling.
5. The Appellant indicates that the area around the outbuilding has been used as residential curtilage and had various outbuildings sited upon it. There is hard standing left over from a former green house still on the site. Letters from residents have also confirmed this and aerial photographs in 1999 and 2003 show a significant grassed area to the rear of Hullavington and neighbouring properties which is suggestive of a garden in the vicinity of the hut. On the balance of evidence before me, the residential curtilage would have extended from Hullavington to include the area where the outbuilding is located. Given its small size and subordinate scale, the scheme complies with LP policies GB2 and GB15.
6. However, the Framework establishes that new buildings are inappropriate unless they fall within the exceptions listed within paragraph 89. None of the exceptions specifically refers to curtilage buildings. Paragraph 89, 3rd bullet point, covers an exception for the extension or alteration of a building but the outbuilding is located a considerable distance from the dwelling. On this basis, the outbuilding cannot be considered as an extension in the way that a detached garage adjacent to a dwelling might be. On this basis, the scheme would be inappropriate development under the Framework.
7. The LP was prepared in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 2 (Revised) Green Belts 1995 which has now been superseded by more recent Framework planning policy. The Framework does not provide for ancillary non-habitable buildings development of the type considered here as exception to inappropriate development. For these reasons, greater weight is attached to the Framework's Green Belt policy in this instance and the scheme represents inappropriate development.

Openness of the Green Belt

8. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open: the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The hut comprises roughly a small semi-spherical structure raised above the ground. The visual perception of the loss of openness is limited by its woodland setting whilst the spatial loss of openness is limited by reason of the hut's small size. Thus, the loss of openness would be limited.

Other considerations

9. The hut has been designed to resemble a brown beech nut in a natural eco build and has been made from UK sourced wood by hand and raised above the ground above a small ladder. It has overlapping curved timber shingle tiles sculpted around a roughly semi-spherical shaped structure and internally, the

space is roughly oval with windows to look at nature and create a space to write. Its benefit to the landscape and scenic beauty of the Chilterns AONB is benign due to its size but it has a fairly unique and quirky appearance and character that blends in its surroundings. Locally, its whimsical natural charm adds considerably to the character and appearance of the area. This is appreciated in filtered views from users of public footpath and from residents, including future generations, of properties along Burtons Lane. Consequently, the hut is of considerable visual interest.

10. In a 2013 appeal decision, the Inspector concluded that the ability to restrict the possibilities for the construction of further outbuildings with permitted development rights would avoid potentially greater harm that would arise with the appeal proposal. On this basis, the withdrawal of permitted development rights amounted to the very special circumstances justifying the development in the Green Belt. In considering a similar condition here, the immediate area around the hut is considered residential curtilage but in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the residential curtilage does not extend beyond this. Therefore, the erection of buildings beyond the vicinity of the hut and garden area behind the existing dwelling would need planning permission in any case. On this basis, the benefit of imposing any such condition would be small.
11. It has been put to me that the hut could be located close to the main dwelling but the hut's rationale is for close association with woodland. Therefore, there is not a greater than theoretical possibility of this occurring and only limited weight can be given to this as a fallback position. Under permitted development rights, a further outbuilding could be constructed within the garden area immediately behind the existing dwelling but similarly, the likelihood of this is small in the absence of justified need. Thus, the weight to be attached to this consideration would be limited.
12. The hut is located to the rear of a neighbouring property but it would not be intrusive, even with lighting, to the outlook of the occupiers of this neighbouring property by reason of its small size.

Conclusion

13. The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful. There is limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The Framework establishes substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Only limited weight can be given individually to the benefits of re-siting the hut and the withdrawal of permitted development rights. However, considerable weight is given to the visual interest of the building by reason of its fairly unique and quirky design. Therefore, very special circumstances do exist because the harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
14. The scheme complies with LP policies GB2 and GB15 and although the hut is inappropriate development, there are very special circumstances to permit it. No recommended planning conditions have been brought to my attention, and based on the nature of the completed scheme, none are necessary.

15. For the above reasons, having regard to all other matters raised, including support, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2018

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/W/17/3188800

Land to the rear of 149-157 Chartridge Lane, Chesham HP5 2SE,

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bradford (Howarth Homes) against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2017/0436/OA, dated 10 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the provision of up to 9 dwellings, with associated access, hardstanding and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is in outline form, with only means of access to be considered at this stage. The description of the application indicates up to 9 dwellings on the site. The Council's decision notice more accurately describes the location of the appeal development than the Appellant's application description and thus has been used above in the banner heading.
3. An accompanied site visit took place but site access was limited to the property at 155 Chartridge Lane.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on (a) protected species and biodiversity, (b) the character and appearance of the area, having regard to trees, and (c) affordable housing.

Reasons

Protected species and biodiversity

5. Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities should only require ecological surveys where clearly justified, for example if they consider there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the development. Assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity.
6. The appeal site is surrounded by development and there has been recent housing built in the vicinity of the site. However, it is a large site comprising

several back garden areas and the Appellant's Ecological Desk Based Assessment (EDBA) has identified a number of protected species, Great Crested Newt (if ponds present), Badgers, bats and reptile habitat that could be present serving as potential constraints on the site. The EDBA recommended a site Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and such an appraisal was intended to inform whether further surveys would be required.

7. Based on the EDBA, the extent and nature of the site, there is a reasonable likelihood of protected species being present on the site and there is a risk that they could be adversely affected by the proposed development given its nature. Given the size of the site and extent of vegetation, survey work and assessment would be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the potential impact on protected species and biodiversity.
8. The EDBA stated that if further surveys highlighted the presence of protected species, their retention should be incorporated into the layout and if impacts cannot be mitigated, appropriate mitigation must be provided. However, without survey work and assessment in the form of a site PEA, it has not been demonstrated that this is possible. Furthermore, Circular 06/2005 states that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. In line with the circular, exceptional circumstances do not therefore exist to allow for a condition requiring further survey(s).
9. On a neighbouring site proposed for development, an ecological assessment just recommended a bat roost survey. However, no details of this assessment have been brought to my attention and my determination is in respect of the appeal site in any case. For all these reasons, it has not been demonstrated that no harm to protected species and biodiversity would arise and thus the proposal would conflict with policy CS24 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (CS) 2011.

Character and appearance

10. Policy GC4 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (LP) 1997 (with Alterations 2001 and Consolidations 2007 and 2011) states that existing trees and hedgerows in sound condition and of good amenity and wildlife value, together with any other landscape features of the site which are an important part of its character, such as ponds, should be retained. The appeal site comprises rear garden areas of properties along Chartridge Lane and an access point off De Vere Close. Some of the rear gardens of properties further along Chartridge Lane have been developed but the presence of vegetation, including trees, remains a strong feature of the area contributing to its verdant character and appearance.
11. The appeal site has various large trees including poplar, spruce, cypress, ash, sycamore, cherry and eucalyptus. Some of these are of considerable height and spread when viewed from outside of the site and the curtilage of No 155. The Appellant's preliminary Arboricultural Impact Assessment concludes that some of the existing trees and vegetation will require removal to facilitate development but that with an appropriate tree survey, better quality trees can be retained.

12. However, means of access is to be considered here and I was unable to access this part of the site as part of my visit and thus it was not possible to fully evaluate the impact of the proposed access on the trees in the vicinity of the access. In this regard, it was not possible to ascertain whether these trees were worthy of retention on visual amenity and health grounds, and the extent to which they would be affected by the means of access. The Appellant's assessment has been undertaken without a detailed site visit, including the physical inspection of trees, and is mainly based on aerial photographs significantly limiting any weight to be attached to it.
13. In the absence of proper evidence on the state and merits of existing trees on the site, it has not been demonstrated that any future development of between 1 and 9 dwellings would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would conflict with LP policy GC4.

Affordable Housing

14. CS Policy CS8 requires a financial contribution for affordable housing on schemes up to 4 dwellings and then a graduated on-site provision, at least one unit for 5 to 7 dwellings and at least 2 units for 8 or 9 dwellings. The Council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2010 sets out the district need for the affordable housing and guidance on securing the housing. There is no mechanism, such as a planning obligation, to secure such a contribution and therefore, there is a conflict with this development plan policy.
15. The development plan is the starting point of any determination. However, account must be taken of any material considerations which may indicate a decision can be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) 2014 states that contributions should not be sought from small-scale developments, including 10 units or less and which have a maximum combined floorspace of no more than 1,000m².
16. In this regard, it is a material consideration of significant weight. The purpose of the WMS is to tackle the disproportionate burden of development contributions on small-scale developers thereby diversifying the house building sector by providing a much-needed boost to small and medium-sized developers. Such a measure is to increase housing land supply. On the basis of the evidence before me, such a consideration is of sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken in accordance with the WMS.
17. The proposal is for less than 10 units but there is a possibility that a development with 9 units or less could have more than 1,000m² of floorspace. Given the fundamental nature of this consideration, this issue cannot be resolved at the reserved matters stage. The Appellant has suggested that affordable housing provision would not be required by reason of the nature of the scheme. Had this proposal being dependent upon this matter being resolved, further clarification from parties would have been sought. In this regard, a condition could possibly be imposed to limit the area of floorspace and so negate the need for provision. As there are overriding issues ruling against this proposal, there is no need to do so.

Other matters

18. The appeal site is within the developed area of Chesham and under the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2016, the site

has been classified as suitable for development. The Appellant indicates that the development would take advantage of Chesham town centre facilities. The centre has a range of retail, leisure, schools, healthcare, a train station and employment facilities. Future residents would utilise these facilities and there would be jobs created through the construction of the housing. The housing would boost the supply of dwellings. The dwelling density of the development would be compatible with its surroundings.

19. However, there would be permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area and nature conservation for the reasons indicated in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. In this regard, the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning should contribute positively to making places better for people and should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity, and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Therefore, the identified adverse impacts would outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons, having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2018

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/18/3196370

Ti Soleil, Lincoln Road, Chalfont St. Peter, Gerrards Cross SL9 9TG

- 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 Lance Jordan against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2017/1898/FA, dated 10 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is for two storey front and rear extensions, single storey rear extension and engineering works to the rear and front garden, including front garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. I have been made aware from both Parties that the appeal dwelling had the benefit of a planning permission (Ref. CH/2016/0177/FA) for two storey front extensions, part two storey/part single storey rear extension, replacement rear and front dormers which was approved in March 2016. However, these plans were not adhered to and gave rise to the retrospective planning application the subject of this appeal.
4. The extensions to the house were substantially complete at the time of my site visit and appear to be broadly in accordance with the elevations as shown on Drawing No. TSPA02 Rev H. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated within an Arcadian development, defined as an Established Residential Area of Special Character (ERASC) and comprising large detached houses set within generous plots. Designs of houses vary considerably, but within the immediate locality pitched roofs predominate, particularly within the street scene. The appeal site slopes quite significantly from the road down in a south-westerly direction and an area has been excavated within the front garden area to provide level parking in the location where the garage is proposed to be located.

6. The earlier grant of planning permission proposed a largely symmetrical principal elevation with two storey gable projections to each side with a substantial dormer window in the centre over the front door within the recess created. The proposal before me now shows the central area at first floor level as in-filled with a flat roof concealed behind a parapet roof. Although symmetry is maintained this area of in-fill gives the dwelling a contrived appearance that is at odds with the prevailing pattern of development within the locality and the ERASC it finds itself situated within.
7. Turning to the rear, again, a pair of gables were previously proposed and approved and although of differing depths nonetheless, when combined with 2no centrally placed dormers, utilised traditional pitched roof forms. The proposal before me has replaced the latter two features with a significant area of flat roof at first floor level and at the ground floor level to the left hand side to the rear of the elevation. Again, I consider these aspects of the proposal fail to integrate with the appearance of the property and would give rise to contrived, cumbersome and discordant architectural features that do not respect the scale and proportions of the host dwelling.
8. Policy H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan 1997 (including the alterations adopted 29 May 2001) consolidated September 2007 and November 2011 (LP) in its criterion 3 stipulates that the roof of a two storey or first floor extension should normally be hipped or pitched, and integrated into the existing roof. It goes on to state that a flat roof two storey first floor extension will not be permitted unless the extension is surrounded by existing pitched roofs on the dwelling, and is subordinate to the main roof and not prominent in the street scene or locality.
9. Whilst it may be that the flat roof element to the front elevation is between two pitched roof gables and against the front roof plane of the main roof, it cannot be said that it is surrounded, and by virtue of the difference in ground levels, it is closer to eye level when viewing it from the street which adds to its incongruity; the very fact that the flat roof is concealed behind a parapet does not hide the fact that it is not a pitched roof. Further, whilst I accept that it is lower than the main ridge of the dwelling, in totality, the extensions would not appear subordinate as they draw the eye in an uncomfortable manner and are prominent in the street scene. I accept that the rear extensions are not visible from the public realm, but nonetheless, the design of the first floor flat roof element in particular, appears as a discordant feature which, again, I consider not to be subordinate especially as it projects beyond the left hand rear gable.
10. Whilst I accept that the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') states that planning policies should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles, it does however state, that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. I consider this to be especially pertinent as the site is located within an ERASC with the Council's Residential Extensions and Householder Development SPD stipulating that an important goal for any extension should be to harmonise with the building, striking a balanced visual relationship with its existing features and integrating in such a way that it does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality.

11. I do not doubt that the in-fill extensions make a more efficient and effective use of the available space of the dwelling, however, it appears to me that this is more a case of form following function and I cannot agree that the resultant building would offer a significant improvement over the appearance of the original dwelling and most certainly not over the appearance of the previously approved extensions, the planning permission for which was not adhered to.
12. Turning to the garage proposal, there exists a grass verge with some new evergreen planting within it, behind which (within the application site) is laurel hedging that is planted in what appears to be the original ground level before it drops significantly by virtue of a recently constructed retaining wall and extended parking area. It is not clear from the plans whether this laurel hedging would remain and whether there would be space for the grass banks of the profiles proposed to be constructed between the garage and the north east and southern boundaries. Further, when taking into account the levels of the retained driveway and the area of land removed as shown on the south eastern elevation of the garage, the garage building would appear overly high and would be higher than the adjacent road. It is cited as being at 1.2m above the highway ground level by the appellant and 1.5m by the Council, but nonetheless it would still be visible from the street.
13. The appellant explains that it has since transpired that the ground level of the garage would be substantially lower such that none of its roof would project above the level of the front boundary. Even if I had been so minded to have allowed the appeal, I consider that it would not have been appropriate to impose a condition requiring additional details of this/revised drawings as to do so would amount to a material change to the proposal which would not have been subjected to necessary public consultation. Whilst I note the reference to a sunken garage with grass roof at Willow Cottage, I have been provided with no details on this. It therefore falls upon me to determine the garage based on the plans that are before me which I consider would be unduly high and consequently prominent within the street in a forward location that would appear alien in character and fail to respect the prevailing character of the development within the area.
14. Further, the SPD advises against the siting of garages forward of a dwelling although I accept that if wholly subterranean or at least with a grassed roof level with the highway verge, then such visual impact would be lessened. Notwithstanding this, in addition to the height, the proposed garage would be of a significant width and, therefore, as it stands, I consider that it would not be modest in size or subordinate in scale to the existing dwellinghouse contrary to LP Policy H20; I do however accept that overall it would not give rise to an overdevelopment of the site.
15. I therefore consider that the proposed garage by reason of its siting and scale would give rise to an intrusive feature within the street scene that would be contrary to the prevailing character of the locality and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the ERASC.
16. All in all, the proposal conflicts with LP Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H20 in addition to Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (adopted November 2011) which together require new development within the District to be of a high standard of design which reflects and respects the character of the

surrounding area and those features which contribute to local distinctiveness which should be in scale with its surroundings of an appropriate form and design, especially within sensitive locations such as ERASCs. These policies also expect proposals to be designed and sited so as to be in keeping with the existing dwelling and other buildings in the adjoining area such that the character and appearance of the street scene is not adversely affected. Further, in addition to conflicting with the SPD as explained above, the proposal also conflicts with Policy H7 of the Chalfont St. Peter Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2028 which requires extensions to existing residential properties to maintain or enhance the design, character and quality of the building.

Conclusion

17. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2018

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/18/3198059
Breyll Path, 18 Green Lane, Amersham HP6 6AR

- 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 Gareth Lloyd against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2017/2315/FA, dated 19 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2018.
 - The development proposed is proposed construction of a part two storey, part single storey rear extension with front dormer window at the semi detached property 18 Green Lane, Amersham, Buckinghamshire HP6 6AR.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are:-
 - whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Weller Estate Conservation Area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 19 Green Lane.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house in the Weller Estate Conservation Area. I have therefore had regard to the fact that Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability or preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This is reflected in Local Plan Policy CA1¹. The site is also described as being in an Established Residential Area of Special Character.

¹ Chiltern District Local Plan Written Statement, Adopted 1 September 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011.

4. The reasons for refusal do not include the front dormer window and I consider that due its size and design set within the existing roof slope it would not harm the appearance of the dwelling and therefore would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Likewise the single storey element to the rear extension would not be of a scale to affect the Conservation Area.
5. The eaves of the two storey element of the rear extension would line up with the existing eaves and the ridge height would be lower than the existing ridge. Whilst it would run flush with the side wall of the existing house, I do not consider that this in itself would fail to make the extension appear subservient to the house. Given its overall proportions to the existing house, I do not consider that the part two storey, part single storey extension would be disproportionate to the existing house nor would it harm its character or appearance. Furthermore, I do not consider that the wider Conservation Area would be affected by this proposal.
6. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed part two storey, part single storey rear extension and front dormer window would preserve the character and appearance of the Weller Estate Conservation Area and no conflict with Policy CA1 would occur.

Living Conditions

7. No 18 Green Lane is set slightly further back than the neighbouring house, No 19, and there is a relatively narrow gap between the houses. The orientation of the houses would cause some loss of light to No 19 late in the day although this would be limited. However, due to the proximity of the extension to the boundary and its overall size, I consider that it would be overbearing to the occupiers of No 19. This would therefore have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 19 contrary to Local Plan Policy H13 which seeks to ensure that extensions to dwellings would not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of neighbours, amongst other things.

Other Matters and Conclusion

8. The appellant has referred to other examples of other extensions in the area which I accept appear similar to the proposal subject to this appeal. However, I do not know the full circumstances of these and therefore they do not alter my conclusion. I have also considered the various policies referred to by the Council which I have taken into account in reaching my decision.
9. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that although the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Weller Estate Conservation Area, the two storey element of the rear extension would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 19 Green Lane. It would conflict with the policies referred to and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR