

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2016

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/16/3161167
42 Lime Avenue, High Wycombe, HP11 1DR

- 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 Mrs S Slater against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/06806/FUL, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the part demolition of existing garage and erection of part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which is situated at the end of a residential street. An attached single storey garage projects partly beyond the main front wall of the dwelling. The other properties along Lime Avenue vary in terms of their size and appearance and, as a result, there is no predominant character to the streetscene. The appeal dwelling occupies an elevated position, with an area of woodland on one side. A public footpath on the edge of the woodland runs along the side boundary of the appeal property.
 4. The proposal is to erect a part two storey and part single storey side extension. Part of the existing garage would be demolished. The extension would incorporate a projecting two storey element at the front. This would provide a larger garage on the ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite facilities at first floor level. At the rear of the two storey element, a single storey extension would provide a utility room and a garden room.
 5. The Council contends that the proposal would be of a poor design and it would not be a subservient addition to the property because of its overall scale, width and mass. Accordingly, the Council states that the proposal would conflict with Policies G3, H17 and Appendix 4 of the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan 2011(LP) and Policy CS19 of the adopted Core Strategy. These policies seek
-

(amongst other things) to ensure that development proposals are of high quality design; and that house extensions do not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the original property or on the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Appendix 4 of the LP provides further guidance and states that extensions should be subservient to the existing building and visually integrated with it. In my opinion, these policies are consistent with the provisions of paragraphs 17 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which (amongst other things) also require development to be of high quality design; and to be visually attractive.

6. I agree that the proposed side extension would be a significant addition to the property in terms of its overall size. Its forward projection at two storey level would also be visually prominent. In that regard, there would be some conflict with the Development Plan. Having said that, given the appeal property's position at the end of Lime Avenue, I am not persuaded that the principle of a large extension with a projecting element would necessarily be harmful, provided the design was acceptable.
7. In my view the appeal proposal would appear fragmented and disjointed, particularly at roof level. As a result it would be an incongruous and visually harmful addition to the existing dwelling, particularly when viewed from the public footpath at the side of the property. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the appellant's approach to the design, as contained in the Design and Access Statement. I also acknowledge that some elements, including the gabled front elevation and external materials, would reflect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. However, it does not alter my findings regarding the proposal as a whole. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR