
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

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

Decision date: 27 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/17/3175632

**Chiltern House, Pink Road, Lacey Green, Princes Risborough,
Buckinghamshire, HP27 0PG.**

- 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 and Mrs P Jarvis against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application ref: 17/05297/FUL, dated 6 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is part first storey, part single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration and installation of 5no. light wells to basement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part first storey, part single storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration and installation of 5no. light wells to basement at Chiltern House, Pink Road, Lacey Green, Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire, HP27 0PG, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 17/05297/FUL, dated 6 February 2017, 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 plans:

Drawing no. PLA 3.00 Rev B:	Location Plan – scale 1:1250; Existing and Proposed Site Plans – scale 1:200.
Drawing no. SUR 1.01 Rev A:	Existing Floor Plans and Elevations – scales 1:50 and 1:100.
Drawing no. PLA 3.04 Rev A:	Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – scales 1:50 and 1:100.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - a) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt for the purposes of national policy and the policies of the Development Plan.
-

- b) The effect of the development upon the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it.
- c) The impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

a) Whether inappropriate development.

- 3. Chiltern House comprises a two storey detached house with basement, erected as a replacement dwelling following the grant of planning permission in April 2005 under ref: 05/05269/FUL. That planning permission removed Permitted Development rights.
- 4. The appeal site forms part of a small ribbon of residential development beyond the settlement of Lacey Green. It is located within open countryside and the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 5. National policy in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') contains a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Such development should not be approved, except in very special circumstances (paragraph 87). However, paragraph 89 sets out a number of exceptions, including the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
- 6. An "original building" is defined within the Glossary to the Framework as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, as in this case, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally.
- 7. Policies GB2 and GB6 of the adopted Local Plan¹ and Policy CS9 Core Strategy² seek to control development in the Green Belt.
- 8. Policy GB6 of the Local Plan relates to extensions to dwellings within the Green Belt. It states that extensions will not be permitted where they would result in the gross floorspace of the original dwelling being increased by more than 50% or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building.
- 9. Chiltern House as constructed pursuant to the 2005 planning permission is a substantial dwelling with four bedrooms, ground floor living accommodation and a basement.
- 10. I have been referred to a recent appeal decision relating to Chiltern House dated 25 May 2016 (ref: APP/K0425/D/16/3145507). On that occasion, the Inspector concluded that although the proposal before him would not increase the floorspace by more than 50% it would nevertheless, by virtue of the mass of additional building, amount to disproportionate additions in the context of bullet point 3 to paragraph 89 of the Framework and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building (see Criterion (1) (d) of Policy GB6).

¹ Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011 (adopted January 2004).

² Wycombe Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2008).

11. The scheme before me differs from that considered by the previous Inspector. Furthermore, my decision is influenced by the subsequent grant of planning permission in April 2017 for a single storey rear extension and 5no. light wells to the basement (ref: 17/05298/FUL).
12. The proposal before me at this appeal involves a significant reduction in added floorspace when compared to both of the above schemes. It would represent a minimal increase only in floor area totalling some 23m².
13. For these reasons I have found upon the first main issue that development as proposed would not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and that it would not be inappropriate development for the purposes of national policy and the policies of the Development Plan.

b) Effect upon openness of Green Belt.

14. The single storey extension would have a floor area of some 11m² and would span a small part of the rear elevation. It would be contained by the existing rear addition and by the rear main elevation of the dwelling as originally constructed. The low height of the extension would render it inobtrusive in the landscape. The small first floor addition to the existing ground floor extension would likewise be of minimal dimensions (some 12m²), having a ridge height below that of the projecting rear gable.
15. Both elements of the scheme would be seen against the backdrop of the rear elevation of the house. They would not be visible from the street and would be screened on both sides by mature boundary hedges. Furthermore, the total floor area of the proposed extensions will be less than that for which planning permission has recently been granted. That permission remains extant.
16. Having regard to these factors, I have found upon the second main issue that development as proposed would have no material effect upon the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land in it. As such, the scheme would accord with national policy at paragraph 80 of the Framework and with Policies GB2 and GB6 of the Local Plan.

c) Impact upon character and appearance.

17. The design of the two extensions is to a high standard. The new structures will complement the existing dwelling and provide enhanced living accommodation, whilst remaining subservient to the host building in terms of their scale and bulk.
18. I therefore find upon the third main issue that development as proposed would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and that it would accord with the requirements of Policies GB6 and H17 of the Local Plan.

Conditions

19. I have considered the two conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014. The first of these is the standard commencement condition in accordance with the requirements of section 91(1) (a) of the

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Condition 1 above). The second requires that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

20. The list on Drawing no. PLA 3.04 Rev A confirms that the materials to the walls and roof, and generally in relation to the fenestration, will match the existing in colour and style. I consider the balance of the materials specified in the list to be acceptable in the particular circumstances of this case.
21. Condition 2 as imposed requires that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt. Since those approved plans already specify the materials that will be used in constructing the development, a separate condition in this regard is not required.

Conclusion

22. I have found above that the proposal would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
23. Having regard to the siting, form and subservience of the two small extensions I am satisfied that they would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area or that of the host building. Neither would development as proposed have any material impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land in it.
24. Accordingly, and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR