



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/19/3227070

23 Lowfield Way, Hazlemere, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP15 7RR

- 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 Miss Claire Ponsford against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/08020/FUL, dated 13 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2019.
 - The development proposed has been described as "the extension of the existing ground floor forward to enlarge living space and to create a ground floor w.c. (cloakroom) and a new porch area (wind lobby) plus; the building of an additional garage alongside the existing single garage to create a new double garage."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of the existing ground floor forward and a new porch area (wind lobby) plus the building of an additional garage alongside the existing single garage to create a new double garage at 23 Lowfield Way, Hazlemere, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP15 7RR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/08020/FUL, dated 13 November 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 172(P)000 (11/2018), 172(P)001, 172(P)002, 172(P)003, 172(P)004, 172(P)005 and 172(P)006.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan Nos 172(P)002, 172(P)003, 172(P)005 and 172(P)006.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development used above has been taken from the planning application form. The council used a different description and in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application in my decision with some unnecessary description removed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is located in a residential area which is defined by terraced and semi-detached dwellings which appear to have had a similar appearance originally, but many of which have been extended and altered. The dwellings of this part of Lowfield Way are laid out around an area of open space, with grass verges aside the carriageways and open frontages to the dwellings. The end-terrace dwelling the subject of this appeal sits within a staggered building line with a footpath to the side leading to Ilex Close.
5. In a setting where numerous dwellings have been extended to the front, the proposed extension would not appear as an incongruous addition and would not undermine the open plan layout in a manner that is materially different to the other front extensions that have occurred. Moreover, although the extension would be prominent and the porch would extend forward of the neighbouring dwelling, the extension would be of a scale and bulk that would remain subservient to the host dwelling and would enable the staggered building line of the original dwellings to remain apparent.
6. The extension would abut the footpath to the side, but not the front and as such a reasonable set back would be retained. The proximity to the side footpath would be comparable to the extension at 25 Lowfield Way. For these reasons, the extension would not be excessively dominating within the plot.
7. Due to the curve of Lowfield Way and the positioning of the dwelling, the proposed front extension would be of some additional prominence from the junction with Ilex Close. However, as the extension would mostly restrict views of the attached dwellings and their forward projections, the extension would not have an unacceptable effect on the openness or character of the area.
8. The proposal also includes a garage extension to the rear of the site which I consider has no harmful impacts on the character and appearance of the area.
9. For these reasons I conclude that the effect on the character and appearance of the area resulting from the development would not be harmful. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policies G3 and H17 and Appendix 4 of the Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011 (as saved, extended and partially replaced) and policy CS19 of the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document which combine to require that development is of a high standard of design, takes account of existing site characteristics, is compatible with the immediate surroundings, is sympathetic to existing buildings and their architectural details and is subservient in scale. The proposal also accords with the similar requirements contained within policies DM35 and DM36 of the emerging Wycombe District Local Plan which has been examined and can therefore be afforded some weight. Policy G8 was also cited by the council, but that policy does not relate to this issue and I therefore find it less pertinent to the consideration of this appeal.

Other Matters

10. The proposal includes a garage extension to the rear and concerns have been raised by interested parties in relation to fire access on the grounds that the

garage would impede the footpath and that a gate would be locked. In this regard it appears that the garage would be no more obstructive than the existing fencing enclosures.

11. Comments with respect to the ownership of the wall of the neighbouring dwelling and a covenant that may prevent development relate to civil matters that fall outside the remit of this decision. Furthermore, by virtue of its shallow depth, single storey height and appropriate positioning, the effect of the porch on the light afforded to the neighbouring property of 21 Lowfield Way would not cause harm to the occupants living conditions to an unacceptable extent. These other matters do not, therefore, lead me to conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
13. I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the development to be undertaken using the external materials listed on the approved plans in order to ensure that those used match the existing materials at the site.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR