



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/19/3229832

The Chequers Inn, Kiln Lane, Bourne End HP10 0JQ

- 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 The Chequers Inn against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/07845/FUL, dated 20 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1No. dwelling to be used for staff accommodation in connection with the attached hotel.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since planning permission was refused on 21 December 2018 the Council has adopted the Wycombe District Council Local Plan, August 2019. The Council has confirmed the policies it considers relevant, and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment. Consequently, I have taken this into account when making my decision.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and flood risk, with particular reference to the disposal of surface water.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located approximately 2km from the village of Wooburn and is adjacent open countryside, and what appears to be agricultural land as part of the Wooburn Common area.
5. The low density, large residential brick and tile development along, and to the rear of Kiln Lane, varies in age and style.
6. The Chequers Inn is located at the junction of Kiln Lane and Harvest Hill. The site includes an established hotel building and separate accommodation block separated by a car-parking area. To the rear of the existing accommodation block there is a large garden area accessed via the car park.

7. Both buildings are shielded from Kiln Lane, the surrounding area, and nearby properties by high hedges and trees to the side and rear of the plot.
8. The proposed development would be a 2-storey side extension to the existing hotel accommodation. The extension would step down from the existing building and provide 3 staff bedrooms. There would be 2 bedrooms on the ground-floor level with a kitchen/living/dining area, a utility room and 2 x bathrooms. There would be a further en-suite bedroom on the first-floor with a separate living and dining area. A shared amenity space would be added to the existing arrangements and two additional parking spaces provided. New hedging would be added to the side of the extension as well as a green roof to the existing shed.
9. The proposal would be attached in matching materials, at a lower ridge height, to the existing accommodation block and would not be readily seen from the surrounding area as it is well shielded by mature hedges and large Leylandi trees.
10. New hedging would improve the boundary treatment where the landscaping and fencing is sparser and a green roof to the existing shed would add to the current green infrastructure. Overlooking is avoided due to sufficient separation provided by the remaining large garden space.
11. Therefore, I find that, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would comply with Policies CP9, DM34 and DM35 of the Wycombe District Council Local Plan 2019, that state, amongst other things, that development should achieve high quality design, improve green infrastructure and enhance the character, quality and distinctiveness of an area.

Flood Risk

12. The appeal site lies within Flood Zone 1, and therefore is considered to be at low risk from surface water flooding. As such, a Flood Risk Assessment is not required.
13. However, the appellant has not provided a drainage scheme that includes a Surface Water Management plan as required by the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA), in this case, Buckinghamshire County Council. As the LLFA has requested that this specific ground investigation should be carried out, and I have limited evidence before me in respect of flood risk, I am uncertain whether or not flood risk would be reduced through the imposition of a condition related to surface water disposal.
14. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM39 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 which requires that all development must incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems, to ensure that run-off rates at the site boundary of greenfield sites will not be exceeded by the development.
15. For similar reasons, the proposal does not align with Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that there is a satisfactory solution to manage flood risk to ensure that the risk is not increased elsewhere and where appropriate, this is supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment.

Conclusion

16. Although I have found in favour of the appellant with regard to character and appearance of the area this does not overcome the potential harm related to flood risk for the site and surrounding area.
17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

JE JOLLY

INSPECTOR