



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/19/3237968

2 Gynant Road, High Wycombe HP13 7TE

- 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 Shehab Shama against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06585/FUL dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling located on a corner plot, adjacent to the junction of Gynant Road and Roebuck Avenue. Gynant Road is steeply sloping and the appeal property is located at the top of the road, with the dwellings grouped in semi-detached pairs and staggered in height down the hill. The properties on Gynant Road, including the appeal property, all have a similar character and appearance, with the majority featuring small gardens or paved parking areas at the front and small front porches of the same size and design, giving the road a generally uniform appearance.
5. It is acknowledged that two properties on Gynant Road feature single storey front extensions covering the full width of the properties (the property

neighbouring the appeal property and one on the opposite side of the road) However, it appears these are in the minority and are not characteristic of the road.

6. The proposed extension would project forward of the full width front extension of the neighbouring property. Whilst it is acknowledged that the building line of the neighbouring property is currently forward of the appeal property, the effect would be worsened by the proposal by adding further mass and bulk that would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties further. The gradient of the road means the general uniformity of the properties and staggered building line are well perceived and the forward projection and change to the building line as a result of the proposal would be prominent and out of keeping with the pattern of development. The proposal would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and Gynant Road.
7. The large scale, in terms of width and depth, of the proposed extension would result in the extension appearing prominent and out of keeping with other properties on Gynant Road, the majority of which feature small front porches. The proposal would result in the front door of the property being relocated to the side of the dwelling. All the dwellings on Gynant Road feature the main access door at the front of the property and I consider this is an important feature to maintain the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has highlighted examples of full width front extensions on Horsenden Road which I saw on my site visit. Whilst there are a larger number of full width front extensions on Horsenden Road compared to Gynant Road, I do not have full details of the scale of the extensions to make a meaningful comparison with the proposal. Although similar in appearance to Gynant Road, Horsenden Road does not form part of the immediate setting of the appeal property and these examples have therefore had little bearing on my decision.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed extension would be contrary to Policy DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (Adopted August 2019) (the 'Local Plan') which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development improves the character of the area and demonstrate appropriate character in the scale, form, layout and detailed design of buildings and respect the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Highway Safety

10. There is disagreement between the parties as to whether the proposal would result in the loss of off-street parking spaces at the front of the property. Whilst it is clear a reduction of the area available for parking at the front of the property would occur, I have not been provided with measurements of the space that would remain available for parking. I do however note that the Council state that the parking area would not meet the minimum size standards according to the Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (September 2015).
11. Whilst the appellant refers specifically to No. 19 Horsenden Road with regard to parking and states that the space available at the front of the appeal property is larger, I have no evidence before me to confirm that the parking areas would be comparable.

12. On-street parking in Gynant Road is not subject to parking controls and I observed at the time of my site visit, parking spaces were available and there was little traffic flow. There is a mixture of properties on Gynant Road with off-street parking and those that utilise on-street parking. I therefore consider that even if the proposed development did result in the loss of off-street parking any displaced parking would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. In addition, if off-street parking at the property would not be possible, this would make additional on-street parking available at the front of the property.
13. In light of the above, it is not considered that the development is contrary to Policy DM33 of the Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that development provide parking sufficient to meet the needs of future occupants and to ensure there is no significant adverse impact from overspill parking.

Other Matters

14. The personal and health reasons for the appellant wishing to construct the extension are understood and whilst I sympathise with the circumstances, these considerations do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified. I note that the appellant feels that they have been unfairly treated and considers that correspondence and communication with the Council has been lacking, but this does not affect my assessment of the planning merits of the proposal and is a matter for the Council.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, although no harm has been found in relation to highway safety, this does not outweigh the harm that has been identified. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR