



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/20/3247267

27 North Drive, High Wycombe HP13 6JW

- 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 Arif against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07321/FUL, dated 25 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.53 Hillview Road in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located within a dense residential setting largely made up of terraced and semi-detached dwellings. The site is occupied by an end of terrace two-storey dwelling with an existing large single storey rear extension. It is located on a steep hill with the neighbouring property to the east, No.25 North Drive, being at a higher level than the appeal site and the neighbouring property to the west, No.53 Hillview Road, being at a lower level. The proposal would add a first-floor extension above the existing flat roof rear extension.
5. The first-floor extension would be set back from the rear elevation and west side elevation, with the ridge height lower than that of the main dwelling. Due to the location of the extension, it would have limited visibility from the streetscene, with only some views of the proposal through the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring site. However, the proposed extension would

be significant in size. The cumulative impact of the proposal along with the single-storey rear extension would result in an extension which would not be subservient to the original dwelling. Although there would be no increase in ground floor area, the overall bulk of the proposal and the existing extension would significantly increase the built form on the site which would appear overly dominant and at odds with the appearance of the original dwelling.

6. The appellant states that other extensions in the surrounding area have been permitted and therefore the proposal is not out of keeping. However, during the site visit no other two-storey extensions were apparent from the rear garden of the appeal site and the proposal would create a dwelling which is excessive in size compared to the other modestly size properties within the surrounding area.
7. For the reasons above the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to the sections of Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) which require new development to respect and improve the character and appearance of the area and existing property and be subservient in scale and ancillary in function to the existing dwelling.

Living Conditions

8. The neighbouring dwelling at No.53 Hillview Road is set at a significantly lower ground level than the appeal property and therefore the proposed first-floor extension would appear to be at a much higher level from this neighbouring site. The extension has been set back by 1 metre from the side elevation of the existing single-storey extension which, along with the lower ridge height, would reduce its visibility from, and impact upon, No.53.
9. There is also a generous gap of over 2 metres between the two dwellings and, although the dwelling at No.53 is slightly orientated to face the appeal site, they do not appear overly close or cramped in nature when viewed from either the road or the rear garden. The proposal would not reduce this gap and, as the second storey would be set back from the side elevation closest to No.53, it would not create a sense of enclosure between the two dwellings. Therefore, the proposal would not have an overbearing or dominant impact upon the dwelling or garden at this neighbouring property.
10. Subsequently, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.53 Hillview Road. It would therefore not be contrary to the section of Policies DM35 and DM36 which require extensions to existing dwellings to prevent significant adverse impacts on and preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

11. In reaching my decision I have had full regard to the personal circumstances that have led to the need for the development. However, whilst I am sympathetic to these circumstances, the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be significant and would not be outweighed by these considerations.
12. The appellant has stated that there are no concerns from occupiers of the neighbouring property, and that there are no issues in relation to vehicle parking. However, these factors carry neutral weight and would not overcome

the identified harm. It was also stated that the Council took an unreasonable amount of time to decide the application, however this delay would not have an impact upon this appeal decision.

Conclusions and Recommendation

13. Although it has been found that the proposal would not impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, harm has been found to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR