



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by Helen B Hockenhull BA (Hons) B.PI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/20/3249477

1 Homefield Close, Stokenchurch HP14 3PY

- 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 Chris and Samantha Newell against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07851/FUL, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension and demolition of side brick wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On 1 April 2020, Wycombe District Council merged with Aylesbury Vale District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Chiltern District Council and South Bucks District Council to become a single Unitary Authority, Buckinghamshire Council. Until such time as they are revoked or replaced, the development plans for the merged local planning authorities remain in place for the area which they relate to within the Buckinghamshire Council Unitary Authority. It is therefore necessary, where the development plan contains material that is relevant to the planning judgement to be made in this case, to refer to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved Wycombe District Council.
3. The description I have used above is taken for the Council's Decision Notice. It differs from that stated on the original planning application form in that it refers to the side brick wall. I have used this description as I consider it better reflects the development proposed.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms a two-storey end terrace house located on the corner of Homefield Close and Slade Road. There is an existing brick wall of around 2 metres in height to the side boundary facing Slade Road. Beyond this is an area of grass next to the highway which contributes positively to the

visual appearance and character of the street scene. Properties on the other side of Slade Road are set back and have grassed front garden areas giving the area an attractive and spacious appearance.

6. The appeal proposes a two-storey side extension which would project approximately 5.35 metres to the side of the existing dwelling into the adjacent grassed area. It would require the removal of the side brick wall and the provision of a new 2-metre-high boundary fence.
7. Policy DM35 of the Wycombe District Plan 2019 seeks to achieve high quality design. Policy DM36 concerns extensions and alterations to existing dwellings. It requires amongst other things that such works are of a high quality of design, subservient in scale and ancillary in function to the existing dwelling and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Council's Householder Planning and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (SPD) provides further advice and states that side extensions on corner plots may be acceptable if they are not overly prominent or out of character with the local area. It goes on to advise that the existing pattern of development on the side street should be respected.
8. The proposed extension would significantly increase the footprint of the original dwelling. This would not be in scale with or appear subservient to the host property resulting in a poor standard of design.
9. The proposal would result in the loss of a large part of the grassed amenity area to the side of the property. At its closest point the extension would be approximately 1.2 metres away from the eastern highway boundary. The appeal property is sited so that it does not project beyond the front elevation of No.77 Slade Road to the north. The proposed side extension would result in the property extending beyond this point. In so doing the proposal would appear prominent in the street scene and would not respect the existing pattern of development, having a negative impact on the spacious character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has pointed out that the forward projection is like that of No's 79 and 81 Slade Road. However, in these examples, the relationship is side to side, not rear to side and their set back reflects the curvature of the road.
11. The appellant has also brought my attention to several other dwellings in the locality which have two storey side extensions. I have had regard to these in coming to my decision. The closest extension to the appeal property is located at No.13 Fowlers Farm Road. However, this is not comparable to the case before me as it forms a single storey side extension, not two storeys, and is much smaller in extent.
12. Other extended properties in the locality have a different context. Whilst they may be corner plots, many do not have the same relationship to properties on neighbouring side roads. The side extension at No. 2 Mead Platt has a similar siting to the scheme before me, however it does not extend as far forward. Whilst I do not have the full details of these other schemes, in particular when they were constructed, it is likely that most of these examples predate the Council's current SPD referred to above. In any event each case should be considered on its individual merits.

13. I note that the appeal property is located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, as the property is within an established residential area, there would be no impact on the landscape of this protected area.
14. In summary, whilst I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of matching design and materials to the existing house, for the reasons given above, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Householder Planning and Design SPD 2020.
15. Accordingly, having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR