



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/20/3253184

219 Deeds Grove, High Wycombe HP12 3PD

- 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 Saf Dad against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/05732/FUL, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing dwelling, garage and shed and construction of 2 two-storey, 3-ded dwellings, forming a terrace with the neighbouring property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's reason for refusal makes reference, amongst other things, to the proposed internal space within certain rooms of the scheme. The appellant has submitted with the appeal an amendment which seeks to address this issue. The amendment would not alter the external appearance of the proposal and only seeks to introduce an internal reconfiguration. Whilst the Council resists the acceptance of the amendment into the appeal process, they have commented that, with certain provisos, the amendment would result in a scheme which met the standards that they have referred to (and maintaining their objection to the other effects of the proposal). In my view, the alterations indicated by the amendment are minor in nature, would not alter the external appearance of the dwellings and would have no greater impact on neighbours or the surrounding area. In addition, the Council has had the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments and has done so in its statement. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the acceptance of the amendments as part of the appeal would not have any prejudicial effects on any party and so I shall consider them within the appeal.

Main Issue

3. Taking account of the above, the main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this semi-detached house, which is located in a residential area consisting mainly of very similar semi-detached houses set

within very similar plot widths. Although there is some variation in the detail of some houses and some have been altered, there is a very consistent pattern and appearance to the dwellings and plot sizes which contribute strongly to the character of this area. I regard this as a positive factor in the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposal would seek to demolish the existing house, garage and out-building (leaving its currently attached neighbour at No 217 standing). The proposed 2 houses would be attached to No 217 to form a terrace of 3 properties. The appellant and the Council have referred to an extant planning permission for the extension of the existing house and I have been provided with details of that scheme (Ref 19/07174/FUL). That extension would be of the same dimensions as the current appeal scheme, with some variations to matters of detail.
6. When compared to the strong sense of pattern and rhythm that exists in this area, the proposal would result in the 2 dwellings appearing cramped and set within significantly narrower plots than is characteristic of the area. Whilst I fully acknowledge that the approved extension would be of the same footprint, it would appear as part of the same dwelling and would not reduce or divide the width of the plot. These are material differences which set the proposal apart from the approved scheme in my judgement. The appearance of the dwellings and the consequent division of the plot would have a harmful affect on the character and appearance of the area by disrupting the strong pattern that I have identified.

Conclusion

7. I acknowledge that the proposal would contribute an additional dwelling to local supply; however, this modest contribution would not outweigh the harmful effects of the proposal on the local area. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM35 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR