



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3276598

27A Slade Road, Stokenchurch, Buckinghamshire HP14 3QQ

- 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 James Hunt against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
 - The application Ref 21/05678/FUL, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as '2 storey to 3 storey extension to bring in line with adjoining properties'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a '2 storey to 3 storey extension to bring in line with adjoining properties' at 27A Slade Road, Stokenchurch, Buckinghamshire HP14 3QQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/05678/FUL dated 3 March 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Proposed Site Plan & Block Plan, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading and my formal decision above is taken from the planning application form. Nevertheless, it is clear from the plans that the development comprises roof alterations to an existing front extension, a second floor extension and alterations to fenestration. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. In the period since the appeal was submitted, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on this change, and I have therefore considered the appeal with regard to the current version.

Main Issue

4. The Council has raised no objection to the alterations proposed to fenestration and the roof of the existing front extension. From the evidence before me and my site visit, I see no reason to disagree with this view. The main issue is

therefore the effect of the second floor extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Slade Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two-storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of three-storey properties. The proposed second floor would extend over the first-floor of the appeal dwelling, and would be of comparable height and depth to the upper part of the neighbouring dwelling at 27 Slade Road.
6. A ground-floor projection to the rear of No 27 includes full height glazing facing a patio area adjacent to the rear of the appeal dwelling. However, it was apparent from my visit that outlook from the room served by this glazing towards the site is already substantially enclosed by the existing building given its very close proximity and two-storey height. The proposal would increase the height, bulk and mass of development on the boundary with No 27, but with regard to this existing relationship, I consider that the greater scale of the building would be unlikely to be perceived, and that any change in views from the glazing to the side of the projection would in reality be very limited. Similarly, I do not consider that there would be a significant increase in the impression of enclosure to the neighbouring patio and garden immediately to the rear of the building. While the development would be more visible from the remainder of the garden, it would span only a fairly small width of the space and would be seen against the neighbouring terrace. In my judgement, it would not therefore be overly dominant or overbearing to users of this space.
7. The Council's Householder Planning and Design Guidance 2020 advises that extensions should not excessively enclose outlook from neighbouring properties. However, taking the above factors into account, I do not find that the proposal would result in a material increase in enclosure or loss of outlook so as to detract from the quality of life experienced by the occupiers of No 27.
8. I therefore conclude that the second floor extension would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Slade Road, and I find no conflict with Policies CP1, CP9 or DM35 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (LP). Amongst other things, these policies together broadly require high quality design and development that preserves the amenities of surrounding properties. The Council's reason for refusal additionally cites LP Policy DM20 which lists matters to be determined in accordance with the Framework. Neighbouring living conditions are not explicitly identified, but I am in any event satisfied that the proposal would also accord with the Framework insofar as it seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

9. Given the location of the site within a built up area and the nature of the proposal, I agree with the Council that there would not be detriment to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which washes over Stokenchurch, and I am satisfied that its natural beauty and landscape qualities would be conserved.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be

reached. Subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR