

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2021

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28 September 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3274039**

**Glenwyde, Windsor Lane, Woodburn Green HP10 0EG**

- 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 Mark Starkey against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
  - The application Ref 21/05545/FUL, dated 21 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is 'replacement portico porch to front, first floor rear extension, insertion of 1 x rooflight to side roofslope and fenestration alterations'.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the Application Form as it is more succinct.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene and Conservation Area within which it sits.

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a large detached dwelling which enjoys a prominent position on the corner of Windsor Hill and Manor Gardens. It sits at the end of a group of other large, modern dwellings although there is notable variety in terms of the size, scale and design of the dwellings within the locality. This variety contributes positively to an attractive street scene and the overall character and appearance of the Woodburn Green Conservation Area (CA).
  5. The proposal seeks to replace an open porch which has a traditional pitched roof with a much larger 'portico' structure, with glazed sides. The existing porch is modest and well proportioned and it sits discreetly within the feature gable on the front elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed replacement porch would be much larger, spanning the full width of the gable and it would be much deeper. Whilst the dwelling is substantial in terms of its size and
-

overall presence, I consider that the overall scale of the porch, combined with its flat roofed design and glazed sides, would not sit comfortably against the design and form of the host dwelling and it would appear as a somewhat disjointed and incongruous addition. As a result, the replacement porch would harm the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling. As it would be readily visible from the public domain, this harm would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

6. The Council also raises concerns about the scale and design of the proposed first floor extension which would be built at the rear of the appeal dwelling. As explained, the appeal dwelling is large and imposing. To my mind, it is capable of accommodating a first floor extension at its north-eastern end, above the existing ground floor addition, even accounting for the fact that such an extension would be visible within the street scene. However, the fenestration detailing to the rear elevation of the proposed addition, along with the windows to be introduced to the side elevation, would not respond well to the detailing and proportions of the existing windows. I also consider that the proposed rooflight would be oversized. For these reasons, I consider that the first floor extension and associated alterations would not sit comfortably alongside the host dwelling and once again, this visual harm would be widely visible from the public domain and the CA. Whilst the appellant has suggested that the window design could be altered, I consider that this would be a fundamental rather than a minor alteration which should be considered by the Council in the first instance.
7. Despite an absence of objections from third parties, I therefore find that the proposed porch, first floor extension and rooflight would, if permitted, harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling along with the character and appearance of the street scene and CA within which it sits. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policies CP9, DM31, DM35 and DM36 of the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan along with the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Householder Planning and Design Guidance' which collectively promote high quality design that respects and contributes positively to its local context, including any heritage assets.
8. The harm to the CA that I have identified would be 'less than substantial' as directed by the Planning Practice Guidance, but I attach considerable importance and weight to the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It goes on to say that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

#### *Other matters*

10. The appellant has not suggested that the scheme offers any public benefits. The appellant does, however, refer to examples of other portico porches,

although these relate to very different buildings and they are not directly comparable to the proposal before me.

11. The appellant has also highlighted other developments within the local area including the erection of dwellings within the garden of a listed building, along with a two storey extension being built nearby. Once again, neither are similar to the development proposed, which I have considered on its individual merits and against its specific context in any event.
12. The appellant asserts that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours in any way and would not result in any highway related issues. However, these are neutral factors in the overall planning balance.
13. The appellant suggests that the porch is required for security purposes and the extension is required for additional living space. This is not dispute, but nothing I have seen or read suggests that a more sympathetically designed scheme could not achieve these objectives.
14. Finally, the appellant has expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the application was dealt with. Whilst regrettable, this it is not a matter for me to consider.

### **Overall Conclusions**

15. I conclude that the proposed replacement porch, first floor extension and rooflight would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling along with the character and appearance of the street scene and CA within which it sits, contrary to the development plan policies outlined above.
16. The arguments advanced by the appellant in favour of the scheme do not outweigh the harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

*David Fitzsimon*

INSPECTOR