



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3288684

21 New Road, Marlow Bottom SL7 3NQ

- 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 R Harper against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
 - The application Ref 21/06108/FUL, dated 12 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2 no. single storey rear extensions, the addition of boarding to the first-floor gable ends and dormers, alterations to the existing fenestration and the erection of a new attached front garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The section of New Road where the appeal site is located is predominantly characterised by chalet bungalows of varying design. No 21 is a chalet bungalow situated within a corner plot. The front elevation of No 21 includes distinctive gable and dormer window features which incorporate matching decorative fascia boards. The first-floor windows within these features are also aligned with one another and form part of an overall cohesive design. This dwelling and others on the road are generally set well back from front boundaries and are served by front gardens and driveways. Where dwellings have front projections, these are more often limited in depth. These factors give a pleasant sense of order and a general spaciousness to the street scene.
4. The Wycombe District Council Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (the SPD) states amongst other things that front extensions will be highly visible in the street scene, so particular care should be taken to ensure that they do not detract from the appearance of the dwelling, or the general character of the street. Paragraph 12.1 of the SPD also states that all garages should be set behind the front building line of the dwelling to avoid obscuring views of the property or intruding into the wider street scene.
5. Due to its substantial projection forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling, the front garage would be at odds with the prevailing layout of buildings in the street. It would appear particularly conspicuous as a result of

the site's prominent corner location which would facilitate views of the development both from New Road and Beechtree Avenue. In addition, in views towards the front of the property, the pitched roof of the garage would interrupt the front profile of the existing dormer window. As a result of these factors, the development would disrupt the cohesive design of the dwelling and would be an incongruous addition to the street scene.

6. My attention has been drawn to the scale and layout of a dwelling adjacent to the more northern junction of New Road with Beechtree Avenue as well as a selection of properties on New Road which have with front extensions or garages. I am not aware of the planning history of these particular examples or whether they were considered prior to the adoption of the SPD or current development plan policies. In any case, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits. For the reasons given, I am not persuaded that the proposal would positively respond to the appearance of the host dwelling or the predominant layout of buildings on New Road.
7. I conclude, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the proposal would conflict with the high quality design, character and context requirements of Policies DM35 (Placemaking and Design Quality), DM36 (Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) and Policy CP9 (Sense of Place) of the Wycombe District Council Local Plan (2019). For the same reasons the proposal would also conflict with the SPD.

Conclusion

8. The development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR