



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSC Hons (PGDip) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/22/3291124

**Sunnydale, Upper Icknield Way, Cadsden, Princes Risborough,
Buckinghamshire HP27 0NA**

- 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 Ms Joanna Goodchild against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/07239/FUL, dated 15 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Construction of two storey side extension. Alterations to existing house. New entrance gates".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area, including whether or not it would conserve and enhance the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The property is a modest two-storey detached dwelling located within the Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The dwelling is sited to one side of a very spacious plot, leaving a considerable area of open green space adjacent to the south. The natural elements of the site and the surrounding area contribute positively to the scenic qualities of the AONB.
5. The houses further along the road are generally much larger than the appeal property, and vary in their design. Sunnydale has a hipped roof, a simple red brick exterior, and UPVC windows. The extension would have a pitched roof with small gabled elements at the front and rear, painted timber windows, a brick exterior, and a glass balustrade at the rear surrounding a balcony. It would have a lower ridge height than the original property, and have a narrower depth by virtue of the main structure being set in from the front and

- rear. However, the extension would also be wider than the existing building, and the entrance door would be relocated from the original building to the front of the extension.
6. Given the size of the plot, and the size of the properties further along the road, development to increase the size of the dwelling would not be inherently harmful. However, there would be an obvious mismatch in design between the original dwelling and the extension, which would relate poorly to the existing building, particularly because of its width. Additionally, as a result of its width, it would not appear distinctly subservient in scale to the existing dwelling. The design of the property, as a whole, would not appear cohesive or visually attractive, and would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 7. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area, and fail to conserve and enhance the AONB. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies DM30, DM35, and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (August 2019) which together seek to ensure: the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB is conserved, and where possible enhanced; development is of an appropriate character in scale, form, layout and detailed design; and the character and appearance of the existing property is respected. The proposal would also fail to align with the guidance provided in the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (January 2020) which advises that extensions should be subservient to the front elevation of the property.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR