



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/22/3307963

Bramley Cottage, The Common, Flackwell Heath, High Wycombe, HP10 9NT

- 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 Mrs Melanie Whitfield against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06321/FUL, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Flackwell Heath Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the end property in a terrace of 7 houses within the CA. They are identified in The Common, Flackwell Heath Conservation Area Character Survey Map as being buildings of significance constructed between 1850 and 1900. They are also identified as part of an important grouping of buildings that surround the Grade II listed War memorial and the small triangle of grass on which it stands, which is identified as an important open space.
4. The houses are set back from the footway with most in the terrace having paved forecourts to enable off road parking. Houses within the terrace and wider CA are not uniform. Some have projecting ground floor bays with single pitched or flat roofs. Clay tiles have replaced slates on some roofs along with UPVC windows. Most houses within the CA have exposed brickwork, although the terrace of which the appeal site is part is mostly finished in white painted render. The appeal property and the neighbouring semi-detached houses have rough flint finishing on some of their walls. The character and appearance of the CA therefore stems mainly from the age of the buildings as reflected in their materials, the variety of detailing, and in particular the configuration of the buildings around the central memorial.
5. The rear of the appeal property and other houses within the terrace have flat roofed single storey extensions of a similar depth. The extensions on the appeal

property and its neighbour are joined. There is no boundary feature between them and as such they appear unusually wide and somewhat incongruous even though they share the same building line.

6. The Council's Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document Adopted (2020) (SPD) notes that existing inappropriate extensions do not justify further unacceptable alterations. The proposed development would extend approximately 2.2 metres beyond the existing rear extension. It would thus project beyond its adjoining neighbour and break up their common building line leading to an unbalanced appearance. It would also appear obtrusive because it would extend beyond the building line of other rear extensions within the terrace. As such it would be incongruous and out of scale with the host property and its neighbours. Other houses within the terrace have relatively low fences and long gardens which would enable some limited views across to the proposed extension. However, there would be no views of it from the War Memorial, or elsewhere within the street.
7. Given the small scale of the development within the context of the CA as a whole, it would not harm its character. There would however be harm in terms of its appearance, albeit from the rear of houses which contribute less to the significance of the CA than their frontages. The harm would therefore be limited and thus less than substantial but would nevertheless be contrary to Policies DM31, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) and the SPD. Which require high quality development that respects the character and appearance of existing buildings and conserves or enhances the historic environment.
8. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires justification and, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. However, no public benefits have been put forward by the appellant.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR