



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/22/3311190

5 Beech Tree Road, Holmer Green, High Wycombe HP15 6UZ

- 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 Enstone M Enstone against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council -East Area (Chiltern).
 - The application PL/22/2371/FA, dated 01 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Single storey side extension with six rooflights'.
-

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 host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey link-detached detached dwelling set back from the Beech Tree Road behind a small private driveway area which serves several other link-detached dwellings of the same design. The dwelling is has a narrow front elevation with a deep form; it has a simple utilitarian design typical of dwellings of its mid-to-late 20th Century era.
4. The dwelling has an existing single storey front and side extension which projects beyond the flank wall by approximately the same width of the house, creating a first floor frontage that is double the width of the narrow first floor element. The appeal scheme would further extend this flank to utilise the irregular shaped corner plot. The resulting extension would create a projecting ground floor which would be closer to three times the width of the original house. The juxtaposition with the remaining first floor element of the dwelling would emphasise the sprawling scale and width of the ground floor extension. This would appear entirely disproportionate to the host dwelling.
5. Although the extension would only be single storey in height and therefore would not add mass or overbear the host dwelling, it would nonetheless dominate it and appear as a contrived and awkward addition.
6. Other properties in the area have similar shallow front and wide side extensions to those existing at the host dwelling. Whilst the existing character

of the area has a sprawling ground floor quality, the appeal scheme would go beyond the scale of anything within the vicinity and would be entirely incongruous. Despite its setback from the road, the appeal site is nonetheless prominent in the street scene by virtue of the spacious and open frontage, as well as its corner plot and siting opposite another road junction. As such, the disproportionate addition would be intrusive and out of character with the area.

Other Considerations

7. The Appellant suggests that the ground floor extensions would make the property suitable for lifelong living as the occupants of the property age. Whilst there is a clear private benefit in increasing ground floor living space in respect of accessibility in general, the Appellant has not addressed how the design of the appeal scheme would meet their particular needs and therefore the benefit is somewhat unquantifiable. I have nonetheless accorded this substantial weight. However, I am not satisfied that such needs could not be met by other less intrusive and disproportionate adaptations to the property, which erodes the weight to be given to the benefit. As such, this benefit would not outweigh the harm which would arise from the scheme.
8. Interested parties have made extensive representations. Many of the representations relate to the front driveway, drainage of existing hardstanding, NHS access and private parking disputes which do not directly relate to the appeal scheme. Unsubstantiated claims have been made that the existing extension is occupied as a separate dwelling by a lodger and concerns were raised that the appeal scheme would thus be occupied separately. The appeal scheme does not propose a material change of use to subdivide the residential property and I have considered the scheme on its face value merits.
9. Interested parties raised the issue of foul drainage provision. Given that the appeal site is a single residential dwelling which the appeal scheme seeks to extend, there is little to indicate that undue strain would be put on existing foul drainage arrangements. Interested party concerns relating to damage to the roadway and construction traffic could have been overcome by way of a construction management condition had I been minded to allow the appeal.
10. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would conflict with saved policies GC1, H13 and H15 of the Chiltern District Local Plan, adopted 2001 and updated 2007 and 2011, and policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District, adopted 2013, and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, high standards of design for development which is well integrated with, and complements, neighbouring buildings and the local area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR