



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/23/3325199

1 Havenfield Road High Wycombe HP12 4TE

- 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 H Majekdunmi against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
- The application Ref 23/05157/FUL dated 19 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2023.
- The development proposed is part single/storey part two storey front extension with Juliet balcony, part single storey/part two storey side extension, 3 x front elevation dormer windows, alterations to roof of existing single storey side projection, single storey rear extension and roof extension on rear elevation to create first floor. Car port to front.

Decision.

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single/storey part two storey front extension with Juliet balcony, part single storey/part two storey side extension, 3 x front elevation dormer windows, alterations to roof of existing single storey side projection, single storey rear extension and roof extension on rear elevation to create first floor with car port to front, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 23/05157/FUL dated 19 January 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 501/104F; 501/105F; 501/106F.
 - 3) The window shown on plan 106F to the first floor ensuite bathroom shall be obscure glazed and no part thereof below 1.5 m above floor level shall open. The window shall be retained as such for the life of the development and no additional windows or other openings shall be inserted into the east or west-facing elevations.
 - 4) Notwithstanding what appears on the drawings referred to in condition 1, no part of any structural wall above ground floor level (or 3.0m from ground level) shall be erected within 1 metre of the boundary between the host property (No.1) and the adjacent dwellinghouse identified as 1A Havenfield Road.
 - 5) Prior to the erection of the car port hereby approved, details of the parking layout including the position of the car port and its structural supports shall be submitted to the Council and approved in writing. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the development (i) upon the character and appearance of the street scene and (ii) on neighbouring users.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Havenfield Road is a suburban street populated by a range of mostly two-storey dwellings largely dating from the middle decades of the twentieth century with some later insertions such as No. 4 (opposite) and 'one-and-a-half' Havenfield Road which is a larger 1.5-storey house adjacent to the appeal site on its eastern side. The appeal site (No.1) together with its western neighbour, 1A Havenfield Road (No.1A) are some of the few single-storey dwellings in this street of mixed housing types which include terrace blocks of houses and two-storey flat blocks set amongst established trees and open grassed curtilages. The appeal site and its adjacent neighbours, however, sit within individual plots which, although of limited size, are mostly very well screened from nearby gardens which include those to properties along New Road.
4. The proposal would comprehensively reconfigure the existing dwelling for which there have been previous approvals albeit of lesser scope. In such cases it is the overall visual impact of the resultant dwelling which is to be considered and although the proposal would largely fill the width of the plot this is not uncharacteristic of dwellings in the locality, and a sufficiency of private amenity space and forecourt adequate for parking¹ would remain. The latter would also be partly screened by frontage planting which would mitigate the prominence of change, so whilst there would be a difference in scale with the western neighbour this is not of itself of detriment in an area where there are a variety of built forms and scale of dwellings. The final ridge height would not be increased and the slight step down from the east to west (from 'one-and-a-half' to No.1A) would reflect these changes in height and scale. The resultant dwelling would be of a similar scale and have no greater visual impact than other 1.5-storey houses in this part of Havenfield Road.
5. I therefore conclude there would be no conflict with Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) (WDLP) which seek to ensure address the existing positive characteristics of an area, achieve a high quality in the design of the area and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Neighbouring users

6. The Council refer to the proximity of roof structure to the boundary on the western side of No.1 and a sense of overbearing for users of No.1A from the additional height. The appellant states that there will be no wall closer to the shared boundary than 1.0m above ground floor level and this would accord with Householder Planning and Design Guide SPD (Design SPD). To achieve some certainty in this regard a condition to ensure spacing from the boundary on site would make the proposal acceptable in this regard.

¹ Subject to ensuring manoeuvring space is retained clear.

7. Importantly, although the proposal would increase the height of the existing dwelling at upper floor level near the boundary with No.1A that dwelling's east elevation incorporates the main entrance door but does not include principal windows to habitable rooms. These are found on its northern and western elevation where there is significant openness above boundary fencing whereas there are trees and planting to other boundaries, and around the appeal site. That the proposal would not unreasonably affect access to daylight is not disputed and my observations point to the relationship between the proposed development and its western neighbour being not inconsistent with other dwellings in the locality.
8. Overall, I consider that the relationship between the resultant dwelling and its existing neighbour would not be unacceptably changed so as to harmfully alter the setting of the smaller dwelling or unacceptably impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring users.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not conflict with Policy DM35 or Policy DM36 of the WDLP, or the Design SPD which supports those policies that together seek good design such that the character of an area is supported by development proposals and protects neighbour amenity. Consequently, for the reasons I have given and taking all matters raised into account the appeal succeeds subject to the usual timing and plans conditions together with conditions mentioned in my reasoning and to protect neighbour amenity and ensure the parking spaces proposed are useable.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR