



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/23/3330877

1 Kew Grove, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1QJ

- 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 A Miah against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 23/06519/FUL, dated 12 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'part single, part double-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and front porch'.
-

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 property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey, hipped-roofed house with an attached flat-roofed garage. It is set back from the road on a spacious plot. Its open layout, where the whole of its front face is visible in the streetscene, is fairly typical of Kew Grove. Its proportions, style, form and facing materials are also similar to most of the other houses here, along with some of those on nearby Bellwood Rise. Whilst 2 Kew Grove ('No 2') opposite this site has a long extension to one side, it is not representative of the road as a whole.
4. The form, style, materials, detailing and fenestration of the proposed side extensions would reflect the appearance of the existing house, their hipped roofs would be set down below its ridge, and they would achieve a symmetrical appearance.
5. However, their combined two storey width would be not much less than the existing house and, in terms of their scale, they would not appear fully subordinate to it. Moreover, the resultant building would have a very squat, elongated shape. Its scale and horizontal proportions would therefore be at odds with the scale and more vertical emphasis, and locally distinctive and cohesive appearance, of most of the houses in the road. It would stand out as a dominant and discordant element in the streetscene.

6. According to the Council, the extension at No 2 was permitted prior to the adoption of the Daws Hill Neighbourhood Plan in 2019 ('DHNP'). In any event, that extension to one side of that property does not justify the harm that would be caused as a result of the two side extensions proposed here. Houses in the wider area, such as on Merlewood Close, are in different streetscenes.
7. In reaching my findings I have had regard to this site's planning history, including a dismissed appeal in 2022 (Ref: APP/K0425/D/22/3304585). Compared to that scheme, the central glazed element has been removed and, as illustrated by drawing no. 03, the span of the proposed side wings would be shorter. However, whilst this proposal would therefore have a reduced mass, for the reasons above it would still harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. Policy 6 of the DHNP sets out that proposals must seek to preserve and enhance the special character of the Daws Hill Neighbourhood Plan area having regard to matters such as massing. The scheme would conflict with that approach.
9. It would also conflict with those parts of Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 Policies DM35 and DM36 which require development to improve the character of an area and, in the case of extensions, to ensure that they respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and are subservient to it in scale.
10. Although the proposed extensions to each side of the host would achieve a balanced appearance, given that cumulatively they would be disproportionately wide and insufficiently subservient, the scheme would also fail to accord with the advice at paragraphs 6.2, 9.1 and 9.4 of the Wycombe Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020.
11. Summing up, the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Whilst it would provide additional living space, the scheme's private benefits would not outweigh the harm that it would cause, and it would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having regard to paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), and all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR