



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4th March 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 8th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/23/3334329

24 Burroughs Crescent, Bourne End, Buckinghamshire SL8 5NR

- 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 Edgington against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref.23/07447/FUL, dated 2 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a "single storey front extension (amendment to previously approved scheme)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated on the north western side of Burroughs Crescent which is a residential road within the developed area of Bourne End. The Crescent comprises detached houses of a uniform size and appearance. They sit close together. Some of the properties have had some form of front extension. The rear gardens of properties in Chalklands face the appeal site and its neighbours on the opposite side of the Crescent. No.26 is situated to the south west of no.24 and is the last house before the Crescent bends north westwards.
4. The properties are link attached with their single storey garages linking the row, underlining their uniformity.
5. Planning permission dated 2 October 2023 (app ref 23/06881/FUL) for a single storey front extension with enlargement of the driveway was granted at the appeal site. This scheme consisted of a 1.8m deep single storey front extension the full width of the front elevation. This is the fallback development.

6. The appeal scheme before me is for a 2.4m deep single storey front extension which would have a mono pitched roof with two rooflights and two front-facing windows. It would match the width of the main elevation of the dwelling. Two on-site front vehicle parking spaces would be available.
7. Whilst the increase in depth from the fallback development would be about 600mm, at a depth of 2.4m the resulting extension would unduly harm the rhythm and general uniformity of the dwellings. The protuberance would appear discordant with the other dwellings and be overly prominent. The front extensions at nos 12 and 16 at a depth of about 1.8m (but different in width and design) can be seen to be appropriate without unduly drawing attention to themselves. The fallback development would, in my view, also harmonise with its neighbours. The appeal scheme, however, would be unduly bulky and would, partly by its location on the front elevation, harm the character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene. It would be contrary to policies CP9 and DM35 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (adopted 2019) and the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2020).

. Conclusion

9. I have borne in mind that the appeal scheme would facilitate the creation of a larger kitchen and a larger hallway and a combined utility room and WC than the fallback development. However, that factor does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

INSPECTOR