



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3344300

Lyndale, Limmer Lane, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP12 4QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Aimee Lomas and Peter Critchley against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/08049/FUL
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension to provide open plan ground floor living/dining space and accessible kitchen area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey rear extension to provide open plan ground floor living/dining space and accessible kitchen area at Lyndale, Limmer Lane, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP12 4QR, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/08049/FUL 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: 01, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07 and 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.
 - 4) The roof area of the development hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony, sitting-out or amenity area.
 - 5) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted two ecological features comprising either bird boxes, bat boxes, bug hotels, or a combination of the two thereof, shall be attached to the house or trees or within the site, in positions suitable for their intended purpose, and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the development.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Lyndale is a two storey detached house in an established residential area characterised mainly by two storey detached houses of varying design and scale. It has been extended in the past, as have others in the area. It occupies a long and relatively narrow plot with high side boundary fences.
4. The relevant policies in this case are CP9, DM34, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (the local plan) which, among other things, require development, including residential extensions, to be of a high quality of design and to respect the character and appearance of the surroundings and to protect and enhance biodiversity. The Council's SPD *Householder Planning and Design Guidance* 2020 provides detailed advice on residential extensions.
5. The proposal would continue the existing single storey side extension into the rear garden, infill the stepped rear elevation and extend further into the rear garden across the full width of the existing house. Although the resultant extension would be fairly substantial in size, it would be subservient to the main house insofar as it would be a single storey and the flat roof would reduce its potential bulk. The proposed construction is of brick, which would be in keeping with the existing brickwork of the house itself and the wider area, with full height glazed doors onto the rear garden. The overall plot size, including the rear garden is ample to accommodate the extension.
6. I consider that the proposal would not appear excessively large or bulky in the context of the existing house itself or the substantial, extended houses in the immediate surroundings. It would not be visible from the street and would only be partially visible from neighbouring properties.
7. The proposal would result in the loss of a small area of grass in the rear garden and consequent impact on biodiversity. The provision of ecological features would mitigate this impact in accordance with policy DM34.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing house or the wider area and that it is consistent with local plan policies CP9, DM34, DM35 and DM36.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework and have amended some of the wording for clarification. Condition 2 detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition requiring the materials to match the existing is necessary and is adequate to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development as condition 2 itemises the plans submitted with the application.
11. The condition referring to the use of the flat roof as a balcony is necessary and reasonable in order to preserve the privacy and amenities of adjoining properties. The condition requiring ecological features is necessary to ensure a proportionate net increase in biodiversity.

PAG Metcalfe INSPECTOR