



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

**by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3348719**

**11 Maxwell Drive, Hazlemere, Bucks HP15 7BX**

- 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 Mr Myles Edelsten against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council (Wycombe Area).
  - The application Ref is 24/05907/FUL
  - The development proposed is garage conversion – room above in roof; front ground floor extension; front first floor extension, open front porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. At the appeal stage, the appellant has offered to make changes to the scheme, but I am required to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans before me and as determined by the Council.
3. The appellant has also referred to an earlier permission granted by the Council in 2019 under its Ref. 19/07315/FUL but my understanding is that permission would have now expired. Furthermore, my decision is necessarily based on the planning merits of the scheme before me.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the local area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling on the south-east side of Maxwell Drive with a side return to Hazlemere View. It has an attached double garage with a flat roof on the Hazlemere View side and a projecting single storey element, also under a flat roof, adjoining the neighbouring property. The land in Maxwell Drive slopes down from north-east to south-west and as a result the appeal property is particularly prominent in the street scene both because of its position at the 'top' of the hill as well as its corner location. Whilst a number of the properties have been extended and altered, the asymmetrical front gables which appear to step down the hill are a predominant and distinctive feature in the street scene.

6. The proposals would include a first-floor extension above the attached garage with a gable end to Hazlemere View and incorporating a front dormer in the cat slide roof. This roof would extend over a first-floor front extension and include an open porch. The existing projecting single storey element would have the addition of a first-floor extension under a pitched roof and gable front.
7. The proposed extensions would introduce a number of different roof forms and roof slopes that would result in a discordant design solution. The addition of first-floor extension under a pitched roof over the single storey projecting element would not relate well in terms of its scale and proportions with the existing property; its two storey height under a pitched roof, given the relatively narrow width in relation to the height, would appear contrived and out of place with the more generous proportions of the gable fronts and roof slopes of the existing and neighbouring properties.
8. The introduction of the cat slide roof at the front would be at odds with the design of the existing property with its dominance of front gables and asymmetric roof forms. The large front dormer would also be a discordant feature which would appear out of character with the form of the existing property and the street scene.
9. The combined effect of all the different elements would be to create a convoluted appearance to the appeal property which would be discordant with and detract from the more regular forms of the surrounding properties, where the asymmetric front gables are a dominant and distinctive feature. In this proposal, the dominance of the front gable with its asymmetric roof form would be significantly reduced by both the first storey extensions.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (adopted 2019) and the Householder Planning and Design Guide SPD (adopted 2020) as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

### **Other Considerations**

11. I have noted the family related reasons for seeking to extend the property as well as the objective to remove the flat roof elements because of water penetration. However, there is no information before me to suggest that these objectives could not be met with an extension more in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area.

### **Conclusion**

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*L J Evans*

INSPECTOR