



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3359299

6 Coningsby Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP13 5NX

- 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 Waseem Akram against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06702/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part double storey rear extension, a first floor side extension, and a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - The living conditions of adjacent occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook from, and the availability of natural light to, 4 Coningsby Road ('No 4').

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Wycombe Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020 ('SPD') sets out, as a guide, general principles to ensure good design. It states, amongst other things, that works should not dominate or detract from the original building or the character of the area, and that extensions should be subservient in scale, mass and bulk to the original dwelling.
4. Numbers 2 to 6 form a small group of detached houses on the eastern side of Coningsby Road close to its junction with Hamilton Road. Notwithstanding various alterations and modestly sized extensions, they form a fairly cohesive group with similar proportions and in a similar style. Elsewhere along Coningsby Road the character is more diverse, and includes flats at Tom Evans Court and Coningsby Court, along with bungalows and two storey detached and semi-detached houses.
5. The host already benefits from a two storey side extension. As a result of this scheme, the form of that part of the property would be altered, but it would remain articulated and set well down from the original building's roof. However, the scheme would also include a large two storey rear extension, which would span the

width of the dwelling, including its previous side extension. It would also extend well beyond the original building's rear face; its flanks, which would be close to the plot's boundaries, would not be set in from its side walls; and it would be similar in height to the original building. Thus, having regard to cumulative impacts, the extensions would not be subordinate additions and they would overwhelm the original building.

6. The crown roof would not be particularly noticeable from public viewpoints, but the scheme's disproportionately long side wall would be partially visible in the Coningsby Road streetscene above No 4's single storey side extension. Moreover, the rear extension would be clearly visible from Hamilton Road, where its bulk, mass and rearward projection would jar with the other properties in this small cohesive group.
7. For the above reasons, notwithstanding the large plot size and the presence of some landscape screening, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby conflict with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) ('WDLP'). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require high quality design which improves or respects the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area, and state that extensions shall be subservient in scale.
8. It would also fail to accord with the advice in the SPD, and with the stance at section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') regarding the need for good design which is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment, taking into account supplementary planning documents.

Living conditions

9. I observed that No 4 has a patio area to the rear, and that the house, patio and garden are at a significantly lower level compared to the host. Having regard to that difference in levels, and given that the scheme's long two storey side wall would be close to the plot boundary and that it would project well beyond the rear face of No 4, it would have an overbearing impact on those occupiers. As No 4's principal habitable room windows are set well in from the boundary, that harmful impact would be most keenly felt on its patio.
10. As illustrated by drawing DRG.03 the proposed ground floor extension would intercept a 45 degree line drawn from the centre of No 4's nearest ground floor principal window. However, that interception would be very marginal and there would be no breach of any 45 degree lines drawn its first floor rear habitable room windows. Consequently, the occupants of No 4 would not suffer from a significant loss of natural light and, having regard to the sun's trajectory, they would experience very little, if any, overshadowing.
11. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, the scheme would have a harmfully overbearing impact on the living conditions at No 4. It would therefore conflict with those parts of WDLP Policies DM35 and DM36 which state that development should prevent significant adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring land and property; along with the advice at part 15 of the SPD that an extension should not excessively enclose the outlook from a neighbouring property having regard to matters including its scale, mass, protrusion, distance from the boundary, and levels.

Other matters

12. The appellant states that extensions comparable to those proposed, along with outbuildings, could be constructed under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ('GPDO'). However, I have no details or plans to enable me to assess whether or not it may be possible to lawfully construct a scheme under the GPDO that could have similar effects to the proposal before me, as claimed. Thus, whilst such a fallback is a material consideration, I have ascribed only very limited weight to it in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and it would harmfully impact the living conditions at 4 Coningsby Road. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR