
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3356482

31 Gerald's Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP13 6BN

- 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 Amrinder Singh against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
 - The application Ref is 24/06645/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a part single part double storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the proposal would be served by suitable parking provision having regard to highway safety and convenience for road users in the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. In the vicinity of the appeal site, Gerald's Road is primarily characterised by semi-detached pairs with similar symmetrical designs. These designs typically include balanced hipped roof forms with a central chimney, mirrored fenestration patterns and front elevations of similar widths. Some properties have undergone works that have differentiated them from their respective attached neighbour. On the whole, however, alterations are more often modest and extensions that are visible from the street are generally either well set back from the front or have a single storey scale. In such cases, this limits any unbalancing effect between corresponding semi-detached pairs.
5. The appeal dwelling at 31 Gerald's Road (No 31) forms a semi-detached pair with 33 Gerald's Road (No 33). At the time of my site visit, No 31 was undergoing works to complete a hip-to-gable roof conversion with a rear dormer and ground floor rear

extension, which are understood to be permitted development. No 33 has a two-storey side and rear extension that is significantly set back from its front and a front porch extension. Despite these works, the semi-detached pair still retain an overall balanced design within the street scene owing to the similar widths of their front elevations, comparable external materials and balanced fenestration, including corresponding bay window features.

6. Due to their proximity to the front elevation of the host dwelling, the proposed single storey front and two-storey side extensions would be prominent additions when viewed from the street. They would not be comparable to the more discreet side extension at No 33 which is significantly set back from its front elevation. When seen alongside the existing hip-to-gable roof conversion, the original design of the host would no longer be readily appreciable, and this would significantly detract from the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. It would also appear discordant within the wider street scene of similarly designed properties. Although the proposed porch somewhat replicates the porch at No 33, this would not be sufficient to integrate the overall proposals into their surroundings.
7. In addition, the hipped roof on the first-floor rear extension, the stepped down gable end of the proposed side extension, and the flat roof of the permitted rear dormer, would result in a mismatch of roof forms that lack a cohesive design. Consequently, when viewed alongside the existing permitted extensions, the proposal would overwhelm the original rear elevation of its host and this would also further reduce the host dwelling's visual connection with No 33.
8. While some aspects of the design would accord with the detailed guidance set out in the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020, there would be overall conflict with its general principle that works should not dominate or detract from the original building or character of the area.
9. I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) (LP) specifically Policy CP9 (Sense of Place), Policy DM35 (Placemaking and Design Quality) and Policy DM36 (Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) which require development to demonstrate attractive and high quality design, and to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Parking provision

10. Like many surrounding properties, the appeal site has an existing vehicular access and large frontage for parking. Gerald's Road is a quiet residential highway, and I observed plenty of available spaces where a vehicle could park safely on the street. I acknowledge that my observations represent just a snapshot in time but, with no detailed evidence to the contrary, and given that a large proportion of residents are able to park on their own driveways, it is likely that there is not a high pressure for on-street parking spaces in this area.
11. Although part of the appeal property's frontage was covered with rubble and construction materials at the time of my visit, I noted that at least one parking space that meets the dimensions set out in the Buckinghamshire County Wide Parking Guidance 2015 (BCPG) could be provided there. I also observed that nearby

houses with comparable frontage areas to the appeal property were able to comfortably park two vehicles on-site.

12. It is not clear that the parking standards guidance in the BCPG applies in this case given that the proposal would not increase the number of habitable rooms beyond extensions that are already under construction using permitted development rights.
13. In any case, given my observations on the parking situation in the area, it is likely that any additional demand for parking arising from the development could be safely accommodated on street and would not give rise to inconvenience or increased risk to the safety of highway users. There is no objective evidence before me to suggest that not meeting the parking guidance would be materially harmful in this instance.
14. I conclude that the proposal would be served by suitable parking provision having regard to highway safety and convenience for road users in the area. It would therefore accord with Policy DM33 (Managing Carbon Emissions: Transport and Energy Generation) of the LP which requires development to provide for parking sufficient to meet the needs of future occupants and to ensure there is no significant adverse impact from overspill parking.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. I have not identified specific harm arising from parking provision. However, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan in that particular regard. For that reason and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR