



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3356402

Braeside Cottage, Chapel Lane, Naphill, Buckinghamshire HP14 4RF

- 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 Martyn Sims against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06722/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “retrospective planning application for a single storey side extension incorporating changes to address planning concerns”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site address in the header above is taken from the appeal form. It is different to the address given on the application form but it more accurately describes the location of the site as it includes a street name.
3. On my visit I saw a single storey side extension to Braeside Cottage. I understand this addition has been the subject of a previous appeal decision reference number APP/K0425/C/21/3285857. The Inspector for this appeal refused planning permission for the extension as built and upheld an enforcement notice that requires it to be demolished. This appeal in effect seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of the extension, although the appeal plans indicate alterations that would change its external appearance. I have had regard to the existing extension but my assessment is based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area, including the effect on the Chilterns National Landscape (previously called Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and hereafter referred to as the NL).

Reasons

5. The appeal property is positioned on a private drive that runs off Chapel Lane. However, it also forms part of the street scene to Braeside, a residential cul-de-sac. The main part of the house is similar to other dwellings in Braeside in that it has 2 storeys with a pitched roof and is mainly constructed of brick. However, within Braeside there is a common feature of side gable walls being constructed mainly of flint with minor elements of brick detailing. These walls are a defining characteristic of the road and add architectural quality and visual interest to the

area. The flank wall of the appeal property is constructed in accordance with this common style and it is highly noticeable from Braeside. Also, from the cul de sac, Braeside Cottage is seen with a wooded area in the background.

6. The proposed extension would not be visible from Chapel Lane but it would be clearly seen from the highway and other nearby properties within Braeside. The extension would conceal the lower part of the flint wall and as a consequence, it would spoil the wall's attractiveness and the appeal property's contribution to the visual qualities and homogeneity of the cul de sac. It is proposed to insert a flint panel into the elevation of the addition that faces onto Braeside and to tint the brickwork elements so they would more closely reflect those on the main part of the house. However, the use of matching materials would not address nor justify the harmful effect of partly obscuring the attractive flint gable wall.
7. The extension as built is single storey and currently has a flat roof with deep metal fascia boards and a central roof lantern. The proposed removal of the incongruous fascia boards would be an improvement to the appearance of the extension. Also, it is proposed to add a dummy pitched roof on 3 sides of the addition so the lantern would be screened from view. However, despite these changes, the extension would still appear squat with a pronounced horizontal emphasis. This would be at odds with the strong vertical emphasis of the gable side wall. Furthermore, the dummy roof would stand out as an unusual addition to the host property and as a unsympathetic feature within the street scene.
8. Despite the concern set out in its refusal reason, there is little explanation as to why the Council considers the proposal would fail to respect the built heritage of the Chilterns. Also, the extension would not obstruct views of the wooded backdrop to the street as it would be fairly low and no taller than the existing garage on the appeal site. As such, the proposal would not undermine the influence of the wood on the scenic qualities of the area and it would further the statutory purpose of conserving the natural beauty of the NL. In these regards, I conclude the development would accord with policy DM30 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (the LP). However, acceptability in these regards fails to address the harm that would be caused by the lack of respect to the built context to the appeal site.
9. I am told Council officers have previously advised the appellant that a side extension to the property would be acceptable in principle. However, it does not follow that the appeal proposal would be appropriate in design terms. Instead, for the reasons as set out above, I conclude the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area. In these regards it would not accord with LP policies CP9, DM35 and DM36. Amongst other things, these seek high quality development that respects existing properties in the surrounding area.

Other Matters and Planning Balance

10. The proposed extension would help address the appellant's need for extra space to accommodate and care for family members. I fully sympathise with the appellant's position and I recognise the development would be personally beneficial. However, I attach only limited weight to these benefits as it would seem there is scope to provide additional ground floor accommodation elsewhere within the appeal site that would not have the same visual effects as the current

proposal. No evidence has been provided to suggest the appeal scheme is the only option for addressing the appellant's accommodation requirements. As such, the personal advantages of the scheme provide insufficient justification to grant planning permission contrary to the identified conflict with LP policies.

11. A decision to dismiss the appeal could impact on the appellant's enjoyment of their home and prevent members of the family from living together. This would represent interference with their human rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 as set out in the Human Rights Act 1998. However, these are qualified rights. In this case, interference would accord with the law and be in pursuance of a well-established and legitimate aim to ensure development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of an area. The protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering with their rights.
12. I also have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under the Equality Act 2010. The harm that would be caused by the development outweighs any benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with protected characteristics of age and disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR