



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3369335

Mulberry House, Meadle Village Road, Meadle, Buckinghamshire, HP17 9UD.

- 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 and Mrs Carter against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/05750/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single-storey side extensions, conversion of existing integral garage, erection of front porch extension, fenestration and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single-storey side extensions, conversion of existing integral garage, erection of front porch extension, fenestration and external alterations at Mulberry House, Meadle Village Road, Meadle, Buckinghamshire, HP17 9UD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/05750/FUL, and subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule appended to this Decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description above is taken from the decision notice as most aptly defining the appeal proposals.
3. The inspection was set down as an unaccompanied site visit but in practice I undertook an access-required visit by courtesy of Mrs Carter, co-Appellant, in order to obtain an adequate view of the rear of the property.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the appeal property itself, the surrounding Meadle Conservation Area (CA) and the settings of several nearby Listed Buildings within it.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Mulberry House is situated well within the Meadle CA and is, in effect, surrounded by mature Listed Buildings of traditional character. Mulberry House, itself unlisted, is relatively modern but is still of conventional, two-storey design, with pale brick walls under steeply pitched, slate roofs. The house comprises two main elements: a double-fronted living area with a bedroom in the roof space, lit by roof lights, and

- a front porch; and a large extension on the north side, set back from the front elevation but with a gable projecting to the rear and also accommodating first floor and loft bedrooms above an integral ground floor garage.
6. The various proposed extensions and alterations would bring about a substantial internal reconfiguration of the house, including the conversion of the integral garage into living accommodation and a further single-storey, mono-pitch side extension on the north side, providing a gym and boot room. There would also be a smaller side extension on the south side to enlarge the living room and an open-fronted, gable-roofed extension to the front porch. There would be significant modifications to the fenestration, including three larger roof lights and more extensive glazing to the rear elevation. Finally, the whole house would be finished in white-painted render over external wall insulation and there would be a new five-bar front gate.
 7. The Council accepts that the proposed single-storey extensions would be duly subservient to the host dwelling and considers that the white-painted render to the walls of the entire extended building would bring about a suitably cohesive visual appearance. The Council also notes that the house and the extensions in particular would be largely screened from public view by boundary features, and that the new gate would be acceptable. I agree entirely with that assessment.
 8. The main concern of the Council, that led to the refusal of the application, relates to the proposed white render to replace the present brickwork. There is also some concern regarding the proposed increase in the number and size of the roof lights.
 9. It is true that the white-rendered finish would result in a relatively stark appearance compared with the present, more subdued, traditional brick elevations of Mulberry House itself, and the darker red brickwork that predominates within the Meadle CA as a whole. In the context of the requisite preservation of the CA and the settings of the nearby Listed Buildings, it is important to consider whether the altered finish and appearance of Mulberry House and the enlarged rooflights would result in any planning harm.
 10. Whilst red brickwork predominates, the CA nevertheless exhibits a considerable variation in the age, style and finishing materials of the dwellings. A significant number have pale-coloured, painted brickwork or a combination of dark timber framing and render. The front elevation of the Listed Quakers Farm Farmhouse, just north west of Mulberry House, appears to have a light-coloured, rough-cast render finish.
 11. Moreover, the residential properties that make up the CA are invariably well separated and screened from each other, such that, from public view, they tend to be appreciated individually. The only exception in the vicinity of the appeal site is the long brick wall of Meadle Farm Cottage which directly fronts the Village Road.
 12. Thus, whilst Mulberry House is plainly within the settings of the Listed Old Thatch, to the south west, and Meadle Cottage, opposite to the east, as well as that of Quakers Farm, its direct visual relationship with those properties is limited. Even though Mulberry House would become almost unique in the area with its extensive, smooth, white-painted render walls, as distinct from coloured brickwork or rough-cast render, I do not share the view of the Council that this would be in any way harmful to the setting of any Listed Building or to the character or appearance of the Meadle CA as a whole.

13. Neither, in my view, for similar reasons, would the additional, larger rooflights to the rear and side roof slopes of Mulberry House be harmful, particularly given that they would be comparatively unobtrusive and that Mulberry House is relatively modern.

Other Matters and Conditions

14. I have considered every other aspect of the appeal raised in the written evidence but found nothing further of concern to affect my decision, save only that the Council advocates, but does not detail, a condition requiring either a bird or bat box or bug hotel to obviate a slight impact on biodiversity due to a reduction in garden area. I agree that this is appropriate.
15. Otherwise, in addition to standard conditions, in order to ensure that the character and appearance of the site, the settings of Listed Buildings and the Meadle CA, as a whole, are all safeguarded, it is necessary to impose requirements for the advance approval of finishing materials. Also required are an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan for a protected Judas Tree at the front of the site, albeit that tree would not be directly affected by the building works.

Conclusion

16. Subject to those conditions, I conclude that the proposed development would comply with the relevant Policies CP9, DM31 and DM35-6 the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan which, consistent with national policy, seek to protect the historic environment and maintain sense of place within the District, including by way of high-quality design for house extensions.
17. This appeal should accordingly be allowed, subject to the conditions outlined above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR

APPENDIX
SCHEDULE OF PLANNING CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in accordance with following approved drawings:

Drawings Nos W2042 01-04, dated August 2022, and

Drawings Nos W2042 40A, 41A, 42, 43A, 44A and 45, dated March 2025.
- 3) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall commence until a schedule of finishing materials to the built development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be implemented only in accordance with the schedule of materials approved.
- 4) No development shall commence until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be implemented only in accordance with the AMS and TPP approved.
- 5) Prior to the extensions hereby approved being completed and occupied details of a bird or bat box or bug hotel or a combination thereof shall be installed and located at the property and thereafter retained in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.