



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2025

**by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 17 November 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3373005**

**Brambles, 29 Chalkshire Road, Butlers Cross, Buckinghamshire HP17 0TS**

- 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 Malcolm John Crouch against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/06010/FUL.
  - The development proposed is single storey extension to front of building and open ended car port structure.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey extension to front of building and open ended car port structure at Brambles, 29 Chalkshire Road, Butlers Cross, Buckinghamshire HP17 0TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/06010/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1.) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.
  - 2.) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: SHDS-29CR-PP-001, SHDS-29CR-PP-003, SHDS-29CR-PP-004, SHDS-29CR-PP-006.
  - 3.) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt including the effect on the openness of the Green Belt; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area including the scenic beauty of the Chilterns National Landscape.

### Reasons

#### *Whether inappropriate development*

3. The site comprises a detached property with a detached carport to the front. The proposal seeks to infill the gap between the dwelling and the carport with a single storey pitched roof extension and carport.

4. The site is located in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are openness and permanence. The Framework states that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances and that, other than for listed exceptions, the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate. One such exception is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy CP8 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019)(LP) is consistent with the Framework and states that the Council will protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.
5. The existing dwelling is a replacement dwelling<sup>1</sup>. LP policy DM43 states that permission will be granted for the extension or replacement of a dwelling where the volume of the original dwelling is between 240 and 720m<sup>3</sup> and the total volume of the resulting building is no more than the volume of the original building plus 50%. The LP clarifies that the original building is the building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if the first building was constructed later than this, the first building constructed. This is consistent with the definition in the Framework.
6. It is stated that the original dwelling had a volume of approximately 390m<sup>3</sup>. The main parties disagree on the volume of the existing dwelling. The Council estimate that the existing dwelling has a volume of 599.1m<sup>3</sup> and a detailed breakdown of this calculation is provided. The appellant estimates that the existing dwelling has a volume of 529.69m<sup>3</sup>, however no detailed calculations in support of how this figure has been arrived at have been provided. Based on the Council's detailed calculations it appears that the existing dwelling exceeds 50% of the volume of the original building. Thus, the additional 52 m<sup>3</sup> created by the appeal proposal would also be in exceedance of 50% of the volume of the original building. Given this, the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition which would, by definition, be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
7. Notwithstanding this, the extension would infill a gap between the dwelling and carport and would be lower in height than the existing carport. Due to the presence of boundary vegetation, there are limited views of the site of the proposed extension from the public right of way which runs along the northern site boundary or in street scene views from the north. Where glimpses of the site of the extension can be gained from neighbouring properties and in street scene views from the south, the extension would be seen against the backdrop of the 2-storey dwellings to the north approved under application reference 22/07562/FUL. In this context, the bulk and massing created by the extension would not have a limiting effect on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would infill a gap between 2 existing structures and would not result in the encroachment of built form into the open countryside. Given this, whilst the extension would exceed the limitations of LP policy DM43, no harm to the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it would arise as a result of the proposed infill extension.
8. In light of the above, whilst conflict arises with LP policies CP8 and DM43, in these particular circumstances no harm would arise as a result of this conflict.

---

<sup>1</sup> approved under application reference 15/07145/FUL

### *Character and appearance*

9. The site comprises a large, detached dwelling located on the west side of Chalkshire Road in Butlers Cross in the Chilterns National Landscape (NL). There is limited evidence before me in relation to the landscape characteristics and qualities of the NL. I observed on my site visit that Butlers Cross comprises a linear village with development fronting Chalkshire Road. Deep grass verges, planting within front gardens and the relationship with the surrounding rural land result in a pleasant, verdant character and appearance to the area. The properties on the west side of Chalkshire Road comprise large, detached dwellings which are set back from the road within spacious plots. With the exception of the appeal site, dwellings within this part of Chalkshire Road do not appear to contain built form projecting forward of the front elevation.
10. The statutory purposes of National Landscapes are to preserve and enhance their natural beauty. The Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023 amends the duty on relevant authorities in respect of their functions to now “seek to further” the statutory purposes of protected landscapes. Meanwhile, the Framework sets out that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing their landscape and scenic beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
11. The proposed extension would be sited to the front of the dwelling. The Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD) states that particular care should be taken to ensure that front extensions do not detract from the appearance of the dwelling or the general character of the street and should respect the position of other dwellings in the street, particularly where there is a distinct pattern.
12. By virtue of its forward siting the extension would be at odds with the pattern and layout of dwellings in the area. Nonetheless, the car port is existing, and the built form would not project forward of this existing structure. The visual impact of the single storey built form which would link the host dwelling and the carport would be limited by virtue of its scale. The extension would be ancillary to the existing dwelling, would not dominate the building, and its form and palette of materials would relate well to the modern form and appearance of the host dwelling.
13. Given the existing boundary vegetation, there would be limited street scene views of the extension from the north, from the public right of way or from the surrounding grazing land. In street scene views from the south and from neighbouring properties the proposed extension would be seen in the context of the existing structures and against the backdrop of 2-storey built form to the north of the site<sup>2</sup>. Given this, no harm would arise from the loss of the existing gap between the buildings and there would be limited overall change to the appearance of the site in views from the surrounding area. Give this, the contribution the site makes to the character and appearance of the area would not be compromised.
14. I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area including the special qualities and the scenic beauty of the NL. I therefore find no conflict with LP policies DM35 and DM36 which require that development create positive and attractive buildings and

---

<sup>2</sup> approved under application reference 22/07562/FUL

spaces which respect the character and appearance of the existing property. I also find no conflict with the SPD, the aims of which are set out above.

### **Other matters**

15. I have found that the individual characteristics of this site and proposal would enable the development to be accommodated without harm. However, I see no reason to suppose that my decision in this case would set a precedent. Differing circumstances would represent matters to be considered were other similar proposals to be advanced elsewhere in the future.
16. The appeal site is located on the opposite side of the road to Dunrobin House, a grade II listed building of early 19<sup>th</sup> century origins. Statute requires that I pay special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting<sup>3</sup>. The highway spatially separates the site from the listed building and there is no indication that the site has any form of historic significance in association with Dunrobin House. Consequently, the proposed development would preserve the setting of this listed building.

### **Conditions**

17. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, on which the appellant has had the opportunity to comment. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard 3 year time limit condition for implementation. In addition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interest of certainty. In the interest of the character and appearance of the appeal property, a condition is necessary to control the external materials of the development.
18. There is no evidence that the highway conditions warrant the inclusion of suggested conditions relating to construction deliveries and the parking of construction vehicles in the interests of highway safety, or that they are necessary to safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties.
19. There is no evidence that a condition requiring that the construction of the development not commence until the dwellings to the north of the site have been completed is necessary in order to render the development acceptable. This condition would therefore fail to meet the tests set down in the Planning Practice Guidance.

### **Conclusion**

20. For the above reasons, whilst conflict arises with the development plan in relation to the volume of development in the Green Belt, I have identified that that conflict brings no harm. I am satisfied that there are material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in strict accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*N Robinson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990