



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3369972

8A The Poynings, Iver, Buckinghamshire, SL0 9DT

- 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 Ms Nicola Taylor against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/1139/FA.
 - The development proposed is for an outbuilding for home gym, office, shower room and recreational area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, which is a Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) and the surrounding area which is within The Ridings Area of Special Character (RASC). The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling with regard to daylight and sunlight.

Preliminary matter

3. In their appeal documents the appellant has included an image of a similar sized outbuilding with black painted timber detailing and traditionally designed fenestration. Not only is the purpose of this image not stated, from the evidence submitted it does not appear to have been formally considered by the council. Accordingly, I am unable to take it into consideration in relation to this appeal.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The South Bucks Townscape Character Study 2017 (SBTCS), outlines how the area, which is known as Richings Park, (RP) was originally developed in the 1920's and 1930's. The appeal site is within the Green Suburban Road Character Area of the Park. This area is characterised by its verdant and spacious plots and surroundings, broadly consistent building lines and gaps between buildings; and homogenous architecture and materials.
5. The appeal site is also within the RASC, which is a small residential area on the edge of RP, which borders woodland and an open field. Whilst the individual

dwelling within this area are not identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets on the Buckinghamshire Local Heritage List extract submitted by the appellant, the whole of the RASC is identified as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset in policy IV4 of the Iver Neighbourhood Plan (INP).

6. The dwellings within the RASC were built by a different developer to those within the original village estate and form a distinct and cohesive group within the village. The Ridings is made up of detached and semi-detached houses formally laid out around a modest sized cul-de-sac with no pavements. There are good sized gaps between the dwellings, which are set back from the road behind typically mature landscaped plots.
7. There is a consistency in the design and palette of materials used within the dwellings, which includes deep hipped and half hipped thatched or plain tiled roofs and a mixture of plain and more detailed front elevations from a mix of white render, red brick, and Tudor style black painted timber finishes. The dwellings within the RASC which front onto The Poynings are similar, although the sense of unity in the buildings is not as strong and there is less sense of enclosure and unity within the street scene. This is partially due to the alteration and extension of some of the dwellings in The Poynings which have blended in with the host dwellings and the street scene with varying degrees of success. Rather than set a precedent these alterations and extensions reinforce the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits,
8. As stated in the SBTCS the RASC is identified for its high quality townscape. It is vulnerable to change due to its distinctiveness, historic background, and largely consistent architectural approach. From my appeal site visit I find that these qualities, along with its spacious plots, abundance of soft landscaping and rural setting contribute to the character and appearance of the RASC and the significance of this NDHA as a locally important heritage asset.
9. The appeal site occupies a prominent position adjacent to the junction of The Ridings and The Poynings. The appeal dwelling comprises a chalet style dwelling with two road frontages, although the main frontage faces The Ridings. Consistent with other dwellings in The Ridings the host dwelling has white rendered walls with ornate black painted timber detailing under a deep half hipped/catslide plain tiled roof. The host dwelling, together with the dwelling opposite at 10A The Poynings, frame the entrance to The Ridings and their long rear gardens which abut the highway create a formal avenue leading to the cluster of dwellings around the head of the cul-de-sac. Currently there are tall fences along parts of these frontages which are utilitarian in character and appearance and have an urbanising impact on the street scene.
10. Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement should be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
11. Consistent with this, INP Policy IV4, states that proposals should demonstrate that they have paid full regard to the qualities that contribute to the significance of the ASC. Policy CP8 of the South Bucks Core Strategy 2011

- (CS), seeks to protect and where appropriate enhance the historic environment.
12. Together and amongst other things policies EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan consolidated in 2007 & 2011 (LP), INP Policy IV4, CS Policy CP8 and the South Bucks District Council Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), seek to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design and makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. New development should be compatible with the character and appearance of sites and their surroundings. The retention and space between buildings should respect the scale of space within the locality and proposals should not adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of existing residential development. Within RP proposals should have regard to the ordered layout and building lines of the area along with the contribution made by low walls and planting.
 13. Paragraph 135 of the Framework has similar objectives, whilst also seeking to optimise the potential of a site. Paragraph 139 of the Framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design guidance on design.
 14. Together Policies H12 & H13 of the LP state that residential annexes should be in the form of an extension to the existing dwelling and should not be designed to be capable of conversion to a separate dwelling. Ancillary outbuildings should be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling and should not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area due to overdominance or obtrusiveness.
 15. The proposed outbuilding, which has been largely constructed is utilitarian in character and appearance. It comprises a plain white rendered 13 metre long oblong building with a grey/black coloured flat roof. The building is located forward and to one side of the host dwelling and its long flank wall abuts and projects above the boundary fence with The Ridings. The proposed outbuilding obscures views of the front and side elevations of the host dwelling from the south along The Ridings. It also has an enclosing and urbanising impact and dominates this part of the street scene. Its impact is exacerbated by the tall boundary fence.
 16. As a result of these factors the proposed outbuilding causes considerable harm to the character and appearance of the setting to the host dwelling, the street scene and the RASC/NDHA. Whilst the harm to the significance of the NDHA would be less than substantial it would nonetheless weaken and undermine the significance of this locally important NDHA.
 17. The appellant has indicated that they would be willing to remove one of the existing outbuildings on the site, to increase the amount of garden area. However, this would not address the concerns raised to the siting and appearance of the proposed outbuilding and its impact on the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the RASC/NDHA. Due to the extent of the harm that the proposed building results in, it is not a matter that could be satisfactorily addressed by the imposition of conditions.
 18. Finally, the stated use of the proposed outbuilding is for a home gym, office, shower room and recreational area. It also relates physically very closely to the host dwelling. Although it could be fitted out and used for an independent

unit of residential accommodation, this would have the potential to unacceptably affect the living conditions of the occupiers of both the host dwelling and the converted outbuilding. This is due to their cramped relationship and potential noise, disturbance, and loss of privacy. I am satisfied that this could be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of a condition which prevents the occupation of the proposed outbuilding for an independent unit of accommodation. Whilst this would be contrary to the wording of LP Policy H12, it would comply with the objectives of that policy.

19. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal causes considerable and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the RASC/NDHA and would materially detract from the significance of the NDHA. Accordingly, it would conflict with LP Policies EP3 & H13, CP Policy CP8, INP Policy IV4 and paragraph 135 of the Framework.

Living conditions

20. Due to the height, length and proximity of the proposed outbuilding to the host dwelling, the proposed outbuilding would have the potential to reduce daylight and sunlight within the adjacent living room. However, the impact would be limited as the adjacent rear facing living room would continue to have a favourable southern and western aspects and would receive a good level of daylight and sunlight throughout the year.
21. For this reason, I conclude that the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling due to loss of daylight or sunlight. Accordingly, the proposal accords with LP Policy EP5 and the SPD.

Other matter and Conclusion

22. I have found that the proposed outbuilding causes considerable and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the RASC/NDHA. It would also materially detract from the significance of the NDHA, in conflict with LP Policies EP3 & H13, CP Policy CP8, INP Policy IV4 and paragraph 135 of the Framework. I attach substantial weight to this finding against the appeal.
23. My finding that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling do not count for or against the appeal. It is a positive consideration that the proposed outbuilding would help in providing additional accommodation to address the over-crowding in their home and to meet the care needs of a family member. I give only moderate weight to this for several reasons.
24. Very limited evidence has been submitted regarding the existing level of accommodation both in the host dwelling and the established outbuildings in the rear garden. Little evidence has been submitted regarding the need for a gym, recreational area and home office and any specific accommodation needs of the family. Also, the concerns relating to the proposed outbuilding relate to its siting, coupled with its size and design rather than the principle of having additional accommodation. It has not been demonstrated that this is the only way that any additional accommodation could be provided on the site.
25. For these reasons I am satisfied that the harm that would be caused by the development outweighs the other considerations. In reaching this decision I

have had regard to Article 8 of The Human Rights Act 1998, Article 19 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under s149 of the Equality Act 2010. However, the harm that has been caused by the proposed outbuilding outweighs its benefits in terms of the requirements set out in this legislation. This includes the right of respect for family life; eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age and/or disability; advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.

26. Taking this into account I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR