



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3373094

20 Dupre Crescent, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire HP9 2RW

- 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 Litherland against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council South and East Area.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/1791/FA.
The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey front extension and alterations to the side elevation fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two-storey front extension and alterations to the side elevation fenestration at 20 Dupre Crescent, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire HP9 2RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/25/1791/FA, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: DC_PL001 A – site location plan, DC_PL_002A - block plan, DC_PL_003 A- Existing plans DC_PL_004A - existing elevations, DC_PL_005A- Proposed plans and DC_PL-006B -Proposed elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with the details set out on the planning application form and shown on the approved plans.

Preliminary Matter

2. The property lies within the Green Belt. The Council found that the proposed development would be a small-scale addition, in line with policy GB10 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999 (Local Plan). Having regard to the details before me and the scale and form of extension, it would not be a disproportionate addition, and in accordance with paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, my considerations focus on the concerns raised by the Council regarding the design of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No.20 is a detached house set back from the road with a flat-roof garage to the front. It is of the same design as other ex-service properties to the southern side of Dupre Crescent, which have a simple rectangular form with a pitched roof with gable ends. However, in Dupre Crescent and the wider area, new development is taking place. The refurbished properties opposite have gable projections to the front, and planning permission was granted in March 2020 for extensions and alterations to Nos. 12 to 24 (evens), which would have changed the external appearance of these properties.¹
5. The proposal would create a dual-pitched forward projection. It would include a flat roof segment between the two gables, though this is a small section and would not be a prominent feature. There would also be cohesion and alignment with the proposed canopy porch, and the existing property exhibits flat roof features. The addition would be wider than the projections on nearby properties, which have a single gable projection to one side, although this is primarily a matter of design aesthetic. Whilst the Council has referred to various design documents, these mainly set out principles, and I have not been referred to a design code or guidance which sets particular design requirements or architectural features for the properties in Wilton Park.
6. The two gables are proportionate with the angle of the roof pitch, and the addition would sit comfortably and centrally on the frontage, inset from the side elevations. As such, I do not find it poorly designed or incongruous, and, in my view, it responds to the evolving appearance of the area and would appropriately integrate with the existing dwelling.
7. As a result of the proposed development, the property would have a different appearance from its immediate neighbours; however, as accepted by the Council, the previous consistent form has changed, with extensions and different styles and features being introduced. Within this context of a varied character and appearance of the area, the resultant design would be compatible with the overall street scene.
8. In conclusion, the proposed extension would appropriately integrate with the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal accords with saved policies EP3 and H11 of the South Bucks District Local Plan and Policy CP8 of the South Bucks District Core Strategy. Together, these require that all new development be of a high standard of design, harmonise with the existing building, and be compatible with the character of the locality. It would also accord with the Framework in that regard.
9. C1 of the National Design Guide is cited in the reason for refusal, although I have not been referred to any specific conflict. This section relates to an understanding of the site and its context, and for the reasons set out, the proposed development would integrate with its surroundings. Similarly, there would be compliance with the overall objectives of the guidance in the Residential Design Guide SPD and the Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study.

Conditions and Conclusion

¹ Council reference PL/20/0110/FA

10. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary to impose conditions that require the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and material details for certainty.
11. For the reasons set out, I allow the appeal.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR