



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/C/24/3344869

Land at 21 Priory Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP13 6SL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) as amended.
- The appeal is made by Mr Mehrban Saddique against an enforcement notice issued by Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
- The notice was issued on 12 April 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *without planning permission the rendering of the front and side elevation*.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 1. *Remove the render on the front elevation (as shown on photo 1)*
 2. *Remove the render on the side elevation (as shown on photo 2)*
 3. *Make good the elevations so they appear the same to that which existed prior to the unauthorised development (as shown on photos 3 and 4)*
 4. *Remove all materials and debris resulting from complying with steps 1 to 4 of this Notice from the Land.*
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: *Within four months of this Notice taking effect.*
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Formal Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under s177(5) of the 1990 Act, as amended.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has raised concerns regarding a lack of correspondence and notifications from the Council in respect to the alleged breach of planning control and subsequent enforcement action. Moreover, that they were denied an opportunity to work proactively with the Council as Local Planning Authority prior to any enforcement action being undertaken. Whilst I understand and acknowledge these concerns, these are matters which have no impact on the planning merits of this appeal.

Appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

3. A ground (a) appeal is that planning permission should be granted for the matters alleged in the enforcement notice, in whole or in part. Consequently, the deemed planning application is for the application of white render to the front and side elevations of 21 Priory Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP13 6SL.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development as built on the character and appearance of the Priory Avenue conservation area (PACA).

Reasons

Character and appearance and impact on the PACA

5. I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the PACA.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.
7. The PACA is a Victorian suburb to the north of the High Wycombe town centre, developed during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The area was occupied by the middle classes during the expansion of the town following the completion of the railway link to London. The area is mostly characterised by Victorian and Edwardian housing. Whilst the area is predominantly residential, the PACA also contains a school, museum and cemetery.
8. The special interest and significance that justifies the designation of the PACA as a heritage asset comes from some of the following features: the grade II listed Castle Hill House with fine flint work; the historic 19th century street pattern and overall unity of the architecture in Priory Road and Priory Avenue mainly in brick with slate roofs; Hamilton County Combined School also in red brick and slate; wide roads and avenues of trees. In terms of the materiality the late 19th century housing uses local yellow brick for entire buildings, with the early 20th century buildings making greater use of cheaper red bricks for the frontages, such as the appeal site. The shift in materials from yellow to red brick is indicative of the wider change in dominant building materials over this period.
9. The appeal site has been rendered with a smooth finish and painted white, which has hidden the red brick but also completely removed many of the important decorative features to the front of the property. These specifically include the loss of the stone string course; covering the colonettes and loss of the decorative capitals from the bay windows; loss of the decorative corbels and keystone from the arched window surround at the first floor level; and the corbels from the doorway. The loss of these details and the provision of the smooth white rendered finish differentiate the appeal site from other dwellings of a similar design and form, notably the adjoining semi-detached property. The removal of these important features dilutes the overall visual consistency of the property within the PACA to its detriment.
10. The appellant draws my attention to other properties within the PACA that have been painted and/or rendered, specifically 30 Priory Road, 13-15 Priory Road, 1-3 Priory Avenue, and Nos 55 and 61 Priory Avenue, which I observed during my site visit. These limited examples do not provide an overriding influence over the character of the street scene or the significance of the PACA in general, but in my view do detract from it, and the current development exacerbates that impact.

11. Furthermore, these limited examples do not preclude the need to achieve high quality design, which conserves and where possible enhances the historic environment as confirmed by policies CP11 and D31 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (WDLP), adopted August 2019. I consider that the development as constructed has removed significant and important details from the façade and coupled with the provision of the white rendered treatment, the development neither conserves or enhances the PACAs significance, nor its character features or the positive elements of its special interest.
12. For these reasons, the development causes visual harm to the character and appearance of the PACA, and consequently it would neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area as a whole. Whilst the effect of the development would be localised such that it would be considered less than substantial harm, the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
13. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework, less than substantial harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Other than the protection of the external walls from weather damage and damp problems, which would benefit the appellant only, no specific public benefits have been raised by the appellant.
14. Consequently, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm to which I must attach considerable importance and weight. The development, therefore, fails to preserve or enhance the setting, and thereby the significance of, the designated heritage asset. Consequently, I have found conflict with the statutory presumptions under Section 72(1) of the Act, which carries considerable importance and weight. I have also found that there is conflict with the relevant sections of policies CP11, DM20 and DM31 of the WDLP and the Framework, insofar as they relate to heritage assets.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme is contrary to the development plan, and that material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with that plan. The appeal under ground (a) therefore fails. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under s177(5) of the 1990 Act.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR