



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2025

by S F Murphy BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI MISEP CEnv.

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/25/3373924

1 & 3 Hampden Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP13 6SZ

- 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 M Ellington and Mr Corcoran against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/05457/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of part single storey, part two storey rear extension and two front dormer windows to both properties and single storey front extension to No.1 Hampden Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of part single storey, part two storey rear extension and two front dormer windows to both 1 and 3 Hampden Road, High Wycombe, HP13 6SZ; and a single storey front extension to 1 Hampden Road, High Wycombe, HP13 6SZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/05457/FUL, 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 drawing number EC/10/25 rev B dated February 2025.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match the external materials used elsewhere in the existing dwellings.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations, bat mitigation, lighting measures and ecological enhancements as detailed within the Emergence and Activity Bat Survey Report (Cherryfield Ecology, 2024).

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice rather than the original planning application form. While there is nothing before me to indicate that the revised description was agreed between the main parties, it nevertheless accurately describes the proposal and it was used by the appellants on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwellings and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached dwellings constructed of brick with tiled roofs. As the land slopes from east to west, the front of the dwellings fronting Hampden Road appear as two storeys whereas at the rear there is a lower ground level. Number (No.) 3 has a rear dormer to the roof that stretches its entire width and No.1 has skylights in the rear slope. There is a rear single storey extension at the lower ground level to No.3 alongside a garage and garden room within its rear garden along the boundary with No.5 Hampden Road. A sizeable single storey outbuilding constructed of brick is located within the rear garden of No. 1 Hampden situated along its southern boundary with the dwelling Rowan.
5. The character of Hampden Road is suburban and residential, with a mixture of two storey detached and semi-detached houses in a variety of mostly traditional styles some with dormer windows and rear and side extensions. Given the topography, houses situated on the western side of Hampden Road have a lower ground level which is not prominent from the street scene.
6. The proposed development would introduce a double storey extension across the rear of No.s 1 and 3 Hampden Road with a flat roof. It also proposes front dormers to both dwellings and a small front extension to No.1. I note the front dormers and small front extension were not raised within the reason for refusal and the Council within their submissions raise no concerns regarding to these aspects. I am satisfied that given these aspects are modest in scale and comparable to other features on properties on Hampden Road, they would not detract from the character and appearance of the area, nor would they create a dominant appearance of the host dwellings.
7. Turning to the rear extension, this would be two storeys in height constructed from the lower level and have a slight stepped-in side elevation before being stepped-in again. The furthest point of the extension would be single storey. To facilitate the extension, the garage at No.3 would be removed alongside, it would appear, over half of the outbuilding at No.1.
8. Whilst cognisant of the proposed depth of the rear extensions, I am satisfied that through the stepped-in design and their positioning from the lower ground level to below the first-floor windows, that for these dwellings the proposed massing of the rear extensions would not dominate the host properties or result in an overbearing appearance which still allows for reading of the original building. This would be further facilitated by the use of matching brickwork and windows assimilating the rear extensions to the host building and that the extensions would mirror each other across the dwellings.
9. I do note that it would appear the rear extensions would extend beyond the recommended depth set out in the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document adopted January 2020 (the SPD) for rear extensions. Although this document provides a number of principles, it is a document providing guidance to householders when considering extensions or alterations to their homes providing good practice advice.
10. I have also noted the proposed rear building line would extend to a depth that is similar to building lines formed by other rear extensions along the western side of Hampden Road. Furthermore, when considered in the context of the host

dwelling gardens, the rear extensions would fit into the existing built envelope without appearing visually dominant.

11. I note the Council have stated that a flat roof on a two-storey extension would typically not be acceptable. However, for this proposal where the proposed extensions roof line would lie beneath the windows of the first floor and the width and depth of the proposed rear extension as a whole, I am satisfied that the proposed extent of flat roof would not be so out of keeping that it would be significantly harmful to the host property. Whilst the flat roof would extend across the rear of the two properties, I consider the use of a parapet would soften the appearance of the flat roof.
12. Overall, I am satisfied given the context of the host dwellings, that the scale and massing of the rear extensions both as a whole and individually, alongside the proposed use of matching materials which would be sympathetic and in keeping with the host dwellings, that the proposed development would not appear as an incongruous addition. Due to the lower ground level, the rear extensions would not appear disproportionate and would respect the character and appearance of the existing building.
13. The proposed rear extension to No.1 Hampden Road would clearly be visible from the street scene. However, due to the sloping of land away from Hampden Road, I am satisfied that the scale and massing of the extension would not appear unduly dominant in the street scene. Furthermore, given the rear extensions positioned behind the dwellings, I do not consider the flat roof element would be prominent in the street scene thereby causing such a discordant feature.
14. Both parties have drawn my attention to a previous appeal decision¹ for the appeal site. The previous rear extension proposal to No.1 appears to be substantially larger in both depth and width than the current scheme with it extending towards the southern boundary. Having reviewed the evidence before me, I am satisfied that this scheme is materially different being both smaller in depth, there being no side extension, there being no terrace area for No.1, and the rear extension to No.1 mirroring that at No.3.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwellings and the surrounding area and would accord with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan adopted August 2019 which collectively require that proposals are of high quality design, be subservient in scale and ancillary in function to the main dwelling house, and that extensions are of an appropriate design and quality which respond positively to the character and style of the building being extended.
16. Additionally, the proposal would accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
17. I note the proposal would not align with guidance detailed within the SPD and this is a material consideration. This is a guidance document and there can be circumstances where development is acceptable which does not comply with

¹ APP/K0425/W/24/3346331

every aspect of it. For my reasons explained above, I do not consider this material consideration would outweigh my overall findings.

Conditions

18. I have had regard to the advice provided in the National Planning Policy Guidance with regards to proposed planning conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of character and appearance I have imposed a condition requiring the external materials to match those used on the existing buildings. I have imposed a condition requiring the implementation of bat mitigation measures, lighting measures and ecological enhancements to ensure protection of species of conservation importance.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

S F Murphy

INSPECTOR