



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MISEP, CEnv

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3374863

18 Daws Lea, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1QF

- 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 Daniel O'Sullivan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/06534/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a part two storey, part first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part first floor side extension at 18 Daws Lea, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 1QF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/06534/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: dawslea 18/4 REV B proposed roof plan; dawslea 18/8 Rev B proposed block; dawslea 18/6 Rev B proposed elevations; dawslea 18/1 Rev B proposed ground; and dawslea 18/3 Rev B proposed first.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a link detached two storey dwelling located on a gently sloping residential road. The properties on Daws Lea have all been built in a similar style and whilst there are size variations, they are all fairly large dwellings with front gardens and driveway parking. The appeal property features a ground floor side extension, and it was clear from my site visit that a number of the dwellings in the area have also been extended on one side, some at ground floor and some at first

floor level. However, generally a good sense of space exists between the properties at first floor level which adds positively to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposed development involves the erection of a part two storey, part first floor side extension, above and to the rear of the existing single storey side extension. The proposed extension would use materials to match the existing dwelling. The first-floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation with a hipped roof, lower than the ridge line of the main house. This would serve to give the extension a subordinate and subservient appearance.
6. I acknowledge that the gap between the properties at first floor level contributes to maintaining a sense of openness which is in keeping with the rest of the street. The proposed extension is, however, modest in scale and would not entirely infill the gap that exists at first floor between the appeal property and No. 16 Daws Lea. The gap above the linked garage between the appeal property and the neighbouring property on the other side (No. 20 Daws Lea) would be unaffected by the proposals and a sense of space would be maintained. Furthermore, the extension would only be visible from a short section of the street and the positive openness which is gained from the large front gardens in the street would be unaffected.
7. I do not share the Council's concerns that a 'terracing effect' would occur as a result of the proposed development given that No.16 is positioned slightly forward of the appeal property and a small gap would be maintained between them.
8. I saw on my site visit that a number of two storey side extensions exist, and the appellant has provided information on properties with planning permission for extensions similar to the appeal proposals. I do not agree with the Council that the positioning of the appeal property is significantly more prominent, given the frontages of No. 25 and 27 Daws Lea are fully visible when travelling down Merlewood Close. The Council suggest a larger gap should be maintained between the appeal property and No. 16 and reference the side extensions at No. 16 and No.14 as an example of how this can be achieved. However, No. 14 and No. 16 appear to be larger properties with more spacious plots and not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. I do not consider that in this instance the gap between properties is of such special significance that the proposed development should be prevented. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (Adopted August 2019) (the 'Local Plan') which seek, amongst other things, to ensure development improves the character of the area and demonstrate appropriate character in the scale, form, layout and detailed design of buildings and respect the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.
10. It would also accord with the guidance in the Adopted Householder Planning and Design Guidance (January 2020) which seeks to achieve high quality design and Policy 6 of the Daws Hill Neighbourhood Plan (December 2019) which requires development to recognise and reinforce distinct local character, including spacing and positioning.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have slightly altered the conditions to better reflect the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property. The Ecology Officer has suggested a condition to secure the delivery of biodiversity enhancements. Given the size and scale of the development, I have not included this condition. No impacts on biodiversity have been identified, and the site is not within a sensitive area. It is therefore unnecessary in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposal would comply with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which alter this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR