



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/25/3375728

4 Springfield Cottages, Alderbourne Lane, Fulmer, Buckinghamshire SL0 0NX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ben Vaughan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application Ref is PL/25/3597/PNE.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in a short row of similar properties. It has a single storey adjunct to the rear elevation, which, from my observations on site and in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, appears to form part of the original property. There is no dispute that permitted development rights for extensions to the property remain intact.
4. Development is not permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph (j) (iii) of the GPDO if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
5. The Permitted development rights for householders: technical guidance (September 2019) sets out that a wall forming a side elevation of a house will be any wall that cannot be identified as being a front wall or a rear wall and that houses will often have more than two side elevation walls. The guidance is clear that, where an extension fills the area between a side elevation and a rear wall, then the restrictions on extensions beyond rear walls and side walls will both apply. Accordingly, in this case, in addition to projecting beyond the rear wall, the proposed extension would project beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwelling house for the purposes of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1(j) of the GPDO.

6. The appellant's submissions indicate that the extension would be 2.1m wide at the furthest point from the dwelling, which is less than half the width of the original dwelling. However, by virtue of the staggered nature of the side wall of the existing rear projection, the part of the proposed extension immediately to the rear of the dwelling, would project a greater distance from the side wall and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
7. I therefore conclude that, as the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, the appeal scheme would not constitute permitted development as set out in Part 1, Class A of GPDO. Consequently, express planning permission would be required for the extension, as proposed.

Other Matters

8. The effects or otherwise of the development on the appearance of the dwelling or the street scene are not matters for consideration in the determination as to whether a proposed development would represent permitted development. Moreover, the provisions of the GPDO do not allow for a flexible approach to the interpretation of the regulations.
9. My attention is drawn by the appellant to a rear extension to the neighbouring property at 1 Springfield Cottages, which it is suggested is identical to the appeal proposal and the Council deemed prior approval was not required. However, I have determined the appeal on its own merits based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR