



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026

by E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3376191

5 Honey Way, Walters Ash, Buckinghamshire HP14 4TT

- 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 Stuart James against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - East Area (Chiltern).
 - The application Ref is 25/06173/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side/rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at numbers 126 and 132 Templewood, and 255 and 257 Main Road having specific regard to privacy and overlooking; and
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the Chilterns National Landscape.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal property is one of 6 detached bungalows located in Honey Way, a private, no through road. There are residential properties adjoining the side and rear boundaries of the site, and on the opposite side of the shared driveway to the front of the site.
4. The appeal scheme includes a single storey ground floor sunroom extension and loft conversion to provide 2 en-suite bedrooms and storage space at first floor level. While the proposal would not increase the height of the existing bungalow, it would introduce a series of new openings at first floor level, including a number of new velux rooflights (Elevations A and C), first floor windows (Elevations A and B), a glazed first floor door and balcony fronting the driveway (Elevation D), and a dormer with glazed doors providing access to a balcony (Elevation C).
5. The proposed dormer to Elevation C, which would serve a first floor bedroom, is a short distance from the boundary of the site which is coterminous with the rear boundaries of the adjoining properties at 255 and 257 Main Road (No.s 255 and 257). The dormer would include glazed doors, which, due to the proximity to the

site boundary and elevated position, would enable views towards the rear of No.s 255 and 257 and their gardens. Although the glazed doors would not enable access to the roof of the single storey extension, they would provide access to a balcony contained by a glass balustrade. Thus, as well as providing an outlook from the full height glazed opening, this arrangement would enable the use of the enclosed space immediately outside of the door, which would be likely to give a much more pronounced feeling of surveillance from the balcony. While the dormer and associated balcony would be a sufficient distance from the windows in the rear elevations of No.s 255 and 257 so as to not compromise privacy in that regard, taking the above factors into account, the dormer window and balcony would result in direct overlooking of the rear gardens of No.s 255 and 257.

6. In addition, given the proximity of the proposed first floor bedroom window in the gable to Elevation B to the adjoining boundaries of the neighbouring properties at 126 and 132 Templewood (No.s 126 and 132), it would give rise to direct overlooking of the rear gardens to these properties.
7. I am mindful that the site is in a built up setting where a degree of overlooking of garden areas is commonplace. However, the proposal would nonetheless introduce a greater degree of direct overlooking to the gardens of the adjoining properties, which would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties. I observed at my site visit there was some planting to the appeal site boundaries, however, this was sporadic in nature and would not overcome the harm I have identified. Moreover, the longevity of such planting in the long term cannot be guaranteed.
8. A second first floor window in Elevation C, would be positioned very close to the boundary of the site. However, as this opening serves a storage space, it would be reasonable to impose a planning condition to ensure the window was obscure glazed, so as to prevent any overlooking of the adjoining properties. Furthermore, rooflights would not usually give rise to overlooking due to their position in the roof slope and subsequent restricted outlook, however, this matter could also be addressed through a suitable condition, if deemed necessary.
9. Concern is also expressed by interested parties regarding overlooking from the first floor opening and balcony to Elevation D, which fronts Honey Way. The proposed glazed door would face towards 1 Honey Way (No.1), directly opposite the site and Ash Close beyond. However, given the immediate view from this aperture would be of the shared driveway and side garden to No.1, which is currently clearly visible from the driveway, it would not result in any loss of privacy to the occupiers of No.1. Furthermore, the distance between the rear boundaries of the properties in Ash Close and the proposed first floor door and balcony, together with intervening boundary treatment means that the proposal would not give rise to any direct overlooking of the properties in Ash Close.
10. My attention is drawn by the appellant to planning permission granted previously by the Council¹ for alterations to the property which included, among other things, a window in the rear elevation in the same position as that now proposed. However, I have considered the appeal on its own merits in light of the evidence before me. Furthermore, while there may currently be a degree of overlooking of the appeal property from the existing first floor windows in the adjoining properties,

¹ LPA Ref: 17/05893/FUL

given the distance of the neighbouring properties from the site boundaries, this is less pronounced than the overlooking that would arise as a result of the appeal proposal and would not justify the harm I have identified.

11. In light of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposed dormer window to Elevation C and the first floor window to Elevation B, would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at No.s 255 and 257 and No.s 126 and 132 respectively, having specific regard to privacy and overlooking. As such, the proposed development would fail to accord with the aims of Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan, adopted 2019 (WDLP), in so far as they require new development to preserve the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Character and appearance

12. The area surrounding the appeal site is predominantly residential in character, including detached and semi-detached single and 2 storey dwellings of a mix of architectural styles, ages and external materials. While the properties in Honey Way are consistent in terms of height, they vary in their design and appearance, including the rendered external finish of the appeal property, which contrasts with the others in the close which are of brick construction.
13. The existing bungalow has a simple form, with a notable absence of openings at first floor level and uninterrupted roof plane. Nonetheless, the proposed glazed door and glass balustrade to the elevation facing Honey Way would be modest in scale given the size of the gable in which it would sit, and the distance the balcony would project from the façade of the building, would not be excessive. Furthermore, the contemporary design of the new upper floor openings would not be at variance with the general appearance of the host dwelling, or the dwellings nearby with accommodation at first floor level.
14. In addition, the proposed dormer would be set back from the gable fronting Honey Way and lower in height than the ridge height of the main roof of the property and would occupy only part of the roof slope on which it would be accommodated. As such, it would appear as a sympathetic addition in terms of its overall size and scale. Thus, while it would create additional space in an attic room, it would not conflict with the overall aims of The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, published February 2010.
15. Given the very modest discrepancy between the eaves height of the proposed flat roof single storey extension and that of the host dwelling, it would not appear as unduly incongruous addition by virtue of its design. Furthermore, this element of the scheme would be largely indiscernible in views from Honey Way due to the presence of an existing boundary fence. In addition, the proposed rooflights would not occupy a prominent position on the roof of the dwelling, so as to appear unduly conspicuous, and would therefore not disrupt the overall appearance of the host dwelling.
16. For the foregoing reasons, the appeal proposals would not appear at odds with and would integrate appropriately with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, having regard to their cumulative size, scale and design. While the first-floor additions would be visible in views from Honey Way and the neighbouring properties, whereby the appearance of the appeal property would differ from others in Honey Way, given the lack of consistency in the built form in

the area overall, this would not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

17. Furthermore, due to the general scale of the development and location of the appeal site within the context of the existing residential development, the proposal would not result in any perceptible effect on the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the Chilterns National Landscape (NL) in terms of its landscape and scenic beauty.
18. For the foregoing reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area or detract from the landscape and scenic beauty of the NL. In that regard it would not conflict with the collective aims of Policies CP9, DM30, DM35 and DM36 of the WDLP, which seek development of a high quality of design, that respects the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area and conserves, and where possible enhances, the natural beauty of the NL.

Other Matters

19. The time taken for the Council to determine the planning application is not determinative in the appeal.
20. It has been suggested that the proposed single storey ground floor extension, together with the conversion of the loft space to habitable accommodation would not require planning permission. Nevertheless, an application was made, and I have determined the appeal accordingly, having regard to the development plan.

Conclusion

21. While the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, it would give rise to harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Material considerations have not been shown to carry sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR