



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2010

by **E C Grace** DipTP FRTPi FBEng PPIAAS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
**1 March 2010**

**Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/A/09/2116430**

**Rowarden, Rayners Avenue, Loudwater, High Wycombe, Bucks HP10 9SL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Neil Meldrum against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
- The application Ref 09/06753/FUL, dated 15/9/09, was refused by notice dated 3/11/09.
- The development proposed is erection of a terrace of 3 x 2 bed dwellings.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed development would be out of keeping with the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is on the westerly side of Rayners Avenue a short distance away from a high railway embankment and bridge. The plot slopes up from the road to the rear boundary and contains a modest bungalow. Although there is a pair of semi-detached houses opposite, the predominant character of this section of Rayners Avenue between the railway embankment and London Road (A40) is of detached houses and bungalows. Despite the appellant's claim that there are examples of terraced housing nearby, these are not in the same street scene as the appeal site and the static caravan site and terraced housing at Rayners Close are separated from it physically and visually by the railway embankment. I therefore find that terraced housing would be out of keeping with the street scene on this part of Rayners Avenue.
4. The appellant also places great reliance on the fact that the proposed terrace is not very dissimilar in scale and appearance to the permission (09/06142/FUL) granted by the Council for extension of the bungalow and providing habitable accommodation in the roof. That scheme to extend the building appears to me to have been contrived with the intention of making this appeal application, particularly having regard to the fact that all the rear ground floor fenestration is provided as full height glazed double opening patio doors and the five rear windows for the upper floor are all in the roof slope. My view in this regard is further reinforced by his statement that *we are proposing to replace this structurally deficient existing dwelling in any event.*

5. I agree with the Council that the previous proposal to extend the existing bungalow is entirely different from the current proposal to demolish it and erect a terrace of 3 new dwellings. I regard the design of the proposed dwellings as being very poorly conceived and whilst the rear first floor window configuration for the previous scheme could be viewed as being satisfactory for lighting bathrooms, dressing room and landing in an individual dwelling, three of these in the current proposal would now serve the second bedroom of each house. Moreover, the substandard aesthetic appearance of the rear elevations of each of the dwellings reflects the contrived approach to the design that has been adopted rather than if it had been a bespoke scheme.
6. I find the introduction of a terrace of meanly proportioned dwellings on this site together with their exceptionally narrow plots would be entirely out of keeping with and harmful to the character and appearance of the locality. Moreover, the harm from its incongruity, poor design and greater intensity of use being proposed would be accentuated by the devotion of much of the large front garden area to hard surfaced parking and manoeuvring space together with bin and cycle storage. The latter are also misleadingly depicted with a green notation on the submitted drawing, which the appellant claims would be maintained as lawn, as are the passageways at either side of the building.
7. The appellant refers to the Local Plan objectives seeking to make the best use of recycled urban land (brownfield land) and Policies H8 and H9, which set out respectively, minimum density of 30dph for new development and provision for a range of types and sizes of accommodation. However, it is clear from the accompanying text that when assessing whether a proposal represents efficient use of the land, regard must be had to site specific circumstances, for example, topography and its size and shape, which all affect the capacity of the site. In my view, these factors, together with its setting render this site as clearly incapable of satisfactorily accommodating a development of terraced housing.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would contravene Policy G3 of the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan and Policy CS19 of the adopted Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy and that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Edward Grace*

Inspector



# The Planning Inspectorate

Quality Assurance Unit  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0117-372-8252  
Switchboard: 0117-372-8000

<http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk>

---

Ian Beck  
Wycombe District Council  
Planning Department  
Council Offices  
Queen Victoria Road  
High Wycombe  
Bucks  
HP11 1BB

Your Ref: 09/06753/FUL  
Our Ref: APP/K0425/A/09/2116430/NWF  
Date: 1 March 2010

---

Dear Mr Beck

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Appeal by Mr Neil David Meldrum  
Site at Rowarden, Rayners Avenue, Loudwater, High Wycombe, HP10 9SL**

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal.

If you have queries or complaints about the decision or the way we handled the appeal, you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at [www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/agency\\_info/complaints/complaints\\_dealing.htm](http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/agency_info/complaints/complaints_dealing.htm). This page also contains information on our complaints procedures and the right of challenge to the High Court, the only method by which the decision can be reconsidered.

If you do not have internet access, or would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our complaints procedure, please contact our Quality Assurance Unit on 0117 372 8252 or in writing to the address above.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 0207 947 6655.

Yours sincerely

Amanda Baker

COVERDL1



*You can now use the Internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of this case through the Planning Portal. The address of our search page is - <http://www.pcs.planningportal.gov.uk/pcsportal/casearch.asp>  
You can access this case by putting the above reference number into the 'Case Ref' field of the 'Search' page and clicking on the search button*