



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 25th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/17/3173147

2 Salisbury Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP13 6UL.

- 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 Mrs Shagufta Khurshid against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/08012/FUL, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as *construction of two storey front extension, steps and railings to front/side, construction of rear box dormer and insertion of window to side elevation in connection with loft conversion to create additional habitable living accommodation.*
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal in so far as it relates to the construction of two-storey front extension, steps and railings to front/side.
2. I allow the appeal and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the construction of rear box dormer and insertion of window to side elevation in connection with loft conversion to create additional habitable living accommodation at 2 Salisbury Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref16/08012/FUL, dated 20 October 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 1525/1C, 2B, 4C and 5.
 - 4) Notwithstanding condition 3 no development shall take place until a drawing at a scale of not less than 1:50 showing the first and second floor plans drawn to reflect the amended scheme design has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural matters

3. The scheme design was amended during the course of the application's consideration by the local planning authority. My deliberations will therefore be based on the design illustrated on the revised drawings 1525/1C, 2B, 3, 4C and 5. Furthermore, I have altered the description in the bullet point above to the description of development set out on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately reflects the proposal before me.
4. Upon inspection of the revised drawings it is clear that drawing number 1525/3 does not show the revised design at the proposed second floor/loft level, in that the front dormer has been retained and the roof windows are not illustrated. Accordingly in the event that I am minded to allow the appeal I would need to require, by condition, the submission of a revised plan drawing to reflect the scheme design before me.

Main Issues

5. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene; and,
 - b) its impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at number 4 Salisbury Road, in terms of its potential to be overbearing and have an overshadowing effect on the street facing window.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The property the subject of this appeal, number 2 Salisbury Road, is a two-storey dwelling house, semi-detached with number 4. Due to the topography of the area the houses, including the appeal property, on the east side of the road are set on higher ground above the level of the road whereas those to the west sit below the road. Although number 2A to the south is a detached house, it is located in a residential street characterised by semi-detached houses.
7. The appellant proposes a two-storey extension to the front of the house facing the street, together with new steps and railings to the front and side. Along with the insertion of a large box dormer to the rear roof slope, roof windows to the front roof slope and a high level window in the gable wall to provide additional habitable accommodation at attic level is also proposed.
8. As I saw some of the houses have large box dormers to the rear roof slope, in what are relatively shallow pitched roofs. Accordingly, although I have some reservations about its design, I nevertheless consider that on balance it would cause limited additional harm and therefore would be acceptable.
9. The Council raises no objection to the proposed insertion of two windows in the front roof slope. As I saw that roof windows have been inserted elsewhere, I consider them to be acceptable here.
10. The two-storey front extension would project 3.0 metres or so in front of the wall of the house facing the street at ground floor level, but slightly more at lower ground floor level. The extension would have a lean-to roof that would finish just below the cill line of the first floor windows with a flat roof over the lower ground floor

addition. As illustrated the new higher roof would have a significantly shallower pitch than the main roof. When viewed from the street, this difference in the roof slopes would result in the extension appearing as an unattractive and dominant alien addition. This harm would be accentuated by the introduction of the lower flat roof.

11. As a result of the proposed floor levels, the pattern of openings and the limited modelling, the extension when viewed from the street would be poorly articulated with an unattractive proportion of void to solid.
12. The designer has also failed to align the new and existing windows. Although seemingly a small detailed design consideration, this matter would serve to detract further from the design of the extension itself, the overall appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and thereby the street scene. As a result of the proposed two-storey extension, the dwelling as extended would appear bland, utilitarian and unattractive when compared to the neighbouring properties.
13. I therefore conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed extension to the front façade, due to its poor design, would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the neighbouring development and the street scene. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies G3 and H17 of the *Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011 (Adopted January 2004) (As saved and extended September 2007); and replaced by the Adopted Core Strategy July 2008 and the Adopted Delivery and Site Allocations Plan July 2013 (LP) and Policy CS19 of the Wycombe Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document July 2008 (CS DPD)* as they relate to amongst other things, the requirement to secure high standards of design and reinforce, by enhancing, the built characteristics of the site and wider context.
14. However, the proposed alterations to the roof, including the proposed rear box dormer and new windows would be acceptable. This part of the proposal would therefore accord with saved LP Policies G3 and H17 and CS DPD Policy CS19 as they relate to, along with other things, the quality of design.

Living conditions

15. The proposed front extension would be located to the south of number 4 Salisbury Road and would project a minimum of 3.0 metres in front of the main façade of the semi-detached pair. Accordingly, although limited it would be visible from the front windows of number 4. Further, at certain times of the year it might well overshadow the front window of the neighbouring property. However, from the limited evidence provided to the contrary and my observations on site, I am not persuaded that it would either appear so overbearing or have such an overshadowing effect as to cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier.
16. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed two-storey front extension would not have a significant harmful impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at number 4 Salisbury Road. In this respect it would accord with LP Policies G8 and H17 and CS DPD Policy CS19 as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conditions

17. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in

the construction of the external surfaces of the building. However, as the information shown on the application drawings is limited I shall, in this case, require details to be submitted to and approved by the Council.

18. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans. However, as drawing 1525/3 does not accurately show the proposal at the loft level, I shall require a revised drawing to show corrected floor plans to be submitted to the Council before the development is commenced.

Conclusions

19. I have concluded that the proposed rear box dormer and new side and roof windows would be acceptable.
20. I have also found that the two-storey front extension, steps and railings to front/side would not adversely affect the residential living conditions of the occupiers of number 4 Salisbury Road. However, I consider that this factor is outweighed by the unacceptable harm that would ensue to the architectural integrity of the host building and the character and appearance of the street scene if the construction of the two-storey front extension were to go ahead. To my mind this is a compelling objection. I have considered all other matters raised, including similar nearby developments identified by the appellant, but none change my overall conclusion, reached on the planning merits of the case that this element of the appeal proposal should not succeed.

Overall Conclusion

21. I consider that the two parts of the proposal are clearly severable, being physically and functionally independent and a split decision is therefore appropriate. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in so far as it relates to the construction of the two-storey front extension, steps and railings to front/side, but should be allowed in so far as it relates to the construction of the rear box dormer and insertion of window to side elevation.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR