The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/17/3173891
117 Totteridge Road, High Wycombe HP13 6HR

- 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 Ishtiaq Yaseen against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
- The application Ref 17/05090/FUL, dated 16 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
- The development proposed is a new flat roof dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. The description of development on the Council's decision, and on the appeal form, includes raising of the roof, roof alterations, side and rear extensions and an alteration to the existing access. However it appears these works have already been granted planning permission[1] and, from my site visit, had already been carried out. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the description used in the planning application form.

3. Also, at the time of my site visit, a dormer with a crown pitch roof was in place, though unfinished, in the position of the proposed dormer.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the Amersham Hill Conservation Area (AHCA).

Reasons

5. The proposed dormer would be on the side roof slope of the house and would face Lucas Road. On the opposite side of Lucas Road there is a pair of semi-detached dwellings which both have pitched roof front dormers. These dormer windows contain two panes of glass each and only occupy around half the width of their host roof slope. As such they appear in proportion with the scale of the host building. The existing dormer at the appeal site also appears commensurate with roof slope it is positioned on in terms of its width. With the

[1] Ref 15/07321/FUL and 16/07836/FUL

exception of another similarly sized dormer window on the rear of St Dunstan's Court, I could see no other dormer windows in the immediate area.

6. At three panes wide, the proposed dormer would be demonstrably wider than the other dormers in the area, including that in situ at the appeal site. Although I accept the provision of a flat roof would minimise its height compared to these other dormers, its width is a more noticeable aspect from ground level and the additional width would mean it would appear significantly larger than these other examples and would occupy a larger proportion of the roof slope on which it would be positioned. It would appear prominently from positions west along Totteridge Road, and from the nearest parts of Lucas Road and, in its context, would appear incongruous in these street scenes. Moreover, it would dominate its roof slope, failing to reflect the scale of the existing house.

7. I consider there would be no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the AHCA due to the development's relatively small scale, the fact that it would be partly screened from views from within the AHCA by a tall conifer tree in the rear garden of the property, and its distance from the AHCA boundary.

8. Nonetheless, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy G3 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') which expects development to respect local context, and Policy H17 and Appendix 4 of the Local Plan which require extensions to not harm the character and appearance of the host property. It would also fail to accord with Policy CS19 of the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (the 'Core Strategy') which requires a high standard of design. I do not consider the development would conflict with Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy as there would be no harmful effect on the AHCA, which is what this policy seeks to protect.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR