



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2019

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/19/3237939

8 Hylton Road, High Wycombe HP12 4BZ

- 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 Robert Schwier against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/06049/FUL, dated 13 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is an extension to a dwelling house involving the construction of single storey front extension and canopy, alterations to ground levels incorporating new retaining wall to front and alterations to driveway. Raising of roof, roof extensions and associated alterations to create second floor living accommodation. Erection of single storey detached outbuilding to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed raising of the roof and roof extensions, single storey front extension and canopy, alterations to ground levels and alterations to driveway. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed single storey detached outbuilding and planning permission is granted for a single storey detached outbuilding at 8 Hylton Road, High Wycombe HP12 4BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/06049/FUL, dated 13 April 2019, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; plan titled Proposed Garden Room; and Drawing 2004, but only insofar as it shows the location of the Proposed Garden Room.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the outbuilding shall match those shown on plan titled Proposed Garden Room.

Preliminary Matters

2. For the purposes of clarity and precision, the description of development given above is taken from the appeal form.
3. For the reasons that follow, I find the single storey detached outbuilding to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed roof alterations, single storey front extension and alterations to the

front of the property. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission only for the single storey detached outbuilding.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The surrounding area is predominately residential. The appeal site comprises a detached property, which lies within a row of similar detached dwellings. Whilst there have been some alterations to them, there remains an element of uniformity about the dwellings along the street, in particular their roofscape, where the properties have similar hipped roofs. Even where alterations have involved the roof, proposals have been designed to retain their hipped element. Front elevations have a generally balanced design, with doors to the front. Car parking is provided by a mixture of on and off-street parking, with the off-street provision including a mix of formal cross over points and non-formal areas where front gardens have been removed to make parking provision. Rear garden areas are private, with limited views into these areas.
6. The proposed development would increase the size of the existing roof to create a gable ended roof, along with insertion of two side dormers. A Juliet balcony is proposed to be inserted into the rear gable on the northern elevation, facing the rear garden. To the front of the property, the proposal involves a single storey front extension and the reconfiguration of the front of the property to provide new parking spaces and altered steps and rear access. A new single storey garden outbuilding is proposed.
7. The alterations to the roof and the insertion of side dormer windows would increase the overall bulk of the existing dwelling. The design and appearance of the additions would be a break in the rhythm and roof pattern that exists along the street. Consequently, when viewed alongside other properties on the road, the proposed amendments to the roof would introduce features, which would have an adverse effect upon the street scene and be out of keeping with the character of the area. In coming to this conclusion, I have also considered other developments in the area, however none are sufficiently comparable to the proposal to overcome my conclusion in relation to the harm that would be caused.
8. Whilst there is rhythm to the roofscape, the front elevations of some of the existing buildings have been altered. As a result, the original building line and uniformity of the front elevations has been eroded. Although, where properties have been altered, they have retained their main entrance to the front of the property. The appeal proposal would include an extension to the front and reposition the main entrance to the side of the existing dwelling. Whilst the size of the extension would not be out of keeping with the street scene, the design of the extension and in particular the re-positioning of the front door would create a relatively plain elevation facing onto the road, which would be out of keeping with the street scene and would be harmful to the character of the area.

9. The proposed amendments to the front garden would be similar to the reconfiguration work undertaken to other properties. However, from the drawings submitted with the appeal, the base of the proposed single storey front extension would provide the necessary retaining wall to allow the garden to be levelled and the new off-street parking provided. I have considered whether the off-street parking element of the scheme could be delivered independently from the proposed extension, however from the information before me it is not clear that it could be.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed alterations to the roof, the single storey front extension and alterations to the front garden would harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, is contrary to Policies G3(General Design Policy), Policies G8(Detailed Design Guidance and Local Amenity), H17(Extensions and Other Development within Residential Curtilages) and Appendix 4 in the Adopted Local Plan to 2011, Policies CS19 (Raising the Quality of Place-Shaping and Design) of the Core Strategy DPD and Policies DM33 (Managing Carbon Emissions, Transport and Energy Generation), DM35 (Placemaking and Design Quality), and DM36 (Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings) of the Wycombe District Local Plan.
11. The proposed single storey detached outbuilding would be located in the rear garden of the property, directly adjoining the rear boundary. Due to the screening provided by the existing property, the single storey building would not be visible from the street and would therefore cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. I therefore conclude that the erection of the proposed single storey detached outbuilding does not harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, is not contrary to Policies G3, Policies G8, H17 and Appendix 4 in the Adopted Local Plan to 2011, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy DPD and Policies DM 33, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey detached outbuilding and dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension and canopy, alterations to ground levels incorporating new retaining wall to front and alterations to driveway, the raising of roof, roof extensions and associated alterations to create second floor living accommodation.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR