



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/20/3249693

Nos 1 and 2 Longland Way, High Wycombe, HP12 3UN

- 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 F Mohammed and Mr M Iqbal against the decision of Wycombe District Council, now Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/07621/FUL, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey front and two storey rear extensions to Nos 1 and 2 Longland Way and a single storey side extension to No 1 Longland Way (Alternative to planning permission Ref 19/05555/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The joint proposal is for combined front and rear extensions to Nos 1 and 2, a pair of three-bedroom semi-detached houses on the eastern side of Longland Way, together with a single storey side extension to No 1. The proposal is an alternative scheme to that granted planning permission Ref 19/05555/FUL on 4 September 2019.
4. The proposal differs from the permitted scheme in just two respects.
5. The most significant proposal is to raise and extend the existing duo-pitch roof over the pair of houses to accommodate the two-storey rear extensions across the back of both houses. The pitch of the roof would be approximately the same as now, but the height of the central ridge would be increased by about 0.9 m and the width of the roof and the flank gable end of the two houses would be increased by about 2 m.
6. Whilst the resulting roof form would be simpler than the pair of hipped, pitched roofs over the two rear extensions in the permitted scheme, the impact on the street scene would be more significant. The pair of houses are at one end of Longland Way on the corner of Chairborough Road which passes immediately behind the properties at an acute angle. With two small areas of informal open space to the side of No 1 and behind the first three pairs of houses, and the

ground dropping away quite steeply, the appeal site is unusually exposed to public view in the street scene. In this context raising the ridge of the roof in combination with a wider flank gable end to No 1 would result in an unduly bulky and overprominent building, both out of proportion and visually jarring when seen alongside the other pairs of semi-detached houses in the row. At present, whether seen from the front or rear, this row of similar houses step down in a regular way in line with the gradient down the road. The proposal, by significantly raising the height of the ridgeline of the first pair of houses in relation to the others, would introduce a starkly discordant feature out of character with the streetscene.

7. For these reasons the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (WDLP). These require development to improve the character of the area, represent high quality design in the detailed design of buildings, and for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings to be subservient in scale.
8. The second proposal is for a front facing extension at first floor level to increase the size of the bathroom within each house. This would project forward across the central section of the pair of houses about 1.2 m from the front elevation, thus stepped well in from both sides and set back from the 2 m deep ground floor extension across the full width of both houses. With the front facing roof slope simply extended further out, and the combined extension partly screened by the high-level garages in front of the properties, this would result in a relatively modest addition to the Longland Way street scene that would not appear unduly prominent or out of place when viewed from the road.
9. Whilst this aspect of the proposal would therefore comply with WDLP Policies DM35 and DM36 a split decision is not appropriate in this case as it is not clear from the plans that the two elements of the proposal are structurally separate.

Conclusion

10. Whilst the benefits of the additional accommodation for the applicants' families are fully recognised, having regard to the impact of the roof proposals on the street scene, the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR