



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2020

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/20/3254146

40 Bellingdon Road, Chesham HP5 2HA

- 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 James Salter against the decision of Chiltern District Council (now Buckinghamshire Council).
 - The application Ref PL/19/3801/FA, dated 5 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer at 40 Bellingdon Road, Chesham HP5 2HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/19/3801/FA, dated 5 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing Ref. O40/BEL/001.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to semi-detached period property which sits at the end of a row of similar dwellings. A box dormer already sits on the main rear roof profile of the host dwelling and an outrigger projects a considerable distance to the rear with a lower ridge. The proposal seeks to enlarge the existing dormer and introduce a large box dormer to just under half the length of the rear outrigger of the dwelling. This addition would be noticeably taller than the height of the existing outrigger and it would connect with the replaced dormer on the main roof.
4. There is no doubt that the proposed alterations would significantly alter the rear roof profiles of the host dwelling. These alterations would not be readily

visible from Bellingdon Road. However, they would be clearly visible from the footpath running alongside the appeal property which connects Bellingdon Road with Treacher's Way to the west and also from Treacher's Close itself, which enjoys an elevated position in relation to Bellingdon Road.

5. Treacher's Close is home to a range of building styles, including some flat roofed buildings. From here, the proposed roof alterations would be seen in the context of the very large rear dormer additions at Nos. 30, 32 and 34 Bellingdon Road. The dormers at Nos. 30 and 32 occupy the full depth of the two storey element of their outriggers and I understand that planning permission was granted for the development at No. 30 following a successful appeal in 2003. I also understand that planning permission was subsequently granted by the Council in 2006 for the roof alterations at No. 32. In doing so, the Council considered this dormer to be acceptable. The presence of these roof additions is a material consideration to which I attach significant weight.
6. The Council argues that the appeal proposal is materially different to the rear dormer my colleague considered to be acceptable and indeed, that at No. 32. The Council has explained that my colleague reasoned the dormer at No. 30 was to be set between an 'enclosure' created by the prominent mass of the dwelling at No. 26 and the projecting two storey element at No. 40. The proposed roof alterations before me would be set outside of this enclosure and would be much closer to the public footpath. Nevertheless, the existing dormers are readily visible and very noticeable when walking along the public footpath and also from certain vantage points along Treacher's Close. They each contribute to the much altered roofscape of this group of semi-detached dwellings and the overall character and appearance of the immediate locality.
7. The roof alterations proposed would be seen alongside some very similar roof dormers. When considered in this specific context, I am satisfied the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the group within which it sits.

Overall Conclusions

8. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its setting. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of saved policies GC1, H13, H15 and H18 of the adopted Chiltern District Local Plan or policy CS20 of the adopted Core Strategy for the Chiltern District, which collectively promote good design which is appropriate to its context.
9. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested a condition to ensure that the external materials of the dormer match those of the host dwelling, in the event the appeal succeeds. I agree that such a condition is required to ensure a visually appropriate development.
10. In allowing the appeal, I will attach these conditions.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR