



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3267993

355 Desborough Avenue, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire HP11 2TH

- 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 Gazanfar Ali against the decision of Wycombe District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/06155/FUL, dated 7 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension and the loft conversion.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling with a hipped roof. It is set back from the highway and has a generous level of space to the rear. Within the street, it is one of a number of detached dwellings that are set back from the highway to a similar degree. There is architectural variety within the dwellings, however, the use of hipped roofs provides a general consistency within the roofscape. Although there are examples of gable ends within the street, the overwhelming and dominant roof form derives from the use of hipped roofs. In addition, houses generally benefit from space between buildings, and when combined with the roofscape, the buildings establish a pleasing rhythm within the street scene which makes a positive contribution to the pleasant suburban environment. Due to the form and appearance of the existing dwelling, it is entirely consistent with the prevailing character and appearance of the area and accordingly, it makes a positive contribution to the surrounding built environment.
4. The proposal would introduce a large two storey extension to the rear of the property as well as a dormer window in the rear facing roofslope. The rear extension would be relatively central to the rear elevation and would incorporate a hipped roof. Accordingly, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would suitably complement the existing dwelling. There are also examples of flat roof dormer windows to the rear of neighbouring dwellings. However, due to the width of the proposed dormer, it would rely on the

proposed roof alterations and side extension to be contained within the roofslope.

5. The roof alterations would convert the existing hipped roof to a pitched roof with gable ends. The side extension would be marginally set back from the front of the property but would also incorporate a similar roof form. Although there are some examples of gable ended pitched roofs, these are incidental within the street scene and do not alter the fundamental characteristics of the roofscape. Accordingly, the altered roof form would be distinctly at odds with the overwhelming prevalence of hipped roofs within the street. Consequently, rather than integrate with the street scene, I find that the proposal would detract from the pleasing rhythm identified above, thereby causing demonstrable visual harm to the surroundings.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019), which taken together, seek amongst other things, high quality design which respects the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR