
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 DECEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3284576

13 North Drive, High Wycombe, HP13 6JW

- 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 Tushar Rahalkar against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06626/FUL, dated 22 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion to form habitable spaces and part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 13 North Drive is a detached bungalow with a hipped pitched roof. It appears unaltered at the front and has extensions to the rear. The majority of the properties along the street are similar bungalows, many of which have been altered and extended with a variety of loft conversions and dormer windows.
4. The relevant policies in this case are CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (the local plan) which, among other things, require development, including residential extensions, to be of a high quality of design, respect the character and appearance of the existing property and the surroundings and provide an appropriate level of amenity for occupants. The Council's SPD *Householder Planning and Design Guidance* provides detailed advice on residential extensions.
5. The proposal includes a front pitched roof dormer, two side flat roofed dormers approximately 11.7m from front to back and an infill extension at the rear.
6. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed front dormer window or the single storey rear extension and I see no reason to disagree with this.
7. The proposed side dormers would result in a fundamental change in the character and appearance of the existing dwelling because of their overall length, bulk and form. They would be out of proportion with the modest scale

of the bungalow and unsympathetic to the original design, resulting in dominant features which would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene.

8. The dormers would be readily visible as a bulky feature in views along the street from both directions. Although there are several other bungalows along the street which have been extended with a variety of dormers, most of them are not of the same large scale as the proposal. I consider that some of the larger ones are not well related to their original building nor well integrated with the other properties in the street scene. I note that the Council has no record of planning permission being granted for the alterations to No. 12 and also, it is likely that some of the less appropriate roof extensions were constructed some time ago without the need for planning permission. They are not necessarily acceptable as examples to be used in favour of the proposal.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene, contrary to local plan policies C9, DM35 and DM36.
10. The proposal provides for obscure glazing in the side windows of the dormers facing the properties on both sides to ensure privacy for the occupiers. The window in the room designated as a store is the only one serving that room. The other windows are either secondary sources of light for bedrooms or serve non-habitable rooms. Obscure glazing would not be acceptable for a window in a habitable room as it would result in a poor level of internal accommodation. Although the store room appears to be of a size which could be used as a habitable room, the appellant has designated it as a store and it is not for me to assume that it would be used for a different purpose.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not result in unsatisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of the dwelling and that in this respect it is consistent with local plan policy DM35.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR