
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: 07 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/21/3283857

73 Adelaide Road, High Wycombe, HP13 6UW

- 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 Mohammad Ashraf against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06574/FUL, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is additional pitched roof front dormer, retrospective.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of additional pitched roof front dormer at 73 Adelaide Road, High Wycombe, HP13 6UW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/06574/FUL, dated 27 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 73 Adelaide Road is a semi detached two storey house located in an established residential area. It has the same ridge height as its attached neighbour and has had a hip to gable extension and a full width single storey front extension. The land slopes steeply downwards from north to south so that the houses have staggered rooflines to accommodate the difference in levels. The front building line along the street is noticeably staggered with the houses progressively set further back on this side of the street from north to south and progressively further forward on the other side from north to south. Many of the houses have front porches and larger front extensions.
4. The relevant policies in this case are CP9 and DM35 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 and appropriate in character. The Council's SPD *Householder Planning and Design Guidance* provides detailed advice on residential alterations including dormer windows.
5. The development proposal has been completed.

6. I consider that the dormer is not unduly prominent in the street scene. It is relatively modest in size with a pitched roof set well within the roof slope and with tile hanging to match the main roof tiles in accordance with the guidance in the SPD. It is visible from the street directly in front of the house, but it is not readily visible from longer views along the street from the north because No. 73 is set back from and at a lower level than No.75 and it is screened by the neighbouring houses up the hill. Although it is more visible from the south it is partially obscured by the main bulk and roof of No. 71 and not unduly prominent.
7. The Council's SPD promotes a preference for dormers to be located at the rear. However, although front dormers are not typical of the immediate surroundings, I have observed that they are not uncommon elsewhere in many parts of the Council's area. The dormer at No. 73 complies in many respects with the general advice for dormers in the SPD, for example in respect of its location within the roof slope and insofar as it is not substantially larger than the window it contains. Its pitched roof form appears similar to the example at 11.3 in the SPD and is almost identical to one at No. 66 opposite, which was allowed on appeal in 2018.
8. I conclude that the development causes no material harm to the character and appearance of the house itself or the surrounding area and that it is consistent with local plan policies CP9 and DM35.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. Since the development has been completed no conditions are necessary.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR