
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/21/3285926

12 St Hughs Avenue, High Wycombe, HP13 7UD

- 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 Mrs Saleem against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06867/FUL, dated 17 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is gable to gable roof extension with rear dormer window and two roof windows to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of gable to gable roof extension with rear dormer window and two roof windows to front roof slope at 12 St Hughs Avenue, High Wycombe, HP13 7UD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/06867/FUL, dated 17 June 2021 and the following plans submitted with it: 1362/23, 1362/24, 1362/26, 1362/27, 1362/29 and 1362/31.

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. 12 St Hughs Avenue is a two storey semi detached house in an established residential area. The road slopes steeply upwards from east to west and the roof lines of the houses are stepped upwards in response to the topography. The front building line is also irregularly staggered. Most of the houses are of brick with tile hanging to the first floor.
4. The relevant policies in this case are DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 which, among other things, require development, including residential extensions, to be of a high quality of design and to respect the character and appearance of the surroundings. The Council's SPD *Householder Planning and Design Guidance* provides detailed advice on residential extensions.
5. The development proposal has been completed.
6. The property has a somewhat complex planning history relating to extensions to the rear and a loft conversion. There are single and two storey extensions

to the rear. My understanding is that planning permission has been granted for an increase in the height of the roof, and a Certificate of Lawfulness has been granted for the construction of a box dormer. On the basis of the information before me, it appears that the latter was smaller than that constructed.

7. The raised roof is evident on site, as is the rear flat roof dormer, the subject of this appeal. The latter is not set in from the sides or away from the ridge and eaves and appears large in proportion to the original house when seen in private views from the surrounding houses. Although it is larger than the dormer for which the Certificate of Lawfulness was granted, I consider that it does not appear significantly more disproportionate than the latter would have done. Similarly, I am not persuaded that it is significantly more noticeable in views of it from the more public domain in St Hughs Avenue. Long views from the street both up and down the hill are obscured by the neighbouring houses and it is really only noticeable from the street in oblique views from close by.
8. The Council refers to the possibility of setting a precedent for further development of a similar nature and that the cumulative effect of this would harm the character and appearance of the area. However, it is an established planning principle that each case is determined on its merits. There are some examples of similar developments in the surrounding area, both of raised roofs and large box dormers. While these have some effect on the regularity of the architectural character of the street scene this is limited to the rooflines and the rear of the houses.
9. Although this development is not strictly in accordance with the advice in the SPD, I consider that, on balance, it is not so harmful as to warrant dismissing the appeal.
10. I conclude that the development does not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and that it is consistent with local plan policies DM35 and DM36.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR