



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/22/3308337

3 Walnut Grove, Wooburn Green, Buckinghamshire, HP10 0AL

- 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 David Whiting against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06511/FUL, dated 1 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is insertion of 2 x linked side dormers with pitched roofs, 1 x side dormer and 1 x roof light to roof-slope and insertion of windows in gables, all in connection with loft conversion (Alternative scheme to PP21/06772/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in a small cul de sac. It is aligned with its gable ends at the front and rear so that the main roof plane is along the sides of the property and is unaltered. Mature trees at the appeal site rear garden boundary screen views of the property from houses that back on to the site. The orientation of the house also prevents views of the sides of the roof from the front of the house. However, the roof is visible from neighbouring gardens and from the rear of houses on Holtspur Lane.
5. The Council's Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (SPD) advises that dormers should be kept as small as possible and should not generally be much larger than the windows within them. Although the 2 pitched roof dormers meet this and other requirements in respect of their position within the roof plane, the flat roofed link between them presents a blank façade and additional mass out of proportion with the

windows. The result is an awkward addition to the roof that fails to meet the requirements of the SPD.

6. The proposed flat roofed extension on the other side of the roof would contain no windows and thus appear bulkier and even more incongruous than the link between the dormer windows. I note that the roofscape within the surrounding area is varied and includes flat roofed dormers on the rear roofs of houses on Holtspur Lane, and flat and pitched roof dormers on nearby flats. However, these differ from the proposed development in that they are proportionate in scale to their windows which help break up their mass. Overall, I conclude that the proposed roof extensions would harm the appearance of the existing house and surrounding area and the proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) and the SPD which require high quality development that respects the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR