



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/22/3303823

3 Roundhill Cottages, Kimblewick Road, Kimblewick HP17 8TB

- 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 Steven Golla against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council
 - The application Ref 22/05250/FUL, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing roof space to habitable accommodation. New dormer window to side (south facing) roof slope, and rooflight to rear (east facing) roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the conversion of existing roof space to habitable accommodation. New dormer window to side (south facing) roof slope, and rooflight to rear (east facing) roof at 3 Roundhill Cottages, Kimblewick Road, Kimblewick HP17 8TB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/05250/FUL, dated 1 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development subject to this decision is complete and I was able to view the development when I attended my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. 3 Roundhill Cottages comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, set back from the highway with frontage parking. It is situated in a flat and relatively isolated position in the open countryside, characterised by large, open fields. The dormer has a flat roof with two windows and is located on the side of a rear projection of the dwelling facing the open fields.
5. There is no consistent character in the locality. However, there is a flat roof extension to a front elevation of a nearby dwelling.
6. The dormer is not visible from the road to the front of the property. The mass of the dormer is broken up by the installation of two windows. Whilst the dormer does have a flat roof, and this aspect would not strictly accord with the

Householder Planning and Design Guide (the Design Guide), by virtue of the matching materials to the vertical sides of the dormer with the roof of the existing dwelling the dormer window does not appear unduly prominent or incongruous.

7. The neighbouring dwelling (approved under ref 20/05863/FUL) is not yet constructed. The proposed dormer window alters the appearance of the building such that the appearance of the two houses would differ. However, given its location this would not affect the relationship between the two dwellings.
8. The Appellant and Council have both drawn my attention to the refused Certificate of Lawful Development (ref 21/08437/CLP) for a dormer window of a similar design, size and position as the appeal before me. This was refused as the proposed window would have been openable and of clear glazing. Based on correspondence between both parties the size, mass and roof design would otherwise have accorded with Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GDPO). This is a significant material planning consideration in my determination of this appeal in terms of the overall visual appearance of the dormer.
9. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the dormer does not harm the character or appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies CP9, DM36, DM44 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019 (Local Plan), Policy KIM2 of the Great & Little Kimble-Cum-Marsh Neighbourhood Plan 2021 (Neighbourhood Plan) and the Design Guide or those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek good design sympathetic to the local area.

Other Matters

10. The Council indicate they consider the rooflight does not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling. I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

11. As the development has been completed, it is not necessary to impose the standard time limit for commencement, neither is it necessary to require that it be carried out in accordance with any plans.
12. The Council have suggested a condition for the provision of ecological features. Having regard to the Framework and the Planning Practice Guide (PPG) I do not consider this mitigation is necessary bearing in mind the scale of development and the alternative position of an extension in accordance with the GDPO.

Conclusion

For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan and Framework as a whole, and taking account of all other matters, the appeal is allowed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR