



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3311958

173 Aston Clinton Road, Weston Turville, Buckinghamshire HP22 5AD

- 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 N Khan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02201/APP, dated 16 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension to create a larger dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The loft extension subject of this appeal is in the process of being constructed but has yet to be completed. Accordingly, in this decision it is referred to as the proposed development or proposed roof extension. Other alterations undertaken to the appeal property are subject of a separate planning permission (Ref 20/02828/APP) and whether the works accord with the approved details is not a matter for determination as part of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The proposed development comprises an extension to the roof of a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which forms part of a linear residential development fronting Aston Clinton Road. The appeal scheme includes a hip to gable roof extension and the erection of a dormer within the rear roofslope. The Council's *Design Guide on Residential Extensions* recognises that rear roof slopes, which are less visible, may be able to accept larger additions but these need to be carefully designed as over-dominant or box-like roof extensions can be particularly incongruous.
5. The dwellings fronting the road generally possess hipped roof forms, including some recently constructed properties which have crown roofs albeit they have the slopes of hipped roofs. The proposed gable roof extension would not reflect the predominant roof forms and there would be some unbalancing of the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, the change to the roof form would not alone be a reason for this appeal to fail.

6. The form and size of the proposed gable roof would be significantly accentuated by the siting and extensive bulk of the proposed dormer's side cheek. It is the combination of the change to the roof form and the dormer's side cheek which would result in the proposed development being visually prominent within the streetscene when viewed from the west.
7. The proposed rear dormer would be erected across almost the full width of the extended gable roof and would be sited above a 2-storey rear extension which possesses a hipped roof. By reason of its size, the proposed dormer would appear a large, bulky and box like addition to the extended roof. Its width would visually dominate the rear roofslope and result in the impression of a third storey being added to the property. Further, the form and size the proposed dormer extension would also significantly unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings when viewed from neighbouring gardens.
8. When viewed from the rear, including neighbouring gardens, the proposed dormer would visually be very limited setbacks from the roof's ridge and side elevation. This lack of a setback from the edge of the roof contributes to the extensive bulk of the cheek being visible from the road. There would also be an awkward visual juxtaposition between the proposed dormer and the 2-storey extension's hipped roof.
9. When taken collectively with the approved alterations, the scale of the proposed dormer would physically and visually dominate and overwhelm the character and appearance of the original 2-storey semi-detached dwelling. The *Design Guide* recognises that incremental additions can distort the original composition of a relatively small house.
10. The appellant has referred to alterations at 193 Tring Road as a precedent. From what could be observed and based upon the documents provided by the appellant, this other scheme can be distinguished from the proposed development, including by reason of its context and because the proposal before the Council for No. 193 indicated greater setting back of the dormer from the edges of the roof. Limited weight has been given to this other scheme in the determination of this appeal.
11. The appellant has raised concerns about the financial consequences of this appeal failing but the proposed development has been assessed on its own planning circumstances having regard to the relevant development plan policy.
12. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan. Amongst other matters, this policy refers to development proposals taking into account the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings, including scale and context, and also the local distinctiveness and vernacular character of the locality, including in terms of form and architectural detailing. Policy H2 of the Weston Turville Neighbourhood Plan is not of direct relevance to domestic extensions. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR