The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3346678
78 Bookerhill Road, High Wycombe HP12 4EX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr M Ikhlaq against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - West Area (Wycombe).
- The application Ref is 24/05176/FUL.
- The development proposed is described as "hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer extension (retrospective)"

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as "hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer extension (retrospective)" at 78 Bookerhill Road, High Wycombe HP12 4EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/05176/FUL, subject to the following condition:

   1) The development hereby permitted is as shown on approved plans: A1.3, A1.4 and A1.5

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. In addition, I have used the above description as it most accurately identifies the works to which the appeal relates. This differs from the application form but has been referred to by the appellant in this way and it appears on the decision notice. No party will therefore be prejudiced by my use of it in this decision. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that has been extended to the rear. The adjoining neighbour has a matching dormer, and the main roof terminates as a gable to the side. The surrounding area is relatively uniform insofar as there being symmetrical semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. There are some instances of extensions to the rear and to the loft which are generally subservient.

5. Whilst not reflecting the prevailing hipped roof forms and being obvious in the street scene, the gable conversion now mirrors the adjoining neighbour. In this respect, it reinstates symmetry between two properties and reflects the consistency of the area. The same can be said of the dormer to the rear, which now matches the adjoined neighbour. Whilst of some size, it has a cascading effect of scale to the rear of the building which, when viewed in the context of the previously approved and nearing completion two and single storey extensions, displays some design subservience. In addition, the smaller windows on the dormer reinforce a hierarchical decrease to the appearance of fenestration moving up the building. This is a traditional approach which, overall, reduces the visual effect of the dormer's mass in the roof space.

6. With these matters in mind, the proposal would be acceptable for the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would comply with Policy CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan 2019, Section 12 of the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2020, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard, amongst other things.

Conditions

7. I have referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes but more to identify them as opposed to works being carried out in accordance therewith, to reflect the retrospective nature of the scheme. I have not included a matching materials condition for the same reason and since I see no problem with the materials that have been used. The Council has recommended a condition for no openings without prior authorisation to be created in the eastern and western flanks of the extension. However, this would not be necessary as a separate permission or compliance with the permitted development regime would be needed for the insertion of new openings therein. The Council has also recommended a condition for a bat and bird box. However, this would not be necessary due to the scale of the development, and I have no specific justification before me therefore.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR