



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3351282

56 Underwood Road, High Wycombe HP13 6YB

- 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 Arshad Mahmood against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council (Wycombe Area)
 - The application Ref is 24/05920/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of first floor rear extension, construction of hip to gable roof extension including insertion of 1 x front dormer and 1 x rear dormer with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. The proposals relate to extensions and alterations to the existing property including a first floor rear extension, hip to gable roof extension with a front and a rear dormer. I understand that it follows an earlier permission for a similar scheme approved by the Council under its Ref: 20/06049/FUL but which included for two front roof lights rather than a front dormer.
3. The Council's reason for refusal on the proposal before me solely relates to the proposed front dormer extension and its effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area. From all the information before me as well as my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view.
4. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal relates to the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the east side of Underwood Road and set within a predominantly residential area, mainly comprising semi-detached properties with variations in their design. Because of the slope of the land, the properties on the eastern side of the road are set a lower level to those on the western side.
6. The dwelling has been previously extended, and the proposal would include a first floor rear extension and loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension with a front and a rear dormer.

7. Although there is some variation to the design of the individual pairs of properties, as well as subsequent extensions and alterations, the roof forms are uninterrupted and there are no other dormer windows on the front roof slopes in the local vicinity. There are a small number of rooflights on front roof slopes, but these follow the roof planes and do not therefore break up the pattern of roof forms along the street. The introduction of the proposed front roof dormer would be a bulky, incongruous and over prominent addition to the existing property, and to the pattern of development in the street scene, particularly in breaking up the uninterrupted roof forms along the street.
8. Furthermore, the proposed dormer window would be poorly designed in relation to the proportions of the built form and pattern of fenestration on the existing property. It would be wider than the gable bay below and this would add further harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling as well as to the street scene.
9. The proposed dormer would be a visually discordant addition to both the existing property as well as the street scene. It would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the existing property as well as the street scene. This would conflict with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the adopted Local Plan (2019), the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2020) and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
10. The Council has also raised in its reason for refusal that, if approved, the proposal would set a precedent for other similar proposals in the future. However, each proposal must be judged on its individual merits and I do not consider that any weight can be attached to this concern. It does not, however, outweigh the harm I have already concluded.

Other Considerations

11. An objection has been raised by a neighbour in Bowerdean Road where the rear gardens back onto the rear gardens of the properties on the east side of Underwood Road. However, I am satisfied that there would be appropriate distances between the rear proposed extensions and the neighbouring properties and gardens to the rear that there would be no material harm to the living conditions of neighbours, from overlooking and loss of privacy. The Council also raised no objection in this regard. The objection also makes reference to hindering the view of the park behind, but the loss of a view is not a planning matter I can take into account.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR