



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/25/3359740

20 Wingate Avenue, High Wycombe HP13 7QP

- 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 Mohammad Moniruzzaman against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/07623/FUL.
 - The development proposed is to remove an existing side garage and build a double storey side extension and changes to the fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a semi-detached two storey dwelling where there are a number of flat roof parts. However, these are largely at ground floor level to the side and rear. There is a first floor flat area but this is fairly minimal in depth and looking from the street tends to be seen against the backdrop of the main pitched roof above anyway.
4. However, the flat roof on the proposed two storey extension would be relatively extensive and to the side of the property, abutting the base of the hip to the main roof. In consequence, there would be an unduly awkward juxtaposition of contrasting roof forms in an elevated position. Given factors such as its extent, height and position, the flat-topped addition would be particularly prominent in views from the street with its discordant presence being readily apparent.
5. This feature would be especially unusual and visually obtrusive in the context of the other similar hipped roof dwellings found in the vicinity. Their pleasant and repetitive form give a significant consistency to the streetscene. There is also a noticeable degree of spaciousness with fairly generous distances tending to be found between the side walls of such properties at first floor level. These gaps are often above single storey additions with flat roofs such as that at the appeal site which would be demolished to enable the extension to be built.
6. In this instance the roof form would provide an abrupt and jarring contrast with the main roof of the host dwelling and other properties. The side addition

- would also appear unduly cramped given the absence of any gap to the boundary. It would therefore appear unsympathetic and incongruous, unacceptably at odds with the general pattern of development in the locality.
7. The Appellant indicates that there would be no increase in the area of flat roof and that materials would be used to match the existing dwelling. However, despite matters such as these it is concluded that for the above reasons the character and appearance of the host dwelling, locality and the streetscene would be harmed.
 8. In these circumstances there would be conflict with Wycombe District Local Plan, 2019, Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 which, among other things, and taken together intend that development should achieve a high quality of design and respect the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.
 9. The proposal would be contrary to the Householder Planning and Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, 2020, where it is advised that the roof form and pitch of side extensions should complement the main dwelling and a minimum 1m gap should be left between the site boundaries at first floor level.
 10. It is indicated that insulation and energy efficiency would be improved. However, there is nothing to quantify the extent of any improvement or to show that this could only result by building such a visually detrimental extension. In this case the improved bedroom layout would be achieved at the unacceptable expense of the quality of the built environment.
 11. The Appellant expresses dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of the application. Nevertheless, this matter does not, in itself, confer acceptability and I must consider the appeal on its own merits.
 12. Because of the harm that would arise in relation to character and appearance and taking account of all other matters raised, it is determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR