



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/D/24/3350630

Meadway, Mill Lane, Stokenchurch, Buckinghamshire HP14 3TW

- 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 Radek Anoszko against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/06154/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with gable extension to the rear elevation and 4 no roof lights to create a new bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. On 22 November 2023, all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) in England and Wales became “National Landscapes” (NLs). I have therefore made reference to NLs in my recommendation and specifically referred to the Chiltern AONB as the Chiltern National Landscape (NL). However, for the avoidance of doubt, the legal designation and policy status of these areas are unchanged, and I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and the requirement to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Chilterns National Landscape (NL).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a single storey detached bungalow with a hipped roof. The dwelling has two single storey extensions, one is a conservatory with a hipped roof and another a single storey rear and side extension with a flat roof. The surrounding area is a mix of residential and commercial uses which has a varied character and appearance. However, there is another bungalow immediately adjacent to the host dwelling which has a similar character and appearance. Properties in the surrounding area have either hipped or gable roofs that are mostly

consistently applied to the whole property. The site is set within the Chiltern NL which has a residential area set within a wider landscape character of wooded valleys and rolling hills.

6. The proposed gable extension would extend the full width of the existing property and would not be set down from the existing ridge or set up from the eaves. Although the proposed development maintains the existing footprint, the gable extensions would add significant bulk to the existing roofscape, which would not appear as subservient and would overwhelm the existing scale of the bungalow.
7. The proposed development would have an unequal roof pitch which would unbalance the property between the front and rear elevation, creating a visually heavy roof to one side. Adding a gable end to the hip roof would not respect the existing roof form of the dwelling and would appear as contrived. Although there is a mix in roof forms within this area and hip to gable roof forms do exist, they are not widely demonstrated within this area. Additionally, even though the neighbouring bungalow has a slightly different roof form, the dwelling has a similar scale, form, design and materials, to the appeal property. Therefore, the proposed development would unbalance this pair of bungalows and would not respect the character and appearance of the appeal property and neighbouring dwelling.
8. As there would be limited visibility of the proposed development, the gable extension would have a limited adverse impact on the landscape and scenic beauty of the NL.
9. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the property, site and locality and NL. The proposed development would conflict with Policies CP9, DM35 and DM36 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) (LP). Together, these Policies seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design, respects the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area with regard to form and design, and is subservient in scale. In addition, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DM30 of the LP which states that development is required to conserve, and where possible enhance, the natural beauty of the Chilterns NL.
10. The proposed development would also be contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. The Framework also requires that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The proposed development would fail to comply with this requirement.
11. Additionally, the extension would not meet the guidance set out within the Householder Planning and Design Guide SPD (2020) and Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (2010) which outlines that roof extensions that alter the basic shape of the roof, for example, from a hip to a gable end will be unacceptable where they would result in an imbalance creating a visually heavy roof to one side.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has stated that they wish to adapt the property to meet modern day living expectations. However, this would be a private benefit that would only relate to a single household. As such this would not carry any significant weight.

Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that this proposed development is the only way to achieve this.

13. Although the appellant has referred to permitted development rights, as these do not apply to properties within the NL this is not a relevant factor in the appeal.
14. There have been no third-party objections, and the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. However, the absence of harm is a neutral matter that weighs neither for nor against the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no identified other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR