



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/25/3359702

Langham Broken Gate Lane, Denham, Uxbridge UB9 4LA

- 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 Adrian Tipa against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application Ref is PL/24/3020/FA.
 - The development proposed is front/side/rear roof extension with raised ridge, side rooflight and solar panels; removal of the existing front and rear dormers and insertion of rear and side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front/side/rear roof extension with raised ridge, side rooflight and solar panels; removal of the existing front and rear dormers and insertion of rear and side dormers at Langham Broken Gate Lane, Denham, Uxbridge UB9 4LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/24/3020/FA, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 0423-PLA 60A, 0423-PLA 61A, 0423-PLA 62A, 0423-PLA 53A, 0423-PLA 54A, 0423-PLA 55A and Location Plan PP-13450770v1.
 - 3) The proposed windows shown above ground floor level in the side elevations of the proposed extensions hereby approved, shall not be glazed or reglazed other than with obscure glass and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window or roof light is installed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. The Framework establishes that development within the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate unless one of the specified exceptions applies. Exception (c), as set out in paragraph 154 of the Framework, allows for the

extension and alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

4. The South Bucks District Local Plan (Local Plan) pre-dates the Framework, but in relation to extensions to properties within the Green Belt, policies GB1 and GB10 are broadly consistent, indicating that limited extensions and alterations to existing dwellings will be allowed. The supporting text to policy GB10 indicates that extensions, together with previous extensions, which increase the floor area by more than half, will not be regarded as small. It does, however, also encourage additional floor space within the confines of the building and advises that only the development which increases the actual volume of the building will count as an extension.
5. The appeal property has been previously extended through a side extension and alterations to the roof. The Council indicates that, in total, the existing additions, together with the appeal proposal, would equate to a 119% increase. This is assumed to relate to the floor area, although it is not qualified and is based on an original property of 112.2 sqm, a figure with which the appellant concurs, but which is referred to as the footprint.
6. While Langham was originally a bungalow and first-floor accommodation was subsequently created, facilitated by dormer windows and alterations to the roof, I agree with the appellant that a large proportion of that additional floor area was within the confines of the building. I have not been provided with any plans of the original property, and many of the various figures provided by the appellant relate to a comparison with the existing property rather than the original. They do, however, calculate that the total floor area of the first floor, including the proposed extensions, would be approximately 81 sqm. I cannot agree with the appellant's assertion that the exception under paragraph 154 of the Framework allows for a doubling of the floor area, but I do accept that the Council's figure overestimates the actual increase. Moreover, the assessment is in relation to 'size', not just floor area.
7. The proposal would not increase the footprint of the building. The first-floor addition would raise its height with a gabled-ended protrusion to the front. While a notable addition that would change the property's appearance, it would extend over part of the existing crown roof and replace the existing large front dormer. In my view, there would be a visual enhancement to the roof design, and the property would have originally had an apex to the roof. The increase in height is limited, with only the ridgeline at the full height, and it would still be a relatively low-level building within the mix of properties along Broken Gate Lane.
8. The individual elements: roof addition, dormer windows and the existing extension, are not of a significant scale and integrate with the design of the property. The property also sits within a large plot. There would be no adverse impact on the character of the area, and there would be no noticeable loss of openness around the property. As a result of the development, massing would be added to the property, although it would primarily be within the existing envelope of the built form, and much of the increase in floor area is associated with the first floor use rather than a spatial increase.
9. Overall, having regard to these various aspects, I do not find that in combination the alterations amount to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the

original dwelling. As such, the proposal would not be inappropriate development. The proposal therefore accords with the Framework and the general provisions of Local Plan policies GB1 and GB10.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans for certainty.
11. I have also imposed a condition, as suggested by the Council, to restrict the proposed first-floor windows in the side elevations to obscure glazing to ensure privacy. However, opportunities for further windows are limited and/or would be aligned with the roof slope. As such, I do not consider further restrictions to be necessary. It is also proposed that permitted development rights relating to extensions and roof alterations are removed. Again, potential opportunities are limited given the existing alterations, and the Framework advises that planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so. I have therefore not imposed either of these conditions.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out the appeal is allowed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR