

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/16/3161960

2 Risborough Road, Kingsey HP17 8NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Killinger against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02903/APP, dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as Part first storey front extension, part two storey side extension and part single storey rear extension with new open porch to front and rear. Re-render dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is:
 - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the proposed first floor front and two-storey side extension.

Reasons

3. The dwelling forms the right hand of a pair of similar extended semi-detached dwellings on the south side of Risborough Road. The pair of dwellings are characterised by a prominent pair of gable front projections with horizontal brick detailing, with detail over first floor window and a shared chimney stack. The host dwelling has been extended to single storey at the side. The adjoining property No 1 has also been extended to the side.
 4. I have carefully considered the appellants' representations relating to the design of the first floor front and two-storey side extension including the proposed ridge height. Moreover, I have taken account of the scale, siting and design of the existing extensions at No 1. However, whilst the side extension at No 1 is substantial, it differs from the appellants' proposal in that it is significantly set back from the main gable fronted elevation, ensuring that it is subordinate to the pair of dwellings. Consequently, the scale, bulk and siting of the proposed extension level with the original projecting gable would appear unduly dominant and therefore visually un-balance the architectural symmetry of the semi-detached dwellings.
-

5. Furthermore, the introduction of the pair of front gables would materially harm the architectural prominence of the original gable front projection of the host dwelling and therefore materially unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings, further compounding the proposals incompatibility with the host dwelling and consequently the surrounding area. Moreover, I am not persuaded that the introduction of the two gable features would materially reduce the visual bulk of the proposed extension and in particular that of its roof.
6. Having come to the conclusions above, it follows that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, this seeks to ensure that development respects and complements the appearance of the dwelling and its setting and its surroundings. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Aylesbury Vale Residential Extensions Design Guide.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, and having carefully considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR