
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/16/3162294
106 High Street North, Stewkley LU7 0EP

- 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 David and Sarah Terry against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02888/APP, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 106 High Street North, Stewkley LU7 0EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02888/APP, dated 3 August 2016, 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 following approved plan: 16/DT/001.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Stewkley Conservation Area (SCA).

Reasons

3. The SCA covers the majority of Stewkley, which is a linear settlement focussed along High Street North and High Street South. There is little consistency in the appearance of the dwellings in the SCA and in the vicinity of the appeal site there are detached, semi-detached, single-storey and two-storey buildings displaying a variety of designs and dating from different periods. The appeal site accommodates a semi-detached two-storey property.
 4. The proposal would involve the removal of an existing extension which projects from part of the front elevation of the house, and a small bow window. The
-

proposed extension would not protrude as far forward as the existing front extension, but would stretch the width of the dwelling.

5. The proposed extension would be modest in its depth and overall scale and, as stated on the planning application forms, the finishing materials to be used would match those used in the host dwelling. Also its hipped roof design would reflect that of the main house. As such, whilst I recognise that front elevations can be vulnerable to unsympathetic extensions, in this case I do not consider the proposed extension would appear disproportionate or unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the main house.
6. The extension would result in the house failing to mirror the other semi-detached property at No 108. However due to the existing front extension and bow window at the appeal site, neither of which are replicated at No 108, and because the two houses are finished in different colours, there is little balance at present. Therefore I do not consider the proposal would result in the loss of any symmetrical characteristic.
7. Accordingly, the development would not appear incongruous in the street scene and would not harm the character and appearance of the SCA. Consequently the proposal would comply with Policy GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') which requires new development to respect the characteristics of the site and its surroundings, and Policy GP53 of the Local Plan which seeks the preservation or enhancement of conservation areas. The development would also accord with the advice in the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'), which both support good design.

Conditions

8. In accordance with the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development. I have also attached a condition specifying the relevant plan in order to provide certainty, and a condition relating to finishing materials so as to preserve the character and appearance of the SCA.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR