



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3231944 52 Pound Hill, Great Brickhill MK17 9AS

- 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 Ian Chaplin against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01098/APP, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is an extension over the existing single storey part of the dwelling. Roof lights and matching materials to be used.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 52 Pound Hill, is located within the village of Great Brickhill which is typified by a range of modern one and two storey, detached and semi-detached, brick and tile residential dwellings.
4. The existing dwelling sits on a corner plot at a minor junction with Rotten Row and Green End, both of which slope away from the appeal site. The building is mostly screened from the road and neighbouring properties by a low brick wall, mature planting and fencing. The appeal site is accessed via a small side road and mirrors the neighbouring property. No 52 is a modern one and two-storey dwelling, that includes a gable and attached double garage.
5. The proposal would increase the building height to two-storeys and include an additional glazed gable that would rise above the existing gable and ridge. New fenestration is also proposed to the side extension and the existing gable.
6. The development would increase the mass and height of the building and change the form of the appeal property. This increase is incongruous with the local area. Further, due to ground level changes, which run down from Pound Hill towards Rotten Row and Green End, harm would be caused by the dominant appearance of the proposal along the adjacent highways.

7. This visual juxtaposition, compared to the prevailing pattern of development within the local area, would be further harmed by the proposed fenestration to the new gable and side extension, which does not respect the character of the original building.
8. The proposal would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDCLP) as supported by the Aylesbury Vale District Council Design Guide, which amongst other aims, requires that proposals for extensions should respect the appearance of the dwelling and complement the character of the original building.
9. For similar reasons, the proposal would be contrary to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, including Paragraph 127 which indicates the developments should be visually attractive and be sympathetic to the local character of the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would not accord with the adopted development plan and as there are no material considerations, indicating a decision otherwise, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR