
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3229782
26 Manor Crescent, Wendover HP22 6HH

- 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 Mrs Bronwen Hughes against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/03745/APP, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is 2 storey side extension and new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There have been a number of revisions to the plans since the date on the application form. The Council has confirmed that it has used the plans Refs: 101E and 102E submitted on 19 February 2019 in its determination. These are the plans on which the council made its decision, therefore, I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. I have, for completeness, used the appellant's full name, which is set out on the appeal form in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The Council have not raised any specific concerns in respect of the effect of the new vehicular access, subject to the imposition of planning conditions. As a result, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on Manor Crescent, a relatively narrow road that is predominately residential in character. There is also an entrance to a school off the road, however, the views of the school buildings along the road are largely obscured due to the trees and shrubs which run along its border. The properties on the road are characterised by pairs of 2-storey semi-detached properties, which are finished in either red brick or orange-brown brick. Despite the variations that have occurred to the properties over time, there remains a rhythm to the pattern of development in the area.

6. The host property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling with brown concrete tiles and orange-brown bricks. The garden to the front of the property is bordered by high hedges. At the side there is a wooden close boarded fence and a gate, which leads to the existing garage.
7. The appeal site is on a corner plot and is on the inner bend at the point where the road curves. As such, it sits within a prominent location in the street scene. Due to its location and positioning on the bend, it has a relationship with its own row of properties, as well as those that sit to the rear of the property.
8. Even though the proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and down from the property's existing ridge line, the proposal would bring the built part of the appeal property closer to its boundary with the road. Whilst I note that there is a mix of hipped and gabled roofs in the street scene, the form of development would significantly alter the current style and size of the property and unbalance the symmetry with the neighbouring property. Although the extension would be constructed in materials to match the host property, and innovation can be acceptable, this would not help to integrate the proposal into the existing street scene. The proposed extension would be a readily visible and an imposing feature within the street scene. This would be particularly apparent when travelling along the road from the school gates, due to this section of road being relatively long and straight. The narrowness of the road would also exacerbate the size and scale of the extension on the street scene. As such, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition and impede on the openness that currently exists on this part of the road.
9. The appellant has cited other examples of side extensions in the area which have been approved, namely 16, 17 and 18 Manor Crescent, which I observed on my site visit. However, the nature of these extensions are not directly comparable and are not as prominent or as readily visible as the proposal before me. The appellant has also provided examples of other extensions on the road at 20, 25, 29, 31 and 37 Manor Crescent. However, I do not have details of these schemes before me or know whether they benefit from planning permission. In any event, the presence of the aforementioned developments does not automatically mean the appeal proposal should be allowed. I have determined this appeal on its own planning merits, having regard to the site's context.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, adopted January 2004. These policies, amongst other things, seek new development to be of high-quality design, which respects and complements the local distinctiveness, setting and character of the area.

Conclusion

11. Although there may be modest social and economic benefits arising from the proposal, these are outweighed by the significant harm that I have found in respect of the main issue. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR