



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3243768

65 Manor Park, Maids Moreton, Buckingham MK18 1RB

- 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 Tim Venn against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02483/APP, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Proposed new double storey side, single storey rear extensions with new front and side boundary wall".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms a link-detached dwelling with an attached single garage. The site lies on a corner plot and occupies an elevated position within the street scene and sits with an estate of dwellings that are arranged in a linear manner along the estate roads. There is a degree of uniformity to the layout of dwellings which I find to be a principal characteristic of the area.
4. The appeal property has been previously extended with a two storey side extension on its southern elevation towards Foscote Road. The proposal seeks a further two storey extension on its northern elevation that would replace the existing garage with a bedroom over and a further single storey extension to the rear to create a new family room. Although the existing dwelling has been rendered, it is nonetheless read as part of the properties along Manor Park, sharing similar qualities to its neighbour with a gable fronted elevation as well as other properties in the vicinity that contain horizontal boarding under windows. Thus, I am not persuaded that the appeal building should be read as a transition between the mixed development along Foscote Road and the dwellings on Manor Park.
5. While the existing extension is quite large, the original property can still be appreciated and how it relates to neighbouring development and the wider area. In contrast the proposed extensions would create a large mass of development that would alter the appearance and scale of the building so that

it no longer is read as part of a coherent and planned development that exists along Manor Park. The scale of the resultant building would be at odds with the relatively simple form of dwellings that are within the vicinity of the appeal site.

6. Furthermore, the size of the side and rear extensions would also consume the original building to such a degree that it would appear as an incongruous and discordant form of development that would detract from and interrupt the regular pattern of development along this part of Manor Park, resulting in material harm to the established character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding the setting back of the proposed side extension, both side extensions could be viewed at the site time from the front of the property and the overall harm resulting from the proposed extensions would nonetheless be visible from surrounding properties.
7. The development would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and the host property. It would be in conflict with Policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Council Local Plan 2004 and the Aylesbury Vale Design Guide for Residential Extensions which seek, amongst other things, that developments respect the character and appearance of an existing building and complement the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to other extensions that have been granted planning permission in the area, notably at 3 and 34 Manor Park. However, I have not been provided with sufficient details of what led to these properties being granted planning permission to enable me to make a direct comparison to the development before me. Moreover, I have considered this appeal on its own merits which is one of the fundamental principles that underpins the planning system.
9. Reference has also been made to the potential to carry out elements of the scheme as 'permitted development'. However, whether or not planning permission is required for the proposal is not a matter that is before me as part of this appeal, as other mechanisms exist to resolve such issues. Consequently, I have determined this appeal on its merits and in light of all representations made.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR