
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3240561
Pitmilly, Upton, Dinton HP17 8UF

- 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 White-Jones against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03106/APP, dated 21 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, enlargement of existing rear dormer, front rooflight, associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposals were amended during the application process. The Council made its decision on the drawings listed in the Officer Report, and I have determined the appeal on the same basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. There are a variety of house styles and designs in the surrounding area, though the appeal site consists of a semi-detached chalet bungalow which is set back from its front boundary in a substantial plot. The dwelling has single storey projections to the front and rear, and a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope. Although there are differing elements to the dwelling, overall it retains an uncomplicated form with simple roof lines, which is reflective of the neighbouring semi-detached dwelling of which the appeal site forms an integral part.
5. The proposal is for a single storey flat roof extension and dormer to the rear of the property which would replace the existing dormer. Whilst overall the proposals would maintain the horizontal emphasis of the existing property, the dormer would be significantly larger, extending beyond the existing roof plane and over the proposed single storey rear extension.
6. It would result in a substantial roof form, and top-heavy appearance to the building, that would be at odds with its established character. Whilst the

- dormer would be inset from the side elevation and lower than the existing roof ridge, its extension over the roof of the rear extension is not well considered.
7. There would be a clear lack of distinction between these two elements with the dormer also overlapping the roof of the existing single storey rear projection. Whilst views of the bottom of the dormer may be more restricted, the proposal would overall result in a bulky roof arrangement that would dominate the host property. Although not visually prominent from the surrounding area, the dormer would diminish the character of the host property and have an unacceptable harmful effect on its character and appearance.
 8. The appellant has stated they would consider the use of alternative materials for the dormer, and these details could be required by condition. However, a different material would not be sufficient to address the harm I have identified above, in relation to the overall size of the proposed dormer.
 9. It is acknowledged that the scheme would raise no concerns in relation to impact on the street scene, living conditions of adjacent properties or highways and parking, though I consider these would have a neutral effect, and therefore do not weigh in favour of the appeal. It is also noted that the proposal would provide improved living accommodation for the appellant, though I am mindful that this benefit would be personal to the appellant and would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
 10. On this basis, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, 2004, which seek to ensure that developments respect and complement the appearance of the existing dwelling. For the same reasons the proposals would fail to achieve the high-quality design requirements of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Residential Extensions, 2013, or the National Planning Policy Framework.
 11. The appellant has referred to amendments that they consider would address the Council's concerns and state the difference between the schemes is negligible. However, the illustration submitted does show a scheme that would be distinctly different to the scheme before me. The amended dormer would be much reduced in size and bulk and sit more comfortably within the existing roof slope. Nonetheless, I have considered the proposal on its own merits and do not find that any such fall-back position provides justification for overcoming the harm I have identified here.
 12. It is acknowledged that there were no neighbour or Parish Council objections submitted to the original planning application though having considered the appeal on its merits this does not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR