
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3238905

69 Limes Avenue, Aylesbury HP21 7HD

- 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 Bala Emayavan against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02304/APP, dated 20 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: Remove existing garage. New part two storey front, side and rear extension. New part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling. Pairs of semi-detached dwellings are located either side of the appeal property, and some of these have been extended to the side, namely No 65 and No 75 Limes Avenue, albeit with recessed first floor extensions.
4. The Council's 'Residential Extensions Design Guide' (the REDG) advises that extensions which are unduly eye-catching or which detract from the composition of the original dwelling are normally unacceptable. For extensions with new roofs, any set-back on the front elevation should preferably be carried through to roof level as this can help accommodate an extension without harming the appearance of the house. This, it states, will also subordinate the extension and help retain the integrity of the original building.
5. The two-storey side extension element of the appeal proposal, projects unduly from the flank wall of the dwelling, coming to within 1m of the property's side boundary. Whereas the lack of a set down from the existing ridgeline and step back from the existing front elevation would result in the dwelling having a bulky appearance that would not respect its original design and proportions. It would also contrast disproportionately with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, No 71 Limes Avenue, and significantly unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The combined effect would result in the

proposal having a discordant impact. Consequently, given the prominent position of the appeal property in the street and the relative balance of surrounding properties this would be harmful to the appearance of the street scene and the general character of the area.

6. It is acknowledged that the proposed two storey bay matches that on the existing front elevation. However, its bulging presence forward of the recessed part of the appeal dwelling's front elevation contributes towards the proposed two storey side extension's harmful bulk and incongruity in the context of the dwelling, the adjoining dwelling and surrounding area.
7. In support of the appeal, my attention has been drawn to other properties in the area that have large side extensions or additions that do not incorporate a 'set-back' or 'set-down' from the building and roof lines respectively. However, I have not been given the full details of these cases, whether they received planning permission and, if they did, what policies and guidance they were considered against. Moreover, I noted during my site visit, that where dwellings on surrounding streets had been extended unsympathetically, these were in the minority. On this basis, I am unable to draw a direct comparison with the appeal proposal, however, in any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, 2004. These policies, amongst other considerations, require development proposals to respect the appearance of the dwelling and the physical characteristics of the surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to the REDG. Finally, it would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, where it requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

R. E. Jones

INSPECTOR