



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3243596

7 Drayton Road, Newton Longville MK17 0BH

- 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 Barrie Jones against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council – Aylesbury Area.
 - The application Ref 19/02965/APP, dated 2 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey garage and construction of two storey side extension. Demolition of porch and construction of new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. I have referred above to the Buckinghamshire Council – Aylesbury Area as this is now the Local Planning Authority for the area covering the appeal site, following the merger of a number of Councils to form a Unitary Authority. However, the original decision (19/02965/APP) was made by Aylesbury Vale District Council.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The appeal site contains a detached double-fronted dwelling set to the south of Newton Longville Conservation Area (NLCA). The importance of the NLCA stems from the integrity of its historic character and cohesion as part of the core settlement. Although there is some disagreement amongst the main parties, it appears that the existing porch and garage are extensions, and not part of the original host dwelling. The surrounding area contains a variety of property ages, with little coherence in the street scene.

6. By way of its substantial set back, and overall limited scale, the existing garage does not add to the apparent width of the host dwelling when viewed in the street scene. In contrast the proposed side extension would visually have no meaningful set back, from the front elevation, or set down, from the ridge line. As such the extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling. Moreover, the overall width of the side extension would result in a significant addition that would compete with the host dwelling and would not respect its proportions and the balanced appearance of the front elevation.
7. The proposed porch, by way of its scale and roof form, would be an incongruous addition to the relatively simple appearance of the front elevation of the host dwelling. Moreover, given its proximity to the road and public views, it would be a prominent addition that would harm the appearance of the appeal property within the street.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling and would therefore cause an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. As such the proposal would result in material harm in conflict with Policies GP9 and GP35 of the *Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan: Written Statement - Part 1*. These seek development to respect and complement the character and appearance of a site, its setting, and surroundings.
9. In reaching this decision I have been mindful of my duty regarding conservation areas. In this instance, and in light of the above I consider that given the existing varied appearance of the immediately surrounding street scene, the proposal would not adversely affect views in to or out of the NLCA.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant is unhappy with the way that the consideration of the planning application was carried out and that there are a number of disagreements between the main parties. However, these are largely outside of the remit of the appeal process. Regarding the provision of bedrooms, I consider that whether the property would be described as having four or five bedrooms would have no material impact on the assessment of the appeal before me. I therefore attach this matter little weight.
11. Several examples of sizeable extensions have been set out within the appellant's statement of case. I do not have sufficient information before me to ascertain whether the circumstances of each are directly comparable to the current proposal, or to comment on consistency between decisions. Moreover, from my observations at the site visit, it was clear that the appearance and location of the examples are not similar to the appeal before me. Nevertheless, all proposals need to be considered on their own merit.

Conclusion and recommendation

12. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR