
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2020

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3250690

9 Moorhills Road, Wing, Buckinghamshire, LU7 0NG

- 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 Phillips against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04022/APP, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located amongst other residential properties of a similar character and appearance. Buildings tend to stand within large plots with garden areas to the front, side and rear, albeit that some properties have been altered and extended. The relatively regular spacing between pairs of properties gives a rhythm to the street and a sense of spaciousness.
4. The appeal proposal involves the addition of a substantial two-storey side extension that would almost entirely infill the space between the existing dwelling and the boundary. The small set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge of the appeal property would provide a token break in the built form of the resulting structure but would not meaningfully distinguish the extension or reduce its large mass when viewed from the street.
5. The extension would appear disproportionately large in the context of the existing house and its adjoining neighbour. It would harmfully infill the space to the side of the property and detract from the spacious character of the street.
6. This would be in conflict with policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004); policy BE2 of the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033; and the National Planning Policy Framework; all of which seek high quality design that is appropriate to its context. The proposal also fails to accord with the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide which specifically

identifies that the infilling of gaps between residential buildings can harm the character of the street.

7. I note that other properties in the local area have been allowed significant side extensions, some of which are close to the boundary. However, I saw none that were directly comparable to the design and proportions proposed in the appeal in the vicinity of the appeal. I have considered the appeal on its own merits.
8. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR