
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3262249

6A New Road, Aston Clinton, HP22 5JD

- 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 and Mrs Robinson against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02308/APP, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is roof alteration to front, including two dormers. Two storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. New Road is on the edge of the village and provides part of a through route. It is lined by pavements on both sides. The adjacent houses to the appeal site are of a simple unassuming design and the neighbouring dwelling to the south west is notable for its cottage like appearance with narrow width and overtly tall chimneys.
4. The appeal site fronts New Road and has a largely open aspect from the south west. Consequently, it is prominent and there are views from the road to the rear garden.
5. The dwelling within the appeal site is very simple and deferential to the character of the area. It has ground floor windows and low eaves with a largely unbroken tiled roof except for a couple of rooflights and the roof of the entrance porch. To the rear is a one and half storey projecting gable with an upper storey window.
6. The proposed extension would be visible from the south west of the appeal site on New Road. It would be two storey with a flat roof but chamfered eaves on one side. This roofline would be in complete contrast to the pitched simple roof of the existing dwelling. The extension would spoil the coherency of the dwelling.

7. Whilst the proposed extension would be physically integrated into the house, it would appear wholly distinct. Consequently, the dwelling would not appear as a coherent whole. Instead the proposal would be seen as competing with the existing main dwelling.
8. The appellant's statement indicates that the concept was for the extension to have presence. Whilst it would be a contemporary statement, the extension would need sufficient space or separation to have its own identity. The existing house is characterised by its simplicity which has a neutral impact on New Road. The extension would be overly strident.
9. The proposed dormers to the front would be tall and would have extensive sides. The dormers would appear overly dominant on the roof spoiling the simplicity and proportions of the dwelling. It is clear from the appellant's statement that the dormers have been reduced in width from an earlier proposal however that does not remedy their height and the resulting expansive roofline so created.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area due to its detailed design.
11. Policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, and Policy BE2 of the Proposed Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan as Proposed to be Modified, require that extensions respect the existing dwelling, the surroundings and setting, views and that attention is given to proportions, detailing, materials and the surrounding vernacular. The Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide provides more detailed guidance of the above. Policy HQD 1 of the Aston Clinton Parish Neighbourhood Plan expects all development to be of a high-quality design whereby the massing, materials and scale are reflective of the surroundings. Paragraph 127 of The National Planning Policy Framework requires design to be sympathetic to the local character. Paragraph 132 does allow for innovative styles if they fit in with their surroundings. The National Design Guide provides more detailed criteria on appropriate design. The proposal would be in conflict with the above policies and guidance.

Conclusion

12. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR