
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/20/3264096

3 Parker Walk, Aylesbury, HP19 9XS

- 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 Phil and Sarah Kane against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02309/APP, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension, demolishing existing garage to provide new living space and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension, demolishing existing garage to provide new living space and associated internal alterations at 3 Parker Walk, Aylesbury, HP19 9XS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02309/APP dated 14 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years of the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted application form and plans: Site Location Plan and Proposed Block Plan KEA/01, Ground Floor Plan KEA/04, Proposed Elevations KEA/05.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Parker Walk is a cul-de-sac within an extensive area of housing. The cul-de-sac is small and the houses are loosely grouped around it. They are varied in terms of their materials and form with various extensions. There is a through footpath which connects with the wider estate.
4. The appeal site includes part of a semi-detached dwelling, its flat roof garage, parking space and a large garden to the rear. Both semi-detached properties have entrances and porches on the side. Due to the arrangement of the cul-de-sac, this side of the building is more prominent than the front.

5. The proposed extension would be to the side and rear of the appeal semi-detached dwelling. It would incorporate the existing porch and garage at the side. The amount of new additional floorspace of this side elevation would therefore be limited, rather it is at least in part an amalgamation. It would also be single storey.
6. The flat roof of the garage would be replaced with a pitched structure which would improve its appearance. The roof would also be modestly pitched and so remain subservient to the main house.
7. The proposal would also replace the existing UPVC conservatory with a tiled roof extension, which would be more sympathetic to the existing house. The roof would be only marginally higher, and the increased footprint would be modest. In any event this part of the extension would be within the large garden and therefore would not appear cramped.
8. The proposal would not be symmetrical with the other semi-detached dwelling. However, the existing flat roof garage currently precludes that relationship. The extension does extend beyond the building line into the rear garden, but the extension is largely based on the existing garage footprint.
9. From the cul-de-sac and the through footpath, the proposal would appear in proportion with the existing building, particularly as the extension would be seen against a wide gable. The detailing of the extension would be simple and not detracting. Similarly, the materials would also match the existing. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. 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. Paragraph 127 of The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires good design and respect for the context. The National Design Guide provides more detailed criteria. The proposal would not be in conflict with the above policies and guidance.
11. The loss of the garage would potentially mean the loss of a parking space, but this would not be significant given the location of the appeal site, the size of the house and the existing on and off street parking. I note that the Council had no objection in this respect.

Conditions

12. Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provide the tests for the imposition of conditions and the Council have suggested conditions in the questionnaire. The compliance condition is helpful for clarity and therefore imposed. The application forms specify that materials will match existing and is therefore unnecessary.

Conclusion

13. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR