



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/21/3271322

189 Prebendal Avenue, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP21 8LE

- 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 Mrs S Hussain against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref 20/03888/APP, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and side extension.
-

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. Prebendal Avenue and other streets within the surrounding Southcourt estate area are predominantly characterised by semi-detached dwellings which are set back from the street on strong building lines within a regular arrangement of generous plots. This results in a generally spacious character, and together with the similar styles and materials of the buildings, provides for an attractive rhythm and strong sense of uniformity to the street scenes.
4. The proposed extension would step forward of the front of the host building and existing garage to its side. Although I noted porches to the front of some other dwellings nearby, these were of typically modest scale limiting their prominence and impression on the overall building line. In contrast, the significantly larger width and scale of the proposed extension relative to the host dwelling would have a much greater visual impact. In my view, its scale and degree of projection forward of the host and neighbouring buildings would be conspicuous, and would harmfully disrupt the consistency of the building line which adds to the distinctive character and appearance of the area.
5. Although no harm to the living conditions of occupiers of the appeal or neighbouring dwellings has been identified, I therefore conclude that the development would be intrusive and incongruous in the street scene, and there would be unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies GP.9 and GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2004 which include requirements broadly seeking development that respects the appearance of the dwelling and its setting and other buildings in the locality. It would also conflict with Policy BE2 of the emerging Vale of

Aylesbury Local Plan which similarly seeks development that respects and complements the physical characteristics of the site and surroundings, although as this is not yet an adopted part of the development plan, I afford the conflict with this policy less weight.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR