
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2021

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/21/3276566

61 King Edward Avenue, Aylesbury, HP21 7JE.

- 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 G Rasakulasuriar against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00232/APP, dated 20 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations to allow for habitable loft space; (Mansard roof with dormers and skylights) and two storey extension to rear to extend balcony and ground floor living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a large two storey dwelling which lies in a prominent position on land bounded by Wendover Way, Turnfurlong Lane and Windsor Close. The site lies in a mainly residential area with schools. It is proposed to raise the roof of the property to form accommodation at second floor level which would be lit by a combination of dormer windows and rooflights in the new mansard roof.

Effect on character and appearance

4. In assessing this issue I have had regard to the general guidance in the Council's Residential Extension Design Guide (1991). The existing property has a mainly rectangular footprint with modest projecting gables on the front and rear elevations and the main roof and gable roofs have a very low pitch roof which reflects a relatively modern period of architecture. In contrast the general style of houses along Wendover Way are two storey with a steep roof pitch, although of a variety of designs and materials, whereas in Windsor Way neighbouring properties are mainly single storey.
5. Therefore, the present low pitch roof is not characteristic of the area and raising it by some 1.7m could in principle make the appearance of the property

more consistent with the local area. However, the proposal relies on a mansard roof which would have a very steep pitch and a 'ridge' on all four elevations, leading to a form of 'crown' roof with an extensive area of flat roof. This roof form would appear bulky and visually awkward viewed from all directions locally on this prominent corner site. I am concerned that the scale and form of mansard roof proposed would dominate the present simple design of the building. Moreover, this scale of additional building bulk would be accentuated by the incorporation of the present side extension into the overall width of the new roof.

6. Overall, I find that the scale, bulk and form of the mansard roof proposed fails to respect the character and appearance of the host building nor would it introduce a new overall design for the property that would integrate well in its setting in the wider street scene but would look out of place. The proposal therefore conflicts with the design requirements of saved Policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004) and Policy BE2 of the emerging Local Plan to which moderate weight can be attached. I also find that the proposal would not meet the emphasis placed on achieving well designed places that are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character as set out in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
7. In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of another local scheme mentioned by the appellant and I looked at this at the site visit, but I do not consider that the circumstances of the site and the roof alterations are the same as the appeal proposal nor does it result in similar adverse effects as those of the appeal scheme.
8. In the overall planning balance I have weighed my conclusions on the main issues with the benefits of the scheme, particularly the additional living space for the appellant's family and making better use of the existing building, but these aspects do not outweigh the adverse effects and the conflict with the development plan. This indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR