



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

**by Andre Pinto BA, MA, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29/04/2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3291049**

**10 Bilwell, Long Crendon, Buckinghamshire HP18 9AD**

- 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 Stephen Clark and Ms Tracey Paterson against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
  - The application Ref 21/03119/APP, dated 30 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is new roof over the existing dwelling, with new rear extensions, fenestration and material alterations to the existing house.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposed development on the host property and on the character and appearance of the area; and
  - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Long Crendon Conservation Area (the CA) and whether any harm to the significance of the CA is outbalanced by any public benefit.

## Reasons

*Effect on the host property and the character and appearance of the area*

3. The appeal site is located within a quiet, mainly residential area, dominated by a predominance of one storey and two storey detached and semi-detached buildings.
4. Built on higher ground, the host property is on a particularly prominent location and therefore particularly visible and noticeable from public land. It consists of a detached, chalet-style dwelling with a hipped roof, set in a relatively large plot with a fairly spacious soft landscaped garden to the front of the property. The front garden, as well as the existing grassed verge between the appeal site and the public highway, contributes to the verdant character of the area.
5. Although buildings along Bilwell vary considerably in their overall appearance, the modest scale and size of the dwelling on the appeal site allows it to integrate fairly well with the surrounding area. Furthermore, 8 Bilwell and 12

Bilwell, to either side of the appeal site, are overall of a similar scale and height, although 10 Bilwell appears to be slightly taller than either 8 Bilwell or 12 Bilwell when viewed from the public highway.

6. The present proposal is for the construction of a part two storey and part one storey rear extension, with a gable extension and a bay window with a dormer extension to the front of the house.
1. Although the majority of the proposed development would be located to the rear of the existing dwelling, it would still be visible from street level, particularly when approached from the west, as there is a generous gap between 12 Bilwell and 10 Billwell allowing for unobstructed oblique views into the rear of the appeal site.
2. The proposal would also increase the ridge height of the building by approximately 0.9 metres. As set in drawing 21 F (2021) the existing gable projection to the front of the dwelling would be marginally widened and a floor to ceiling dormer window, with a Juliet balcony, provided. On the other side of the front elevation, a new bay window would be provided alongside a dormer immediately above it. These changes, both to the front and rear of the existing building, would lead to the creation of a significantly more prominent building when viewed from public land, and consequently, a more noticeable one within the streetscape.
3. The Council's Design Guide: Residential Extensions (DG) (1991) states, in relation to front extensions, that only small additions which will not harm the quality or character of the building are generally permissible. Consequently, when assessing the effect of the proposed development, it is necessary to consider not only the overall size of the extension but also its effect on the composition of the existing building, as well as its effect on the quality and character of the building.
4. Although I agree with the Applicant that the existing building is of limited architectural quality, its contribution is intrinsically linked to its scale and overall modest design, which is in line with the character and appearance of the buildings to either side of the appeal site.
5. Although it appears that care has been taken by the Applicant to create a proposal that would result in an attractive, well designed building, the proposed development would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and, moreover, would result in a building that would detract from the its current intrinsic value.
6. Therefore, by destabilising the existing relationship between these buildings, the current proposal would harm the quality and character of the wider areas as well as the host building.
7. The contemporary design of the proposed front elevation would be at odds with the more modest and less contemporary design of the properties located to either side of the development site, as well as well as the prevailing design of the other dwellings found along Bilwell. This clash with the character and appearance of the surrounding area would only be reinforced by the appeal site's particularly prominent location within the streetscape.
8. This approach is in line with the Framework, particularly paragraph 130, which states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that development will

function well and add to the overall quality of the area and is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

9. Although I accept, as stated within the Appellant's Appeal Statement, that there is a lack of consistency between the dwellings along Bilwell from an overall design perspective, I find that the design of the proposed development, particularly of the proposed front elevation, would be at odds with the dominant character and appearance of the area.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the building and the area and, in that regard, be contrary to Policy BE2 and of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) and Policy LC9 of the Long Crendon Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2023 (2017) which both aim to ensure new development respects and complements its setting, the DG (1991) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### *Effect on the CA*

11. The Long Crendon Conservation Areas appraisal document (2009) states that there are two separate Conservation Areas within Long Crendon: one centred around Bicester Road and the other centred around the High Street. The appeal site is located within Identity Area 7 The Square, which is part of the conservation area centred around the High Street.
12. The appraisal also states the CA centred around the High Street includes the visual highlight of Long Crendon: the High Street itself, which leads from The Square north-eastwards to St. Mary's Church. The curvilinear street is bounded on both sides by a cohesive group of historic buildings. With its strong sense of enclosure, virtually continuous building line and series of unfolding views culminating in the landmark St. Mary's Church, the High Street is arguably one of the best examples of an historic street within the District.
13. The appraisal also recognises that modern development has had a significant impact upon the village, but is largely contained to the north-west and south-east of the High Street, including Bilwell.
14. The significance of the CA is therefore derived from its historical interest namely its established street pattern, particularly along the High Street, its sense of enclosure and the historic buildings which date back to the 19 century. Given the above, I find that the significance of the CA, insofar as it relate to this appeal, to be primary associated with the established street pattern and sense of enclosure.
15. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
16. Considering that the present proposal does not significantly alter the location of the existing dwelling within the curtilage of the building, considering that it is set back from the public highway and that the existing front garden and associated grass verge would remain largely intact, the proposed development would not alter the established street pattern of the street.
17. Nevertheless, the proposal would result in a building that would be significantly more imposing than the existing structure and would differ substantially, in

terms of its overall design and appearance, from the buildings located to either side of the appeal site.

18. As previously stated in this decision, although the existing building is of limited architectural quality, its value to the character and appearance of the CA is linked to its modest scale and design which does not compete with the other more architectural significant features of the CA.
19. Consequently, and considering the effect of the proposal on the CA as a whole, I do not find that the current proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and therefore would harm its significance. The magnitude of this harm would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. In these circumstances, the Framework requires that, where a development proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
20. No specific public benefits have been brought to my attention in relation to the proposed development, albeit I recognise there would be some; mostly economic and linked to the construction of the proposed dwelling. However, as any such public benefits would be very modest given the small scale of the development, these would be substantially outweighed by the relatively significant harm arising, bearing in mind the importance and protection given to designated heritage assets by statute and national and local planning policy.
21. The appeal proposal would not, therefore, preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) which aims to protect heritage assets, Policy LC10 of the Long Crendon Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2023 (2017) which aims to sustain or enhance the character and appearance of the Long Crendon Conservation Area, the Long Crendon Conservation Areas appraisal document (2009) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Conclusion**

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

*Andre Pinto*

INSPECTOR