



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3297575

11 Church Lane, Mursley, Milton Keynes MK17 0RS

- 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 Greg and Rose Lovett against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03690/APP, dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor extension to rear and side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor side and rear extension at 11 Church Lane, Mursley, Milton Keynes MK17 0RS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03690/APP, dated 16 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LS CLM 01 001 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 010 Rev P2; LS CLM 01 079 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 080 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 081Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 90 Rev. P0; SA CLM 01 91 Rev.P0; SA CLM 01 90 Rev.P0; LS CLM 01 100 Rev.P2; SA CLM 01 101 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 102 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 200 Rev.P1; SA CLM 01 201 Rev.P1; and SA CLM 02 Rev.P0.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as indicated on the submitted application form.

Main Issue(s)

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling having regard to scale.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling of a traditional pitched roof design which sits in a generous plot. It has an 'L' shaped footprint and has been subject to previous extensions to the side and rear elevations. The character and appearance of the original dwelling, as well as its architectural merit, has been altered significantly as a result of the previous additions, particularly with regards to the rear elevation of the original property. As such its original form and style can no longer be clearly appreciated.

4. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the side and rear elevations of the dwelling. The extent of the footprint of the extension in relation to that of the existing dwelling, together with the shallow pitched roof would serve to ensure it would appear subservient in scale and mass to the host dwelling as it stands. Therefore, the proposed extension would not unduly affect the building's existing visual quality, particularly having regard to its modest scale.
5. The Aylesbury Vale District Council Design Guide; Residential Extensions, raises concerns regarding the effect of large scale extensions on the appearance of the host dwelling. The general thrust of the guidance is to ensure that extensions are appropriate to and do not harm the character the original dwelling. Given the limited extent of any obvious remaining architectural cohesion of the original dwelling, particularly in relation to the rear elevation of the property, I conclude that the extension would not have a harmful effect upon the appearance or the architectural integrity of the original building.
6. I therefore find no conflict with Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan policy BE2, which promotes good design and amongst other things sets out that all new development proposals shall respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site including scale and context.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR