



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3295651

17, The Green, Great Horwood, Buckinghamshire MK17 0RH

- 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 Adam Hamlen against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03516/APP, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side orangery extension, new porch canopy, changes to fenestration in relation to new internal configuration, new dwarf wall and railing incorporating an entrance gate, new timber framed carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of 17 The Green, its significance as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), and the character and appearance of the Great Horwood Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. 17 The Green is a detached two storey brick built dwelling with a dual pitched slate roof which runs at a 90 degree angle to the highway. It is identified as a 'local note' building in the Great Horwood Conservation Area Appraisal (December 2012) and is a NDHA. Its age and architectural detailing together with the fact that it forms part of a group of historic buildings on The Green and Nash Road contribute to its significance. The building occupies a prominent position on the main route through the village in views to and from The Green.
4. The CA in this part of the village includes The Green, which is made up of grass and a parking area. The Green is an area of public open space which is surrounded by a number of traditional buildings, including listed and unlisted buildings of similar architectural styles and materials. Views towards the open space from Nash Road, where it widens and meets The Green, make a positive contribution to the quality of the environment. Views from The Green along the more enclosed adjacent streets are also an important characteristic of the area. No.17 reflects the established pattern of development, with gaps between the buildings allowing views of private gardens.
5. The proposed development includes several elements. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the proposed car port or the replacement of the existing

windows in principle, subject to the approval of the detailed design of the new openings. I have no reason to disagree with this.

6. The proposed single storey orangery extension would extend almost the full width of the side elevation of the dwelling. As a consequence of the scale and bulk of the extension, the proposal would dominate the side elevation of the appeal property and would stand out as an overly large addition. Moreover, the combination of the hipped roof design and extensive glazing, both of which contrast to the main dwelling, would mean the extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the existing building which would fail to reflect the appearance of the property. Whilst it is suggested that the side elevation to which the extension is to be attached is of less architectural and historic significance, this would not justify the erection of the otherwise inappropriate extension. The orangery would therefore detract from the appearance of the dwelling and would be detrimental to the character and appearance and historic interest of the NDHA.
7. Furthermore, and for the same reasons, the orangery, which would be visible through the gaps between the buildings, would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the CA. As the effect would be localised, being visible in glimpsed views from the highway between the buildings, I therefore conclude the proposed orangery would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the NDHA and the designated heritage asset.
7. The traditional pitched roof open porch canopy is of modest proportions and limited scale in relation to the existing front elevation of the dwelling. Whilst the addition would obscure a small amount of the facing brickwork to the front elevation of the property, the open design, with a degree of transparency, would ensure that any impact in this regard is limited. Therefore, the addition would not appear as an incongruous feature in relation to the existing dwelling or unduly dominant in the street scene.
8. The French doors and side lights to the front entrance door introduce a vertical emphasis to the fenestration. However, the changes are modest in scale and the proportions would not appear unduly out of keeping with the host dwelling.
9. Properties in the area are enclosed by a variety of front boundary treatments which form visually important features in the street scene. The existing boundary wall to the front of the dwelling appears to have been altered with the addition of render to the roadside elevation, which is not a typical feature of the locality. The height and design of the proposed dwarf wall, railings and gates, which would reflect others in the vicinity, would not appear unduly visually dominant in relation to the existing dwelling, nor would they appear as an alien feature in the CA.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the porch, French doors and boundary treatment would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and the setting of the NDHA, but for the reasons given, the orangery would harm the character and appearance of the NDHA, and as a consequence would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the CA.
11. The proposal would also see the replacement of the existing modern windows with a more traditional design. This would be likely to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, but given the small scale of the works, would be of limited benefit and therefore attract limited

weight. Likewise, the alterations to the boundary treatment may result in some improvement to highway safety, but in the absence of demonstrable harm from the existing situation, there is no substantive evidence that this would be of significant public benefit so would also be of limited weight.

12. I conclude that the orangery would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling as a NDHA and the CA and would cause less than substantial harm to their significance as heritage assets. The development would therefore conflict with the aims of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Policies BE1 and BE2 which seek to preserve and enhance heritage assets, and secure high quality design sympathetic to existing dwellings, and guidance in the Framework.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn to other developments allowed in the area, but it has not been shown that other extensions are comparable in form or siting to the proposed orangery. They do not, therefore, lead me away from my earlier findings.
14. It has been suggested that a condition could be imposed to address design issues, however, it is not for the appeal procedure to evolve a scheme and I must consider the proposal as shown on the submitted plans.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons set out above the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations which would indicate otherwise that permission should be granted. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR