



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2022

**by G Dring BA (Hons) MA MRTPI MAUDE**

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

**Decision date: 01 NOVEMBER 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3305038**

**20 Bushmead Road, Whitchurch, Buckinghamshire HP22 4LG**

- 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 Simon Parkes Poole against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
  - The application Ref 22/00528/APP, dated 11 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2022.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side and front extension and a first-floor extension to existing bungalow dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The site plan identified on drawing no: PPA 20 0002 A00 dated October 2021 indicates the position of parking which the Council refer to as the potential location of a garage/car port structure. No details are submitted in respect of this, and it is not included in the description of development and therefore it is not considered as part of this appeal.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a modest single storey dwelling, detached single garage and associated garden area. The dwelling is set back from the road by a considerable distance. A hedgerow situated along the front boundary along with trees and vegetation present in the front garden and the surrounding area mean that the existing dwelling is not visible from Bushmead Road currently.
5. The appeal site sits within a ribbon of development where a number of detached dwellings are set back a similar distance from the road. There is significant variation in the character and appearance of the dwellings that make up this section of Bushmead Road, with a number of dwellings being two storey with projecting front gable features.
6. The proposal, which includes a significant first floor extension, would result in a much larger two storey dwelling with single storey elements to the side and rear. The scale, massing and overall size of the proposed extensions are such that they would dominate the host dwelling. Consequently, the extensions

would not appear subordinate, and they would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst I note that the existing dwelling is of little architectural or historic merit, constructed of materials that are uncharacteristic of the area and that the appellant intends to utilise local materials to improve the quality of the resultant dwelling, this would not minimise the harm I have found in this regard.

7. The host dwelling is set back from the road and is not therefore prominent. This together with the mixed character and appearance of the surrounding area and the position of the extensions, set away from the site boundaries, means that the proposal would be in keeping with the scale and appearance of other dwellings within the surrounding area.
8. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, but it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It is therefore contrary to Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013-2033 Adopted September 2021, relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and relevant guidance in the National Design Guide and the Aylesbury Vale District Council Residential Extensions Design Guide Adopted May 1991 and amended November 2013. These policies and this guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development proposals respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and ensure that extensions do not overwhelm the existing building.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant's aim to create a more sustainable home in order to reduce energy consumption is noted. However, this benefit of the proposal does not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The lack of objections to the application from interested parties does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. I note that the Council have suggested that a full planning application for a replacement dwelling may have been a more appropriate route for the proposal identified. However, the appellant submitted a householder application and the Council's decision was made on that basis. I have therefore had to consider it on that basis also.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh the harm. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*G Dring*  
INSPECTOR