



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: 1 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/22/3304199

Oak Farm, Bragenham Side, Stoke Hammond MK17 9DB

- 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 Mrs Edwards against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04015/APP, dated 12 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is side extension to existing dwelling.
-

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 existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Oak Farm is a detached single storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space that sits back from the road within a generous garden area. The dwelling has previously been altered and extended. Timber clad dormer windows are present on the front elevation along with gable features above two of the ground floor front windows. A detached garage sits to the front of the dwelling in close proximity to the boundary with the road. The appeal site sits between a public greenspace and agricultural land in an area of rural character, not subject to any statutory landscape or heritage designations though it is in the Brickhills Area of Attractive Landscape. A mixture of fencing, hedgerows and mature trees are located along the boundaries of the appeal site, which together with the garage, provides some screening of the site from the road.
4. The proposed development would extend the existing dwelling considerably with the ridge line of the most substantial part of the extension continuing at the same height as the existing dwelling, being connected by a lower flat roofed link extension. Given its large scale relative to the existing dwelling, the Council states that the proposed development represents the size, character and appearance of a separate dwelling. It is accepted that the use of matching materials and the inclusion of certain design features within the proposed development such as dormer windows and gable features above the ground floor windows would respond to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
5. However, whilst the additional built form would not be situated forward of the front building line of the existing dwelling, it would result in a visually dominant

feature that would overwhelm the existing dwelling due to the overall bulk, width, height and position of the extension. The proposed development would not be a subordinate extension and it would result in an addition that is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

6. Whilst Bragenham Side is a no through road to vehicular traffic, I noted at my site visit that it appears to be a well-used pedestrian route. I also note that the existing dwelling sits within a generous plot, set back from the road and that the appeal site is partly screened by mature vegetation along the site boundaries and in part the existing garage building. However, there are views of the existing dwelling from certain vantage points along the road and the presence and condition of vegetative screening can change over time, meaning that the proposed development would become more visible at certain times of the year. I note that the appellant has suggested that the retention of landscaping could be conditioned along with a requirement for additional screening to be put in place. Whilst existing vegetation could be retained and additional screening be provided, this would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling that would result from the proposed development.
7. I conclude that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. This is contrary to the requirements of policies BE2 and NE4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013-2033 (September 2021), relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), relevant sections of the National Design Guide and relevant guidance in the Aylesbury Vale District Council Residential Extensions Design Guide (amended 2013). These policies and this guidance seek amongst other things, to ensure that new development proposals respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site, ensure that extensions do not overwhelm the existing building and minimise the impact of development on the visual amenity of the locality.

Other Matters

8. The design and siting of the proposed development would not be detrimental to the living conditions of any neighbours and no issues are identified in relation to noise or light pollution, contamination or air quality. I also note that the proposal does not involve the removal of any trees or hedgerows. However, a lack of harm in respect of these considerations does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
9. The appellant has suggested that the use of permitted development rights could provide a significant volume of additional space however no details are provided as to how such a development would be designed or the likelihood of this alternative option being implemented. I therefore only afford limited weight in my decision to this matter.
10. My attention has been drawn to other planning permissions on other sites in the local area. However, no detailed information is before me and in any case, this appeal relates to the appeal site and is determined based on its individual merits.
11. I note the appellant has stated that pre-application advice was sought and that there was a delay in the determination of the application. Be that as it may and

whilst this is unfortunate, it is not something that weighs in favour of the proposed development.

12. Whilst the appellant also states that the proposed development would provide the benefit of additional flexible living accommodation, would be of a high standard of sustainable construction and that biodiversity enhancements could also be secured by condition, none of the benefits of the proposed development would outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. 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