



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/23/3319848

23 Little Britain, Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, HP18 0XA

- 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 Alison Scagell against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03320/APP, dated 26 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey outhouse extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which is situated in a corner position, within a small modern residential development. Houses are grouped closely together and positioned relatively close to the highway. Relief is provided in some places (including at the appeal property) by narrow grass verges and boundary hedging.
4. The proposal is to replace an existing outbuilding with a new single-storey outhouse extension, which would provide storage space and an area to park a scooter and tricycle. The extension would be built close to the side boundary and would be clearly visible in the streetscene. The proposal is effectively a resubmission of an earlier application that was refused by the Council in March 2022 (reference: 21/03190/APP). The appeal proposal has been reduced in width from 3m to 2.6m (according to the Council Officer's report).
5. The Council contends that the proposal would be an overly prominent feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. It considers that it would conflict with Policy BE2 of the adopted Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 and with Policy WAD1 of the Waddesdon Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek to ensure (amongst other things) that new development respects the character of its surroundings and the existing pattern of development.
6. In addition, the Council refers to its Design Guide – Residential Extensions, which emphasises the benefits of landscaping within developments. I consider that these policies and guidance accord with paragraph 130 of The National

Planning Policy Framework 2021, which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area and to be visually attractive.

7. Although the proposed extension would complement the existing dwelling in terms of its design, it would result in built development closer to the road with a reduced area of landscaping, as it is difficult to see how the existing hedging would not be affected by the construction work. Given the site's prominent position in the streetscene, I consider that the proposal would appear as an unduly prominent feature that would reduce the relatively spacious and verdant character and appearance of this corner plot. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan policies, as referred to in paragraph 5 above.
8. In reaching my decision, I have given weight to the fact that the proposal would provide a secure location for the storage and parking of a mobility scooter. However, it has not been demonstrated that other alternatives have been explored within the site. Consequently, I conclude that this benefit is outweighed by the proposal's harmful impact on the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR