



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3336772

10 Mallard Close, Watermead, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP19 0GJ

- 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 M Muzammal against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/03320/APP, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.
3. The appeal has been supported by the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) for Swindon Borough Council. As this SPD relates to another Council it is not be relevant to the appeal proposals and, therefore, I have not had regard to its content.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with an attached double garage to side. The dwelling has a pitched roof design, with half-hips on the main roof. A wide single-storey flat-roof extension is located to the rear. The dwelling is located within a predominantly residential area, with Mallard Close comprising detached dwellings of varying design, although the half-hip roof design is a consistent characteristic. The dwelling backs on to Pintail Close, with the rear of the dwelling terminating views along a cul-de-sac. From here the roof, first floor, and upper part of the rear extension are visible, above the fenced boundary. The roofs of other dwellings on Mallard Close are also visible.

6. The extension would be sited above the existing wide ground floor rear extension. Cumulatively, with the existing ground floor extension, the proposals would result in the full loss of the original rear elevation of the dwelling. The extensions would add considerable mass and bulk to the dwelling, resulting in a dominant addition which erodes the original character of the property.
7. The proposed roof design has a pitch that is significantly shallower than the main roof of the dwelling. This would markedly contrast with the characteristic hip-roof design of the host property and other properties on Mallard Close. The design of the extension would therefore fail to harmonise with the existing dwelling, resulting in an unacceptable loss of its character.
8. It is acknowledged that, from Mallard Close, the extension would only be glimpsed over the attached garage. However, the extension would be clearly visible from Pintail Close. Its scale is such that it would appear as a prominent addition when viewed along the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, from here, the incongruity of the roof design would be most apparent and would appear significantly at odds with existing dwelling and other visible roofs on Mallard Close.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021); the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document; and, the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these seek to achieve high quality design in new developments and require development to respect characteristics of the site and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR