
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3345950

2 Grendon Way, Bierton, Aylesbury HP22 5DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Paul Power against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/00812/APP.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey rear extension, and loft conversion incorporating two pitched dormer windows to front, and flat roof dormer to rear".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council do not object to the single storey rear extension and two pitched roof dormers elements of the appeal scheme. I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the flat roof dormer to the rear and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Appearing to have been largely unaltered, the appeal building is a semi-detached bungalow, which is of a modest height and eaves with a largely plain roofscape. The plain roof form and modest height of the bungalow is a key positive feature of the unit. There are varying building types on the surrounding roads but within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are other semi-detached bungalows. A few have been extended to the rear with a modest flat roof dormer, but many remain unaltered. The proposal would have a limited visual effect to Grendon Way. This does not however reduce its positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The dormer would span the majority of remaining open roofscape in both height and length. This excessive scale would be an incongruous and dominant addition to the modesty of the bungalow and detract from the originality of its plain roof form. In addition, it would not appear as a subservient addition to the unit by virtue of the top heavy, flat roof appearance compared with the overall scale of the existing bungalow. The proposal would also appear

prominent and bulky on the side elevation of the existing bungalow and the flat roof would jar awkwardly with the existing pitched roof due to its size and run. Resultantly, it would not have a positive contribution to the unit.

6. The appeal proposal would be substantially larger in scale and massing than No 12 Grendon Way and leaves no resulting roof space. Photographs of other examples of similar development in other locations have been provided. I am, however, unaware of their planning status and the finer details such as the circumstances which prevailed at the time or matters taken into account. They do not therefore lead me to recommending the appeal be allowed.
7. Therefore, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033, Chapter 8 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document, Policy HO3 of the Draft Bierton Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

8. It is not sufficiently clear that the proposed development is the only way of meeting the increased internal space requirements of the incumbent family. I therefore attach limited weight to this personal need. I understand there is a need to insulate the property and, to the environmental sustainability benefits this would bring I would ascribe moderate weight. I am unaware of the precise details of a previous planning application(s) on the appeal site and, specifically therefore, what bearing they might have on the scheme before me. I therefore ascribe them only very limited weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan by virtue of the above harm. This is a matter to which I attach substantial weight. I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR