
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/24/3345951

4 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 Martin King against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/00814/APP.
 - The development proposed is described as "Householder application for demolition of garage. Erection of single storey rear extension and extension of garage. Loft conversion incorporating flat roof dormer to rear. Fenestration changes".
-

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, the demolition of the garage and the extension of garage elements of the appeal scheme. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation thus focusses on the proposed dormer 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 dropped 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 of them have been extended to the rear with a modest flat roof dormer but many remain unaltered. The proposal would only be viewed when leaving 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 the remaining open roofscape in both height and length. This excessive scale would obscure the rear roofscape of the bungalow and unacceptably detract from the plain and largely original roof form. It would appear incongruous and dominant. It would not be a subservient addition to the bungalow by virtue of the top-heavy, flat roof appearance. The

proposal would be prominent and bulky on the side elevation against the modest bungalow and the flat roof would jar awkwardly with the existing pitched roof. Resultantly, it would not make a positive contribution to the dwelling.

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.
9. Amended plans have been supplied with the addition of two pitched roof dormers to the front elevation. However, the amended plans would not change the position of the appeal as they do not tackle the issue at hand. Nevertheless, it is not for the consideration of an appeal, in any case, to seek amended plans as the Council would not have considered them as part of the original application and they would not be subject to the correct public consultation, in the interests of fairness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. 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

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

John Morrison INSPECTOR