



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3356550

7 Icknield Close, Wendover, Buckinghamshire HP22 6HG

- 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 Mr and Mrs R Mcallister against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02812/APP.
 - The development proposed is the removal of a side flat roof garage and rear kitchen area, and the construction of a new two storey side and rear extension with lean-to single storey entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2024 ('the Framework'), and I have had regard to it in my decision.
3. I have also considered the property's planning history, particularly a previously refused application (Ref: 23/03801/APP), but I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which is fairly prominently positioned on the inside bend of Icknield Close, with a large side garden separating it from the neighbouring detached house at No 9. Elsewhere, Icknield Close mostly comprises semi-detached and detached two storey houses, finished in masonry, with hipped or gabled roofs, some of which have side extensions.
6. The Buckinghamshire Council Vale of Aylesbury Design Supplementary Planning Document 2023 ('SPD') sets out to inform and guide the quality of design for all development across the area, including household extensions. In broad terms, its Principles DES56 and DES59 state that proposals should respond to the local character of the area and to the design of the original dwelling.

7. Amongst other things, SPD Principles DES58 and DES60 continue that extensions should be subservient to the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling and should not overwhelm the house from any given viewpoint; and that side extensions should be set back from the original house, with a lower ridge.
8. As illustrated on drawing no. 2313-07, the proposal's south-western elevation would be only very slightly narrower than the original dwelling's front face. Its set-down at ridge level would be so small such as to be barely perceptible in the streetscene. The proposed extension would be set back slightly from the host on its front face, but it would project well beyond its rear. Consequently, it would have a significant two storey bulk and mass which would be larger than, and would overwhelm, the original building. Given its siting, that bulk and scale would be very visible in the streetscene, including in views looking across the property's side garden, where it would not appear subservient to the original dwelling.
9. Whilst some other properties in Icknield Close have side extensions, I observed that most of those, including on the other half of this pair at No 5, and at No 3, are much more modest in scale compared to this proposal, and are therefore in proportion with, and subordinate to, the original building.
10. There is a particularly large extension at No 18 but, unlike here, it is stepped well back from the host's front face, and it is further away from the road. Moreover, I have few details of that scheme, which is not typical of this streetscene, and which would appear to pre-date the adoption of the SPD. I also have few details of the developments referred to on Manor Road which, in any event, are in a different streetscene.
11. The scheme would be suitably finished in matching materials and its form would broadly respect the host, but for the above reasons it would have a domineering impact and would not appear subservient to the original building. It would thereby harm the character and appearance of the host property and this streetscene. As a result, it would conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021) which, in broad terms, requires development to respect and complement the characteristics of the site and its surroundings, having regard to matters such as scale.
12. Given the extension's siting within a large garden, and the gaps to neighbouring properties, the scheme would not conflict with SPD Principle DES62 which primarily addresses the effect of rear extensions on living conditions. However, in failing to achieve a suitably subservient appearance, the scheme would conflict with its Principles DES58 and DES60.
13. It would also fail to comply with the Framework's requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character, taking into account any local supplementary planning documents; and with the National Design Guide (2021), including its stance at C1 that well-designed new development should respond positively to the features of the site itself and the context beyond its boundary.
14. Having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR