



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by **A Phillips MPlan, BA, CertHE and MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3353931

4 Wedon Path, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP19 9BL

- 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 Mrs N Mahajan against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01848/APP.
 - The development proposed is for garage conversion, but to change window to white so it matched the original doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Retrospective application for garage conversion, but to change window to white so it matched the original doors at 4 Wedon Path, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP19 9BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01848/APP, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The window of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no.101 within three months of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development as set out in the planning application form includes the term 'retrospective'. As this is not an act of development, I have omitted it. During my site visit, I observed that the garage conversion has been carried out but that the white window shown on the submitted plan has not been installed.
3. The Council states that the application site does not appear to be fully in the ownership of the appellant. Nevertheless, it has determined the application on the basis of the submitted plans. There is limited information before me to substantiate the Council's concerns. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the evidence before me including the ownership certificate provided by the appellant.
4. Since the appeal was lodged there has been an updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, I am satisfied there are no implications for the main issue for this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is:
 - The effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The site formed part of a triple garage block and parking courtyard set back from a shared surface road, with the remaining two garages having white doors. The site is set behind a double garage block again with white doors.
7. The converted garage due to being set back from the shared surface road and location behind a double garage has a limited impact upon the public realm. The dark framed window is an incongruous feature, though the appellant intends to replace this harmful feature with a white window that can be secured by a planning condition. With the white window, while the development does change the overall appearance of what was the triple garage there is a limited impact on the character of the area and there would be no loss of architectural quality.
8. Subject to the replacement of the window, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it accords with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) which requires that all new development respects and complements the local distinctiveness and vernacular character of the locality.
9. The Council has referred to the VALP Supplementary Planning Document in its reason for refusal. However, the extract provided refers to the conversion of agricultural buildings and is not relevant to the main issue in this case.

Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above a condition is necessary to secure the installation of the white framed window shown on the submitted plans.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR