



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/24/3354022

Avenue Lodge, Stratford Road, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire MK18 1NY

- 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 Neil Burnside against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/01412/APP.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

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 Matters

3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published prior to the determination of this appeal. The substantive parts of the new version do not however differ from the previous insofar as they relate to the main issues. The cases of the main parties will not therefore be prejudiced by my reference to the new version.
4. The Council has commented on revised plans. However, this was after the determination of the application and in the interest in fairness I am to consider same plans as the Council did originally. The appeal process is not a suitable mechanism to amend or negotiate revisions. This is for a fresh planning application.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Avenue Lodge is a detached dwelling primarily constructed from red brick with characterful pitched roof elevations. It is a Non Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) in a prominent position on the main road, amongst other more recently built dwellings set further back. This siting and grouping emphasise the positive contribution that the building's traditional features make to the street scene and, by association, the character and appearance of the area. These include the original

linear form, principal elevation detailing, porch, and chimney which remain legible despite the building having been previously extended.

7. The extension would be highly visible in the street scene and obscure the entirety of this original elevation and the above mentioned characterful details would be unacceptably eroded. The chimney particularly would be obscured and sit awkwardly in the middle of the roof. Moreover, the readability of the linear form would be lost which would reduce the quality the building's style.
8. The proposal would mirror the height of the ridge and eaves of the dwelling. This lack of subservience would compete for visual dominance with the host. Resultantly, it would present a disjointed and unrelated elevation. The loss of the original porch would harmfully detract from the original form of the building. The new lean-to porch, in combination with the dormer window, would clutter the front elevation and draw attention away from both the simplicity of the building and the feature of the bay window particularly. In combination, the impact on the key attributes of the dwelling would result in harm to the NDHA and, by association, the character and appearance of the area.
9. A debate about the architectural or historic quality of the building aside, it is a NDHA, and a balanced judgement will still be required regarding the scale of any harm or loss and its significance. I would ascribe substantial weight to the harm I have found above given its scope and irreversibility. The scheme would provide additional space; however, I would give this only limited weight given that it is not sufficiently clear that it is the only way of doing so. With this and the above in mind, there would be conflict with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 and the Framework which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment amongst other things.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and 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