



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 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: 17th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3360002

35 Broughton Avenue, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP20 1NN

- 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 P Eldridge against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/03548/APP.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey rear 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 Matter and Main Issue

3. The planning history refers to an approved rear dormer and single storey extension which has been partially built. Elements of the permission could be built in conjunction with this proposal; however, I have no details or plans of such a scheme. In any event, the proposals before me have been considered as a whole based on the description of development above and, specifically, their effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling within a row of buildings of a similar form. Primarily the surrounding buildings are two storeys, and any examples of extended features are to the rear, generally single storey and as such clearly subservient. Resultantly, the pleasant consistency across the dwellings to both the front and rear contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would result in a development which would relate poorly and awkwardly with the rest of the building. Whilst the dwelling can accommodate some extension, the proposal would not sit comfortably and would obscure its modest character. Moreover, due to the overall scale, it would not be viewed as a subordinate addition and would obscure the rear elevation in its entirety. The use of hipped roofs would attempt to retain some subservience, however the intersections and combination of them in conjunction with the gabled roof would not relate well to the building. Whilst it already appears unbalanced due to the dormer window, this

would be emphasised by the proposal and there would be no clear fenestration hierarchy which would be typically found on a building such as this. This is also highlighted by the lack of consistency in the size, type and location of windows.

6. The proposal would not be visible on the street scene; however, this would not diminish the importance of the affected elevation to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the works would be visible to the rear of many neighbouring properties and as such sufficiently exposed to have an impact on the area. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 and the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has provided details of other examples of development with some viewed from the rear garden of the appeal site on the site visit. A few unsympathetic examples appear to be the exception rather than the norm and none that I have seen sufficiently compare to the appeal scheme to the extent that I would change my findings.
8. The proposals would provide more space for the incumbent family with the associated benefits such could bring to their quality of life. The scheme may also incorporate carbon reduction measures as well as biodiversity enhancements. I would afford these limited weight given that it is unclear as to whether such matters are either reliant on the proposed development or it is the sole means of achieving them.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. 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

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR