



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025

by **C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3362305

2 Eastfield Road, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP20 1PA

- 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 T Sakhi of Design Studio E17 against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03377/APP.
 - The development proposed is part single and part two storey side and rear extensions and installation of hardstanding and a dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the appeal form, as this more comprehensively describes the proposed development, although I have omitted elements that are not acts of development. No party would be prejudiced by such.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling set within a large corner plot in a predominately residential area. It is not within a conservation area nor the curtilage of a listed building. However, due to its corner location, and the size of the plot, the appeal site is prominent within the street scene and despite the boundary wall enclosing much of it to one side, the plot provides a welcome open character within the context of the surrounding area.
5. The appeal proposal omits the first floor rear extension and the width of the two storey side extension has been reduced and includes a greater set back from Narbeth Drive, compared to the scheme previously refused at the appeal property. However, despite these reductions, the proposed extensions are of significant scale compared to the original host property.
6. The ground floor area of the proposed extensions would more than double that of the original dwelling. Furthermore, despite that the proposed two-storey side extension would be setback from Narbeth Drive, set in from the front elevation and set down of the main ridgeline of the existing dwelling, it would appear as a large and overly dominant addition to the original dwelling. Therefore, even though the proposal may meet some of the principles set out within the Council's Design

Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the appeal site is a large plot, overall, the combined scale and massing of the proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions that would not appear subordinate to the original dwelling. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

7. Furthermore, as a consequence of the corner location of the appeal site and that the proposed large two-storey side extension would project significantly toward Narbeth Drive, considerably forward of the prevailing building line of properties fronting this road, it would appear as an overly dominant and intrusive addition within the street scene. While the existing side boundary wall along Narbeth Drive would diminish views of the rear single storey extension from the road, the two storey side extension and the overall scale and massing of the extensions combined would not be discernibly reduced by the boundary wall.
8. There are examples of other dwellings on corner or end plots nearby in the local area, which have had side extensions thereto, including some two-storey side extensions. I viewed the examples referred to in the evidence, during my site visit. However, these examples are not directly comparable in terms of their location, scale, design and appearance to that proposed. In particular, even though the appeal site is a large plot, there is no continuing line of dwellings at the rear, unlike 123 Narbeth Drive (No 123). Consequently, this means that a two-storey extension to its side would be much more prominent in the street scene compared to the extensions at No 123. Furthermore, from the evidence provided, the extensions to No 123 were granted prior to the adoption of the Design SPD.
9. The two-storey side extension at 43 Northfield Road, is at the end of a cul-de-sac and, while it does not include a set-back from the road boundary, it is of a different scale and proportions compared to the appeal proposal and has a different site context. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on its own merits, having regard to current policy and guidelines.
10. The proposed extensions would, as asserted by the appellant, be of high quality design and include materials to match the existing. The proposed front porch and first floor window addition above it, would likely enhance the appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposed single storey rear extension would be of comparable depth to that of the single storey extension at the rear of 4 Eastfield Road, and principle DES62 of the SPD does not negate instances where rear extensions are of greater depth than 4 metres. However, such matters would not overcome the harm caused by reason of the overall scale and prominence of the proposed extensions.
11. Even though the Design SPD is guidance, it is referred to in Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) (adopted September 2021), which requires new development proposals to respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings including the scale and context of the site and its setting. Furthermore, the principles for household extensions set out in the SPD are important to ensure new development assimilates well with the host property and surrounding area, which are general good design principles to promote high quality new development.
12. In view of the above, the proposed extensions would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, in conflict

with Policy BE2 of the VALP and the principles set out in the Design SPD, including principles DES56, DES58, DES59, DES60 and DES62. Although, I do not find the proposal would conflict with principles DES55 and DES57, as these relate to agricultural and equine buildings and impact on neighbours, respectively.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
14. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR