



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2010

by **Mark Balchin BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
3 September 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/10/2132686
65 Langdon Avenue, Aylesbury, Bucks HP21 9UW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr David Norman against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
- The application (Ref.10/00589/APP), dated 19 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2010.
- The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, front porch and detached single-storey double garage.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the garage on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The Council has not objected to the extensions to the dwelling, and I agree that they are acceptable.
 4. The street is characterised by generally large detached houses, most with integral or attached garages. However, there are bungalows on two sides of the green at the end of the cul-de-sac, one of which adjoins the appeal site. Most properties are set well back from the road, and there are plenty of trees and shrubs in front gardens. This provides a spacious feel to the area.
 5. The double width and double length garage would be sited at the front of the appeal dwelling, roughly equidistant between the house and the side garden wall of the adjoining bungalow, no.68. Although the front garden and forecourt are larger than most nearby, in my view, the garage would be dominant. For an ancillary building, it would be substantial in scale. Its ridge would be only slightly lower than that of no.68; the double width would highlight its mass; and because of its length, despite the set-back from the highway boundary, it would still project significantly forward within the site.
 6. Because of the street pattern, wider views of the structure would be limited. However, it would be clearly visible from the approach to the site adjoining nos.53-63 and from no.68. In my opinion, the large, free-standing building, which would be uncharacteristic of the area, would be very prominent and
-

incongruous in the street scene. I agree with the appellant that the position of the corner plot is unusual and that it is not appropriate to apply a strict interpretation of building lines, but my decision is based on the unacceptable visual impact of the garage.

7. I conclude that the garage would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policies GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2004.
8. I have considered whether it would be appropriate to issue a split decision in view of the acceptability of the extensions to the house. However, the implementation of those proposals could prejudice the design of a revised scheme incorporating a garage, which may be acceptable to the Council. As a result, I have declined to follow that option. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Balchin

INSPECTOR