



## Report to Buckinghamshire Council – Central Area Planning Committee

---

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Application Number:</b>  | 21/04734/APP   |
| <b>Proposal:</b>            | Householder application for removal of existing garage and erection of single storey rear and side extension |
| <b>Site location:</b>       | 213 Tring Road, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, HP20 1JH   |
| <b>Applicant:</b>           | Mr Kuruparen Suppiah   |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>        | Carmen Timoce  |
| <b>Ward affected:</b>       | AYLESBURY EAST   |
| <b>Parish-Town Council:</b> | AYLESBURY  |
| <b>Valid date:</b>          | 13 December 2021   |
| <b>Determination date:</b>  | 07 February 2022   |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>      | Approved, subject to conditions.   |

---

### 1.0 Summary & Recommendation/ Reason for Planning Committee Consideration

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the removal of the existing garage and the erection of a single storey rear and side extension that would wrap around the northeast and southeast elevations of the existing dwelling.
- 1.2 The application site is located within an established residential area, in Aylesbury, on the northern side of Tring Road.
- 1.3 This application has been evaluated against the Development Plan, which comprises the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Adopted September 2021 (VALP), and the guidance as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF). Having regard to all the relevant policies, it is concluded that the development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the main dwelling, that of the street scene and wider area, residential amenity, parking, and ecology. The development would therefore comply with policies BE2, BE3, I4, NE1, NE8 and T6 of VALP and with the guidance as set out within the NPPF.
- 1.4 The recommendation is that permission be approved subject to the conditions recommended at paragraph 7.4.
- 1.5 The application was called in by Ward Councillor Mark Winn for consideration by committee and raised the following (summarised) material planning issues:

- Overdevelopment;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and,
- Impact on the street scene and wider area.

1.6 The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Central Area Committee considered that given the issues raised, it would be appropriate for the proposal be considered at Committee.

## **2.0 Description of Proposed Development**

2.1 The application site relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse that is located within a residential area that is characterised by a mixture of house types and designs. The main dwelling is part brick built and part pebbledash rendered with a tiled element, at first floor level, on the principal elevation.

2.2 The property features a large hardstanding area to the front of the dwelling and a single detached garage that is located to the northeast of the main dwelling and abuts the shared boundary line with neighbouring property No. 215 Tring Road.

2.3 The boundary treatment to the rear is mainly marked by approximately 1.8m high close boarded fencing, although there are a few areas marked by lower close boarded fencing or brick wall.

2.4 There are no significant changes in ground levels at the site, but the ground does slope away slightly from southwest to northeast.

2.5 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing detached garage and erection of a single storey rear and side extension. This application follows two previously refused planning applications (20/03355/APP and 21/01784/APP) both for extensions which were refused on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020 and 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2021, respectively.

2.6 The new scheme proposes amendments with regard to the depth and width of the proposed rear element, and alterations to proposed openings.

2.7 The proposed development would have a maximum depth of 8.7m (southeast flank elevation), a minimum depth of 3.25 (northwest flank elevation) with a maximum width of 5m (north-west), a minimum width of 1.26m (southwest elevation) and a ridge height of 2.98m for the side element and approximately 3.2m for the rear element.

2.8 The proposed extension would have a flat roof design with three rooflights and would be built in materials that would match those existing on the host dwelling.

2.9 The proposed works would also include the installation of two rooflights onto the existing flat roofed single storey rear projection.

2.10 The application is accompanied by:

- a) Application Form
- b) 622/D001 Rev A Location Plan 1:1250
- c) 622/D002 Rev C Block Plan 1:500
- d) 622/D003 Rev A Existing Plans and Elevations

- e) 622/D004 Rev B Proposed Plans
- f) 622/D005 Rev A Proposed Elevations
- g) 622/D006 Rev B Parking Plan
- h) Design and Access Statement, dated 10<sup>th</sup> December 2021
- i) Ecology and Trees Checklist

### **3.0 Relevant Planning History**

#### **3.1. Reference: 88/01608/APP**

Development: Attic conversion

Decision: Approved                      Decision Date: 27 July 1988

#### **3.2. Reference: 98/00805/APP**

Development: Installation of dormer window in side elevation

Decision: Approved                      Decision Date: 3 June 1998

#### **3.3. Reference: 18/03645/APP**

Development: Conversion of the garage into a habitable room and roof extension.

Decision: Householder Approved      Decision Date: 21 February 2019

#### **3.4. Reference: 20/03355/APP**

Development: Demolition of the existing garage and erection of rear extension

Decision: Householder Refused        Decision Date: 8 December 2020

Refusal reasons:

1. The proposed rear extension in combination with the existing rear extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk and excessive width would fail to represent a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and combined with its design would represent an incongruous and contrived form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair it forms a part of and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area and therefore contrary to Policy GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE2 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF.2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its siting, scale and proximity would result in an overly dominant visually intrusive form of development upon the residential amenities and light levels of the adjoining occupiers at 211 Tring Road and therefore is contrary to Policy GP8 and GP9 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE3 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF.

#### **3.5. Reference: 21/01784/APP**

Development: Removal of existing garage. New single storey rear and side extension

Decision: Householder Refused        Decision Date: 22 June 2021

Refusal reasons:

1. The proposed rear extension in combination with the existing rear extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk and excessive width would fail to represent a subordinate addition to the host dwelling

and combined with its design would represent an incongruous and contrived form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair it forms a part of and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area and therefore contrary to Policy GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE2 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF.

2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its siting, scale and proximity would result in an overly dominant visually intrusive form of development upon the residential amenities and light levels of the adjoining occupiers at 211 Tring Road and therefore is contrary to Policy GP8 and GP9 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE3 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF.

#### **4.0 Representations**

4.1. See Appendix A of this report.

#### **5.0 Policy Considerations and Evaluation**

5.1. National Planning Policy Framework 2021

5.2. National Planning Practice Guidance

5.3. Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Adopted September 2021) (VALP):

*Policy BE2 Design of new development*

*Policy BE3 Protection of amenity of residents*

*Policy I4 Flooding*

*Policy NE1 Biodiversity and geodiversity*

*Policy NE8 Trees, hedgerows and woodlands*

*Policy T6 Vehicle parking*

5.4. Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG):

*VALP Appendix B Parking Standards*

5.5. Design Advice:

*Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide*

5.6. Aylesbury Town does not have a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **Raising the quality of place making and design, and landscape issues**

Policy BE2 of VALP (Design of New Development), Residential Extensions Design Guide, NPPF

5.7 The site is located within the built up area wherein the principle of development is acceptable. The proposal comprises the demolition of the existing detached garage that would allow the erection of a flat roofed single storey rear and side extension. This would be built in materials that would match those existing on the host dwelling, except for the flat roof which would have an asphalt roof installed. The single storey extension would wrap

around the northeast and southeast elevations of the existing dwelling and would be set in from the site boundaries.

- 5.8 The property has been previously extended in the form of a single storey rear extension, a front porch and two dormers, one to the side and one to the rear of the dwelling. These developments are not considered to be part of the original dwelling.
- 5.9 Local concerns have been raised as to the scale of the development relative to the original dwelling and the impact of the overall enlargement.
- 5.10. The existing single storey rear projection at No. 213 Tring Road was built more than ten years ago, alongside with the existing extension at No. 211 Tring Road. The two projections are similar in design with a depth of 4m. These existing two rear projections have already pushed the buildings beyond any notional building line.
- 5.11. While the proposed development would not prescribe to the proportions envisaged for side and rear extensions within the design advice set out in the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide, the proposal would be located mainly to the rear, would be single storey in nature and would have a flat roof design similar to the one of the existing single storey projections on site and in the local area, defending an appeal on this point is unlikely to be sustainable.
- 5.12. The host dwelling is sited within a large plot, and it features a garden that measures 36.37m in length (approximately 321 sqm). The total floor area of the existing dwelling (detached garage not included) together with the proposed extension would be approximately 110 sqm. The dwelling is set back from the main road with a large front garden.
- 5.13. By demolishing the existing detached garage, which has a total area of approximately 13 sqm, further land would be made available to allow for the proposed extension to be built.
- 5.14 Regarding the character and appearance of the two semi-detached dwellings, Nos. 211 and 213 Tring Road, the original design of the pair has already been altered by way of installing one side dormer on each dwelling and by adding the front porch element at No. 213 Tring Road. It is considered that the proposed rear and side projection would not have an additional adverse impact upon the already altered appearance of the two properties, given that the proposal would mostly be located to the rear of the property and would be single storey in nature.
- 5.15 In terms of the impact upon the streetscene, the proposed rear element would not be prominent within the wider area due to the highly limited views available from the main street. Whilst the proposed side element would be, in part, visible from Tring Road, any such views are relatively limited owing to the pattern of development in the surrounding area. Any views are likely to be concentrated on the gap between the host dwelling and No. 215, when stood directly in front of the properties. The proposed side element would also be set back from the host dwelling's principal elevation and main road by approximately 8m and 19m, respectively and flat roof designs are a common feature along the Tring Road. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not have a negative impact upon the character and

appearance of the streetscene or within the locality.

- 5.16 Overall, the proposed development is informed by the character and features of the host dwelling and its setting, in accordance with the requirements of policy BE2 of VALP. Given the single storey nature of the proposal, the size of the plot and its context, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable on balance and would not represent an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would therefore comply with policy BE2 of VALP and the guidance within the NPPF.

### **Amenity of existing and future residents**

Policy BE3 of VALP (Protection of Amenity), NPPF

- 5.17 As aforementioned, this proposal follows a previously refused planning application on site. The current scheme seeks to address the reasons for refusal stated under planning application reference number 21/01784/APP.
- 5.18 As previously mentioned, it is proposed to demolish the existing garage and erect a flat roofed single storey rear and side extension.
- 5.19 To the rear of the property, the host dwelling shares its boundary line with the neighbouring properties Nos. 60 and 62 Broughton Avenue. It is considered that in this instance, given the length of the rear garden, the single storey nature of the proposal and the existing boundary treatment, no privacy concerns are raised relating to these neighbours.
- 5.20 In regard to the neighbouring property No. 211 Tring Road to the west (attached), the current scheme proposes an extension that would be set back by 3m from the shared boundary line and would have a maximum ridge height of approximately 3.17m.
- 5.21 There would be no windows installed on the flank elevation facing toward the neighbour's rear garden (northwest), although it is proposed to install a door. The current boundary treatment between the host dwelling and No. 211 comprises a mixture of 1.5m high brick walling and 1.8m timber fence panels.
- 5.22 To the southeast, the application site abuts the curtilage of No. 215 Tring Road which features a two-storey rear and single storey rear and side extension. The boundary treatment between Nos. 213 and 215 is marked by standard close boarded fencing which varies in height in certain areas. The proposed extension would be set back from the shared boundary line by approximately 0.9m.
- 5.23 The proposal includes the installation of two high level windows that would serve the kitchen and the utility room, and a glazed uPVC door. The proposed windows would be located at 1.9m on the elevation, when measured from ground level to the bottom windowsill. The existing single storey rear projection at No. 215 Tring Road features one opening on its northwest flank elevation which serves a shower room. Given the existing openings on the side elevations of the two properties, the existing boundary treatment, it is considered that the single storey nature of the proposal and the location of the two high level windows ensures that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact upon the privacy of the occupants at No.215 Tring Road.

- 5.24 The proposed window on the southwest elevation of the side element would be facing toward the main road. Given the existing openings on the host dwelling's principal elevation and the proposal's set back position, it is considered that this would not raise any concerns.
- 5.25 Local concerns were raised that the proposal would have an overbearing impact upon adjacent neighbours, and it would fail to comply with the 45-degree rule, resulting in a negative impact upon the light levels received by the occupants of neighbouring property, No. 211.
- 5.26 Although the proposed resulting extension would exceed the depth recommended by the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide, it is acknowledged that at a depth of approximately 4.5m, it would be only 0.5m deeper than the guide aspirations. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be set back 1.96m from No. 215 when compared to the existing rear projection at this neighbouring property. A refusal on this point would in the view of officers not be sustainable.
- 5.27 In terms of the 45-degree rule, the agent has shown on plan that the proposed extension would comply with the 45-degree rule relative to neighbouring property No. 211. In addition to this, the sun rises from northeast and sets down toward northwest given the scale and positioning of the proposed rear extension, it is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse effect on light levels received by the neighbouring occupants of the adjacent properties.
- 5.28 In summary, it is considered that the residential amenities of the adjacent neighbouring properties would not be materially affected, and the proposed development would therefore comply with policy BE3 of VALP and with the guidance within the NPPF.

### **Transport matters and parking**

Policy T6 (Vehicle Parking) and Appendix B (Policy T6 Parking Standards) of VALP, NPPF

- 5.28 No changes have been proposed under the current scheme with regard to the resulting number of bedrooms and the parking provisions stated in the previous application (21/01784/APP).
- 5.29 Whilst the proposed demolition of the garage would result in the loss of one space, the dwelling will retain three off street parking spaces to the front. Appendix B of VALP states that for a 4-bedroom property the parking requirement is 3 parking spaces.
- 5.30 Although the parking spaces as shown on drawing No. 622/D006 Rev B would measure 2.48m x 5m and would marginally fail the Council's standard dimensions for a parking space (2.8m x 5m), the proposed spaces are still useable and effective to provide parking sufficient to serve the site's needs, and the Council and Highways Authority do not have any objection to the proposed arrangement, a refusal on this point would not be sustainable.
- 5.31 No objections are raised with regard to policy T6 and Appendix B of VALP, and the NPPF.

## **Ecology**

Policy NE1 of VALP (Biodiversity and Geodiversity), NPPF

5.32 The application site lies within a Green Impact Risk Zone for Great Crested Newt Habitats, which means that there is low habitat suitability but Great Crested Newts might be present. However, it is considered that the nature of the proposed works is unlikely to impact upon the protected species. An informative has been added to this report advising the applicant of the procedure that should be followed if a Great Crested Newt is encountered during the works.

## **Other matters**

### *5.34 Trees*

The property is not located within a Conservation area and there are no Tree Protection Orders on site. As such, there is no requirement for the applicant to seek permission from the Council with regard to the soft landscaping.

### *5.35 Flooding and drainage*

The application site has been identified to be within an area susceptible to low and intermediate levels of surface water flooding. However, the property is not located within a Flood Risk Zone 2 or 3. As such, no additional flood mitigation information would be required.

Notwithstanding the above and given the concerns raised by a local resident, the Officers consider that the proposed patio area to the southeast and northeast of the dwelling should be built in permeable materials. This would be secured via condition.

### *5.36 Use*

Concerns were raised with regard to the use of the proposed extension and existing detached garage as a 'Spice Kitchen'. It is noted that in 2018 planning permission was granted for the change of use of the garage and the current scheme includes the demolition of the building. As such, the Officers have nothing to raise with regard to this matter, this is not a matter for relevance as part of this application.

Regarding the use of the proposed extension, Paragraph 2(a) of Section 55 of Part III of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that any alteration, improvement or maintenance of any building or works which only affect the interior of the building is not considered development and therefore any internal works that will be carried out at this site would not amount to development and would therefore not require any formal planning permission. Notwithstanding this, if the applicant intends to use the proposed area or any other area that is currently in residential use for commercial purposes then this would be a matter for the Council's Enforcement team and not this application.

### *5.37 Inaccuracy*



A local resident has claimed that there are inaccuracies in the submitted plans. It is accepted that planning permission should be clear on its face and the drawings which accompany it should be readable to their four corners. In this case, a proposed rooflight was missed from the Proposed First Floor Plan and the existing front porch was omitted. However, these were resolved during the course of the application. In addition, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that there are legal boundary issues and as such it did not give rise to any concerns.

As such the Council is satisfied that the plans submitted are accurate and fit for purpose.

#### 5.39 *Precedent*

Concerns have been raised that the development would set an undesirable future precedent. However, the Officer's findings in this application must be based only on the individual planning merits of the case that is before us. The circumstances of other sites would be different and if proposals came forward elsewhere within the locality, they would be assessed in the light of the factors relevant to those cases. Therefore, Officers consider that the concern about precedent does not offer a basis for resisting the scheme.

#### 5.40 *Comparable cases*

A local resident has referred to recent refusal decisions to support their stance in respect of this matter. However, those decisions are not directly comparable to this proposal as some relate to schemes outside of Aylesbury; and those from within the Aylesbury area are not within the same street. Therefore, none lead the Officers to alter their findings and in any event each case must be considered on its own merits.

### 6.0 **Overall Assessment**

- 6.1 For the reasons mentioned above, the proposed single storey side and rear extension would not represent a form of overdevelopment of the site, would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling, and would not have a negative impact on the streetscene and locality nor upon the residential amenity of the adjacent properties. On-site parking provision is also sufficient. The Officers consider that the proposed scheme addresses the reasons for refusal of the previous planning application (reference number 21/01784/APP) which are as listed above for reference.
- 6.2 As set out above, it is considered that the proposed development would accord with development plan policies BE2, BE3, I4, NE1, NE8 and T6 of VALP.
- 6.3 Local Planning Authorities, when making decisions of a strategic nature, must have due regard, through the Equalities Act, to reducing the inequalities which may result from socio-economic disadvantage. In this instance, it is not considered that this proposal would disadvantage any sector of society to a harmful extent.

## 7.0 Working with the applicant / agent

- 7.1 In accordance with paragraphs 38 and 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) the Council approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way taking a proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments.
- 7.2 The Council work with the applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate, updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.
- 7.3 In this instance the application was considered acceptable following amendment and is therefore recommended for approval.

## Recommendation

- 7.4 Having regard to applicable national and local planning policies, and having taken all relevant material considerations into account, it is recommended that planning permission is **GRANTED**, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason** – To comply with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the planning application hereby approved and drawing numbers:

- 622/D001 Rev A Location Plan 1:1250, received on 22.06.2022
- 622/D002 Rev C Block Plan 1:500, received on 22.06.2022
- 622/D004 Rev B Proposed Plans, received on 22.06.2022
- 622/D005 Rev A Proposed Elevations, received on 11.12.2021
- 622/D006 Rev C Parking Plan, received on 23.06.2022

and in accordance with any other conditions imposed by this planning permission.

**Reason** – To ensure that the details of the development are acceptable to the Local Planning Authority and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the submitted application form and on the approved plans.

**Reason** – To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Adopted) 2021 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

4. The scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose.

Reason – To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway and to comply with policy T6 of Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Adopted) 2021 and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

5. The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall at no time be used as a balcony, sitting-out or amenity area.

Reason - To preserve the amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings and to comply with policy BE3 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Adopted 2021) and with the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

6. The external patio and associated paths of the development hereby permitted shall be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

Reason – In order to reduce the risk of flooding and to accord with policy I4 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

#### Informatives:

1. Great Crested Newts (European Protected Species): The applicant is reminded that, under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to: deliberately capture, disturb, injure or kill great crested newts; damage or destroy a breeding or resting place; deliberately obstructing access to a resting or sheltering place. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under these acts. Ponds, other water bodies and vegetation, such as grassland, scrub and woodland, and also brownfields sites, may support great crested newts. Where proposed activities might result in one or more of the above offences, it is possible to apply for an EPS mitigation licence from Natural England or the district licence distributed by Buckinghamshire Council. If a great crested newt is encountered during development, works must cease, and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist

## **Appendix A: Consultation Responses and Representations**

## **Appendix B: Site Location plan**

# **APPENDIX A: Consultation Responses and Representations**

## Councillor Comments

*1<sup>st</sup> comment Cllr Winn dated 7<sup>th</sup> January 2022:*

“I have received representations from residents that no yellow notices were displayed for this application and as a result they are being denied the right to due process by being able to make meaningful comments against this application. Can I formally request that an extension be given to the timeframe for comments.”

*2<sup>nd</sup> comment Cllr Winn dated 4<sup>th</sup> February 2022:*

“If this application was recommended for approval by the planning officer I think there are a number of material planning issues which would benefit from examination in public before the planning committee.

One of the major issues is the fact that this is one of more than one extensions on this property which cumulatively would fail to represent a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and do not overcome the material issues that led to the refusal of a previous planning applications 20/03355/APP (refused in December 2020) and 21/01784/APP (refused in June 2021). I also feel that we need to examine in the planning committee if this scheme is detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semidetached pair it forms a part of and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, with these two points taken together it needs to be determined by the planning committee whether this application should be refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policy GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE2 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF, which again were reasons why approval was previously refused for applications.

Further to the above I note the fact that the highways authority although they have not objected to this scheme did recommend that the following condition is placed on the application 'that the scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose extensions on this property and are added to those to such an extent'. It is very important that this condition is imposed if approval was given for this extension.

I also have been aware that the gardens at the back of Tring road have in the past flooded and this includes the area of this proposed extension. I have noted that there is no comment on the possibility of a flooding risk if approval was given. I think it would be unacceptable to give approval without an investigations by experts into this matter first.”

*3<sup>rd</sup> comment Cllr Winn dated 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022:*

“As per my submission on 4 April I would restate the fact that I believe there are material planning reasons why this application would benefit from call-in for determination by committee.

I confirm I do not have any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, personal interest, prejudicial interest or any personal bias in the Planning Application being called-in.

To restate the material issues were one of more than one extensions on this property which

cumulatively may be seen would fail to represent a subordinate addition to the host dwelling and do not overcome the material issues that led to the refusal of a previous planning applications 20/03355/APP (refused in December 2020) and 21/01784/APP (refused in June 2021). I also feel that we need to examine in the planning committee if this scheme is detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair it forms a part of and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, with these two points taken together it needs to be determined by the planning committee whether this application should be refused on the grounds that it is contrary to Policy GP9 and GP35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan, VALP Policy BE2 and the AVDC Residential Extensions Design Guide and NPPF, which again were reasons why approval was previously refused for this application.

Further to the above I note the fact that the highways authority although they have not objected to this scheme did recommend that the following condition is placed on the application 'that the scheme for parking and manoeuvring indicated on the submitted plans shall be laid out prior to the initial occupation of the development hereby permitted and that area shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose extensions on this property and are added to those to such an extent'. It is very important that this condition is imposed if approval was given for this extension , and I would ask that the planning committee ensure that this condition is imposed.

I am happy to confirm I do not have an Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, personal interest, prejudicial interest or any personal bias in the Planning Application being called-in."

### Town Council Comments

*'Aylesbury Town Council have no objection to this application.'*

### Consultation Responses (Summarised)

Highways Officer dated 07<sup>th</sup> January 2022: No objections, subject to conditions.

### Representations

6 public representations have been received, all objecting to the proposed works as summarised below:

#### *Design*

- Overdevelopment of the application site.
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling, that of the semi-detached pair of which it forms part.
- Impact upon the streetscene and wider area.
- The materials proposed are not accurate.
- Fails to promote high quality design.

#### *Residential amenity*

- Overbearing to neighbouring properties as the ground level slopes downwards away from the dwelling.
- Impact on privacy.
- Impact on natural sunlight.
- Impact on garden amenity.
- No information has been submitted in regard to the 45-degree rule in relation to No.211 Tring Road.

#### *Use*

- Concerns that the proposed extension would be used for commercial purposes.
- Misleading statements regarding the 'net space' addition. The garage does not represent residential space.

#### *Flooding*

- The existing driveway is not built in permeable materials and the addition of laying a patio area to the side/rear of the host dwelling in non-permeable materials will increase the surface water flood risks. The matter raised with regard to the proposed soakaway would be addressed by the Building Regulations regime.

#### *Landscaping*

- Impact on trees.

#### *Other matters*

- Concerns regarding the accuracy of drawings submitted i.e. height, separation distances, overall measurements of the proposed extension.
- The front porch is not shown on the site/block plan, parking plan.
- Concerns regarding the boundary lines shown on plans.
- A new precedent being set.
- Several householder extensions examples which were refused on different grounds were brought to our attention.

# APPENDIX B: Site Location Plan



Do not scale – this map is indicative only

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2020. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Buckinghamshire Council, PSMA Licence Number 0100062456