
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2016

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

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

Decision date: 10th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/16/3157988

91 Oakwood Cottage, Worlds End Lane, Weston Turville, Bucks HP22 5RX

- 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 Mrs Jacqueline Steadman against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01975/APP, dated 24 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the Worlds End Lane street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal comprises the erection of a detached garage in the westernmost corner of the property frontage, adjacent to the boundary with next door and the highway.
 4. The appeal property is part of a ribbon of development extending south from the main part of the settlement of Weston Turville. Apart from a small number of dwellings on the other side of the road a little further to the north, the land opposite (to the west) is part of the open countryside. In combination with the extensive and well greened frontages at the majority of nearby properties, this creates the sense of a spacious, semi-rural area.
 5. The garage would be constructed from materials that would generally reflect the site's semi-rural location and would be reasonably well-screened on the approach from the north by the existing relatively tall boundary vegetation. However, it would be very prominent when travelling from the south due to the more open frontages in this location and also very noticeable in views directly towards the property.
 6. At my site visit, I noted an absence of outbuildings in front of dwellings along Worlds End Lane in the vicinity of the appeal property. The proposed building would therefore be the only such structure in this part of the settlement and would appear as an anomaly. For this reason, its presence would be amplified and it would be out of keeping with the frontages of other nearby properties
-

and therefore incongruous within the street scene. I accept that suitably worded conditions could provide for additional boundary planting were I minded to allow the appeal. However, I am not persuaded that this would overcome the overall effect of a development stridently standing forward of the dwelling where no other such structures exist along this part of Worlds End Lane.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to developments at other properties in Worlds End Lane where outbuildings have been constructed in front of dwellings close to the highway. Having taken the opportunity to view these at my site visit, I noted that they are located much closer to the core of the settlement where the character changes from the distinctive open frontages that are found in the area of the appeal property to shorter, more enclosed frontages. In addition, it is unclear whether some of these outbuildings are contemporary with the dwellings to which they relate. Where they may not be, I do not have any details of what led to these other developments being considered acceptable and thus, I cannot draw any direct comparison between them and the proposal before me.
8. I therefore consider that the proposal would harm the Worlds End Lane street scene and the character and appearance of the area more generally. Thus, it would run counter to Policy GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan Part 1 (2004) that sets out a number of requirements that overall seek to ensure development complements its surroundings. Although this policy is now of some age, I consider it to be in general accordance with the requirement for good design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. I have also had regard to the Council's Design Guide for Residential Extensions, which seeks to resist garages being placed in prominent locations and to which I consider the proposal would also run counter. Although this document dates from 1991, it has been amended following the adoption by the Council of the Aylesbury Vale Householder Extensions Local Development Order in 2013. I do not find the Design Guide to be overly prescriptive and therefore consider it to be in broad accordance with the Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of neighbour objections, the appeal does not succeed.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector