
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by Rory Cridland LLB (Hons), Solicitor

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

Decision date: 30 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/W/16/3155474

4 Trafford Close, Buckinghamshire, Great Missenden HP16 0BS.

- 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 Sanchia Brown against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2016/0535/FA, dated 17 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and conservatory to form an additional two bedroom end of terrace unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a residential cul-de-sac within the built up area of Great Missenden. It forms part of a terrace of 2 storey properties of generally uniform width arranged around a central green space. The area is characterised by buildings of similar appearance and construction which helps create a general sense of uniformity. It is located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
5. Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy¹ requires new development to be of a high standard of design which reflects and respects the character of the surrounding area and those features which contribute to local distinctiveness. Similarly, Policy H3 of the Local Plan² permits new development which is compatible with

¹ Local Development Framework Core Strategy for Chiltern District (2011)

² Chiltern District Local Plan Written Statement (adopted 1 September 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001); Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011

the character of the surrounding area and which respects, amongst other things, the scale of buildings in the locality of the application site. Policy GC1 sets out a number of criteria against which proposals will be assessed and requires that the scale of new buildings is not at variance with any surrounding buildings with regard to frontage width.

6. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a new dwelling alongside No 4. However, its frontage would be considerably narrower than those of the adjacent properties as well as many other dwellings located nearby. This would be at variance with the established frontage width and would be visually discordant within the street scene. Furthermore, its close proximity to the boundary would result in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance and exacerbate its overall impact. This would be harmful to the character of the surrounding area.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would be at variance with the frontage width of nearby properties. Furthermore, it would result in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance which would fail to contribute to local distinctiveness and would be harmful to the character of the surroundings area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy and Policies GC1 & H3 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has sought to challenge the Council's ability to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. However, even if I were to conclude that there is a shortfall of the level suggested by the appellant and that the determinative policies listed above were relevant policies for the supply of housing³, I consider the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the limited benefit which a single unit of housing would provide.
9. The appellant has referred to a more recent detached dwelling which has been erected alongside No 1, planning permission for which was granted on appeal⁴. However, that scheme differs considerably in both its design and width to the present scheme - as does its overall impact on its surroundings. Furthermore, I note that that decision pre-dates the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework which attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. As such, I do not consider it provides a justifiable precedent for the development proposed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory Cridland

INSPECTOR

³ and accordingly should not be considered up-to-date

⁴ APP/X0415/A/08/2074215