
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by David L Morgan BA MA (T&CP) MA (Bld Con IoAAS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 24th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/17/3166602

1 Drews Park, Knotty Green, Beaconsfield HP9 2TT

- 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 Shafiq Malik against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2016/1524/FA, dated 15 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of carport pergola and erection of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. At the time of my site visit the existing carport pergola had been largely clad in horizontal painted timber cladding, save for its western elevation that remained open. Although it was difficult to judge accurately the proportions of this structure in relation to the existing plans, from an assessment of the line of this front elevation in relation to the position of the eastern-most dormer, it looked as if the existing structure had been reduced in depth. Due to the differing scales of the respective plans, those accompanying the appeal and the one associated with the 2016 Certificate of Lawfulness are of very limited assistance in allowing one to be more definitive on this.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Drews Park is characterised by substantial detached modern houses set within generous grounds bordered by mature or maturing planting. The appeal property occupies the plot on the corner with Penn Road and is therefore significant in the contribution it makes to defining the approach to the Drews park and thus the character and appearance of the area. The house on the site is a large mostly linear structure with a varying height to the pitched roof which is set above brick elevations. The carport structure stands at 90° to the main house but in close proximity to its north elevation. The existing pergola structure, now clad, though partly screened by the boundary planting, is still discernable from Penn Road and on the approach to Drews Park.

5. The proposed garage, broadly on the same footprint as the existing structure (though perhaps slightly larger) would be constructed of brick beneath a projecting fascia and flat roof with the west elevation enclosed with a pair of garage doors.
6. It is the case, whether clad or not, that the existing pergola carport does to a certain extent define an element of the built form of the site. However, and again whether clad or not, there is a sense of lightness and visual subservience to it in relation to the house that mitigates its presence within the street scene, especially as it is perceived in relation to the main house.
7. However and notwithstanding the presence of the existing structure, the proposed garage, with its sheer brick elevations in association with the severe horizontal emphasis of the fascia and flat roof, would have a significantly more tangible consolidated presence on the site. This would be particularly the case where it is seen in relation to the main house, where it would be seen, despite the boundary cover, in close and awkward juxtaposition to it.
8. This would in my view cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area and so conflict with policies GC1, H13, H15 and H20 of the Chiltern District Local Plan and policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District, all of which seek, inter alia, to both secure a high standard of design and safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Failing to achieve these objectives the proposals would also conflict with the aims set out in paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which advises that permission be refused for development of poor design.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Morgan

Inspector