
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2017

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/17/3179724

The Shieling, Village Way, Little Chalfont HP7 9PU

- 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 & Mrs R Taylor against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2017/0391/FA, dated 3 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a replacement detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement detached garage at The Shieling, Village Way, Little Chalfont HP7 9PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref CH/2017/0391/FA, dated 3 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 2408-2-TP1 Rev A, 2408-2-A4 -TP2 and 2408-2-A2-TP3
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a detached garage at the side. The property is set back from the road within a mature established residential area, typically characterised by large detached dwellings within spacious plots. Whilst there is some variation in the house styles, a number of the dwellings along the private road are built close to the highway and have garages and outbuildings at the front that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.

4. The proposal would entail the construction of a replacement detached garage at the side of the property. It would be set forward about 4.3m from the front elevation of the house and would be set back about 6m from the front boundary behind a driveway/grass verge and boundary hedge. It would have a hipped pitched roof with a maximum ridge height of about 4.7m.
5. Whilst the proposed garage would be located in a prominent position in front of the property, the scale, form and siting of the proposed garage would not be out of keeping with the built form of some of the existing garages and outbuildings in the area built close to the highway, including a pitched roof double garage to the front of the Thatches. The single storey form and hipped pitched roof design of the proposed garage set back from the front boundary together with the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the boundary treatment would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. This would allow the proposal to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the main property and limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
6. I therefore consider that the overall scale, design and siting of the proposed garage would not significantly detract from the streetscene and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be consistent with the overall design aims of Saved Policies GC1, H13, H15 and H20 of the Chiltern District Local Plan 1997 (including the alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 and November 2011 and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District 2011. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that all extensions and ancillary residential buildings (including garages) are designed to a high standard in keeping with the existing dwelling and any other buildings in the area, which reflects and respects the character of the surrounding area and would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the streetscene or locality.
8. In addition, the proposal would accord with the Council's Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD). The SPD guidance on garages and outbuildings outlines that such buildings should be modest in size and subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling particularly when sited in front of a dwelling.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plan as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR