
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2017

by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/W/17/3180275

1 Shrimpton Close, Knotty Green, Bucks HP9 2AZ

- 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 and Mrs A Varcoe against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref CH/2017/0450/FA, dated 10 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is subdivision of plot and erection of new detached dwelling, served by new vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of Shrimpton Close and Mynchen Road. These roads form part of a larger estate characterised by chalet style dwellings. Although many properties within the estate have been extended and updated, and walls, fences and hedgerows abut parts of the highway, I observed that the area has a largely uniform appearance of dwellings in an open and spacious setting. Although enclosed by a tall hedgerow, the appeal site on this prominent corner makes an important contribution to this character.
4. Policy GC1 of the Adopted Chiltern District Local Plan 1997 including Adopted Alterations 2001 (ACDLP) requires development to be of a high standard of design and acknowledges that design includes both the appearance of the development and its relationship to its surroundings. Amongst other matters, this policy states that development should be in accordance with the siting of any existing adjoining buildings and if fronting a road, the scale and alignment of the road in which they are to be located. Policy H3 of the ACDLP and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (CS) have similar aims requiring development proposals to be compatible with the character of the surrounding area and those features which contribute to local distinctiveness.
5. The new dwelling would be of a design that would respect the established character and appearance of the area, and its siting and design in relation to Shrimpton Close would respect these matters also.

6. However, the new dwelling would be set forward of nearby development on Mynchen Road, and its side elevation facing this road would be at odds with the front facing dwellings nearby. Whilst the mature landscaping is shown to be retained, and would go some way to soften the visual impact of the dwelling, I consider that the tall gable feature would be a prominent, dominant feature in the street scene. The proposal would result in an incongruous feature on this largely open corner site which would significantly reduce the spacious qualities of the area and have a harmful effect upon its character and appearance.
7. The appellants have drawn my attention to the Council's Chiltern Townscape Character Assessment (TCA). Within this document the appeal site is identified as being within Area 3 Mynchen Road Residential Area where medium and small-scale development could potentially be accommodated. The area was assessed as having moderate sensitivity, with no special qualities desirable to safeguard. Whilst noting these matters paragraph 13.4.15 of the document makes it clear that although the principle of development is acceptable, this is subject to appropriate siting, design and mitigation.
8. In this case I have found that the siting of the new dwelling and its appearance from Mynchen Road would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Both the policies of the development plan referred to above and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) place importance on good design and the need to take account of the different roles and character of different areas. The appeal proposal, for the reasons given, would fail to achieve this. The reference to the area having no special qualities in the TCA does not lead me to conclude differently.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the established character and appearance of this attractive area, which would be in conflict with the aims of ACDLP Policies GC1 and H3, CS Policy CS20, and the design and character core planning principles of the Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR