



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019 by Alex O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc

Decision by A U Ghafoor Bsc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/19/3225773
378 Chartridge Lane, Chartridge HP5 2SJ

- 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 Terry Dyer against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/18/4774/FA, dated 18 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The established pattern of development surrounding the appeal site is characterised by houses which are substantially set back from the road. On the site's side, the frontages have been mainly kept open and devoid of any notable development. The site, and its immediately adjoining neighbours, follow this pattern. Apart from views directly in front of the site, it is largely screened from views in both directions when seen from the road, due to landscaping. The proposed garage would be positioned closer to the front boundary than to the house. Whilst other garages are present along Chartridge Lane, as a whole the road is remarkably varied in its character, and as such it is necessary to assess the proposal against the character of the immediate vicinity.
5. Whilst aesthetically the garage would complement the house, due to the similarity in roof form, it would be a substantially-sized structure, in comparison, due to its height and width, and would not be seen as a subordinate addition. As such, the proposal's scale and massing, combined with its proposed siting in a somewhat isolated position in the front garden, has the potential to be an imposing feature in the street scene, which would be out-of-keeping with the quality of the street scene, and which would disrupt the established pattern of development. Currently the soft landscaping, which would not be removed by the proposal, softens this visual effect to an extent, but the presence of landscaping cannot be relied upon to reduce the harmful impacts of the proposal, as the screening could be removed at any time, either by present or future occupiers of the appeal property. The development would be

at odds with the aims and objectives of advice found in the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the 'SPD').

6. The appellant has referred to an appeal decision relating to a proposal in Prestwood, Great Missenden¹. However, in that appeal, the Inspector mentioned that even if planting were to be reduced in the future, the proposal would have a minimal effect on the landscape and scenic beauty of the area. This is not the case here, where if the screening were to be removed, the proposal would appear out of character with the established pattern of development. The appellant also referred to an appeal decision relating to a proposal in Chalfont St Giles². However, that appeal involved a shed, which the Inspector noted was relatively small in scale, which is not the case for this proposal.
7. The appellant provided details of two grants of planning permission for garages, near the appeal site: Homestead Farm Cottage (Chartridge Lane), and 341 Chartridge Lane, and I went to both of these locations on my site visit. Regarding Homestead Farm Cottage, the established pattern of development and the street scene is markedly different from the proposal, with that site appearing in views as an independent and distinct unit. That proposal is not comparable with the scheme before me. In relation to 341 Chartridge Lane, the development appeared to be nearing completion, and whilst there are some similarities with the appeal proposal in terms of scale, that development does not set a desirable example due to such a large mass being positioned near the front boundary, in clear views from the road.
8. Both parties have referred to a previous appeal decision relating to 372a Chartridge Lane³. However, as each case must be determined on its individual merits, my assessment of the merits is based on the circumstances that prevailed at the time of my site visit.
9. In light of the above, I find that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policy GC1 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (including alterations adopted 2001) (consolidated 2007 and 2011), and with Policy H20. The proposal would also conflict with Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy (2011). Additionally, the proposal would conflict with the advice given in the SPD regarding the siting of garages in areas characterised by open frontages.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/X0415/D/18/3209591

² APP/X0415/D/18/3205771

³ APP/X0415/D/12/2189124