
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/19/3229676

8 Sherbourne Walk, Farnham Common SL2 3TZ

- 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 Paul Rowley against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/18/4601/FA, dated 4 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a timber frame car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a projection on the right hand side of the front elevation creating an almost "L-shaped" appearance. Sherbourne Walk is characterised by fairly large houses which are set back from the road behind reasonably sized front gardens. No 8 is typical of this and has a gravelled front garden with some surrounding greenery. Boundary treatments in the area are generally in the form of low-level walls and fences with a variety of hedges, trees and vegetation. These elements combine to create a green, open and spacious character and appearance.
4. The proposed development is a timber framed car port with a tiled, cat slide roof. The car port would sit between the front projection and the front boundary of the property; filling the gap which currently exists.
5. One elevation of the car port would be largely open allowing access for vehicles. However, the proposal would present a large, blank elevation to the road, albeit softened slightly by nearby greenery.
6. The proposed car port would fail to respect the established building line, removing an important visual break and harming the sense of spaciousness and openness. Whilst I note that the existing front projection at No 8 already breaches the building line, this is to a far lesser extent than would be the case should this scheme be permitted.

7. I appreciate the appellant's efforts to design a sympathetic scheme. However, the proposed introduction of a large structure within the front garden of No 8 would fail to reflect the predominant pattern of development in the area, eroding its character and appearance.
8. I acknowledge that a tree and some planting in the front garden of No 8 would be retained and would partially screen the proposal from view. However, given the scale of the proposed development combined with gaps in the vegetation and the proximity to the boundary of the proposal, it would, nevertheless, appear unduly prominent in the street scene.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, I have found conflict with saved Policy EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan, March 1999 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these promote high standards of design and Policy EP3 states that development will only be permitted where its scale, layout, siting, height, design, external materials and use are compatible with the character and amenities of the site itself, adjoining development and the locality in general.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples which are said to represent similar schemes to that before me. Whilst I have given these careful consideration in my assessment outlined above, these examples do not appear in the same immediate visual context as the appeal property. The majority of the other outbuildings are sited further away from the front boundaries of the properties and/or within properties that do not have existing front projections thereby retaining a sense of spaciousness. Many are also extensively screened by much larger and denser trees and hedges. These examples are also the exception to the rule and are not representative of the prevailing character and appearance of the area. In any event, each case must be determined on its individual merits.
11. I also note that no objections were received from neighbouring residents. However, none of these considerations are sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR