



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/19/3236342

1 Tattlers Hill, Wingrave HP22 4PU

- 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 Tony Andersson against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01470/APP, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development is described as 'planning application for existing chicken run with coop and greenhouse. Application for new gate and fence'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the full name of the appellant from the appeal form, as only his surname was given on the original planning application form.
3. On my site visit I observed that the chicken coop and greenhouse were already in place and therefore I am considering these elements retrospectively. I noted that there was an existing 'side fence' on the site. However, this fence differs in design from the submitted plans, in that it has horizontal beams and concrete base panel slots, rather than vertical beams. As it is not clear whether the fence in situ is what is sought by the appellant, I have assessed the fence as shown on the submitted plans, rather than as I saw on site. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I am considering this appeal part retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Tattlers Hill is a residential cul-de-sac. The appeal property is located on a corner and the existing boundary hedging runs for a considerable length along the curve of the road. The site has an open area for access to the driveway, which is bordered by a wooden fence with concrete pillars and base panel slots. Most of the front boundaries are open, or are marked by low fencing and planting, which gives the road a soft-landscaped and open character.
6. The chicken coop and greenhouse are located to the front of the property and are unexpected and alien features when compared to the front area of the

surrounding development. Due to the height of the chicken coop and greenhouse, they are visible behind the boundary hedge. Given the height, length and prominence, the development forms an incongruous feature in the street scene, which is at odds with the prevailing residential character for the cul-de-sac.

7. In terms of the proposed fence, shown on the submitted plans, it would separate the side of the front garden and driveway area from the neighbouring property in the same way as the existing fence on the site. It would be a relatively tall feature and would be in contrast to the existing relatively open front gardens. When combined with the proposed gate, given the stature and prominence of these features, they would form a stark and hard feature in the street scene, which is at odds with the existing open and green character.
8. For the reasons above, the development harms the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it is contrary to saved policy GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004) and Policy 5 of the Wingrave with Rowsham Parish Neighbourhood Plan (2015). These policies require development to be high quality and respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and the surroundings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has stated some of the works could be considered permitted development, subject to certain amendments. However, this is not a matter before me.
10. The appellant has suggested that the development allows for the home production of food which benefits the environment, and that the fence is required for security. It is also suggested that the presence of chickens has proved an attraction for families and children. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. I note that the appellant has raised concerns in terms of how the Council has dealt with the application, but I have assessed the application on its merits and found it to be unacceptable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR