
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/20/3254948

13 Eghams Wood Road, Knotty Green, Beaconsfield HP9 1JP

- 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 Probett against the decision of Chiltern District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/20/0737/FA, dated 27 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey double garage in the front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached 2 storey house which is sited within its generous plot. The property is located in a residential area containing similarly sized houses and plots. The houses display a variety of designs and there is a feeling of spaciousness due to the size of the plots and their frontages.
4. The road here curves gently and whilst I accept the appellants' point that it is not possible to draw a strictly consistent 'building line', the houses are all set well away from the road and the open frontages are a consistent feature which adds positively to the character of the area.
5. The proposal would result in the construction of a detached garage with a pitched roof, close to the front boundary of the plot. Its size and siting would make it a prominent feature within the street-scene. Taking account of the open and spacious nature of the frontages here, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on this characteristic feature. The appellants suggest that additional planting would help to screen the garage. In my judgement this would take some time to establish and would be unlikely to completely screen the garage.
6. The appellants have drawn 2 other examples of garages within the locality to my attention. Although it is not for me to comment on how successful these are in terms of their effects on the area, I note that one is attached to the front

of the house and both appear to be set further away from the front boundary than the proposal. In addition, I do not have the full details about the approval of these garages. Therefore, these existing garages have no overriding effect on my consideration of the appeal.

7. Policy H20 of the Chilterns District Local Plan 1997 (with subsequent alterations) states that residential out-buildings should be modest and subordinate and should comply with other policies within the Local Plan, including those relating to residential extensions. With regard to these, considerations of the effects of such a proposal on the street-scene and the pattern of development are pertinent. Whilst the Council has accepted that, in relation to the size of the existing dwelling, the proposal can be considered as modest and subordinate, they consider that the proposal would fail to comply with these other considerations. In addition, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document '*Residential Extensions and Householder Development*' (SPD) states that in areas where open, spacious frontages are characteristic it is unlikely that permission would be granted for a detached garage. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would not comply with the requirements of these policies and the SPD.
8. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the representations, including the presence of landscaping and screening on some properties. However, I find that neither this nor any other matters are sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR