



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: 5 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/20/3256012

Rear of 4 and 6 Walkwood Rise, Beaconsfield, Bucks HP9 1TX

- 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 RAP Building and Developments Ltd against the decision of South Bucks District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/20/0887/FA, dated 12 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached garage (in connection with the dwelling approved under Ref: PL/19/2025/FA).
-

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 proposal intends to provide a detached garage within the frontage of a dwelling which would be constructed as a result of a recent planning permission granted by the Council and referred to in the description within the heading of this decision. The proposal is to be constructed on land fronting onto Wattleton Road. The appeal site sits within a residential area which contains mainly detached houses set within generous plots.
4. The Council identifies the area as an 'open plan suburban' typology and this is set out in the 'Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Assessment'. The appellant states that this document does not form part of the development plan for the area and has not been the subject of public consultation; he concludes that little weight should be given to it as a result. I agree with this but what I do take from the document is that the general description of the area as being one where low density housing set within generous plots with generally open and landscaped frontages, is accurate and relevant to this appeal. The appellant appears to generally accept such a description but, identifies a number of factors which leads him to conclude that the proposal would not affect that character.
5. My own observations of the area lead me to conclude that the area does display a good degree of spaciousness. The plots are generally large and the

frontages are of a good size with many being open and of an open-plan style. Although there are some small number of exceptions to this, I consider that this feature is a strong positive contributor to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposed garage would be set adjacent to the front boundary of the plot, in front of the house. Although not attached to the house, it would virtually fill the gap between the house and the front boundary here. Taking account of the size of the garage and its position, I consider that it would appear prominent within the street-scene and would sit awkwardly in its position forward of the house and at the rear of the public domain. It would unacceptably erode the spaciousness of this part of the frontage and would appear unduly prominent. The appellant indicates that landscaping could be provided to screen the garage but I consider that this would only have a limited effect and would take some time to establish.
7. The appellant has referred to a number of other features within the area in support of the appeal. I have considered the details submitted and have taken the opportunity to view these at my site visit, where they currently exist. Some refer to household extensions which I do not see as directly relevant to the appeal proposal and one refers to the existence of a detached garage that was demolished to make way for a consented scheme. In the latter case, I think that no reliance can be placed on a feature that would have been removed several years ago. The permitted extension at No 6 Walkwood Rise would provide a garage attached to the house set off the boundary with Wattleton Road. It would appear as a modest extension to the house with distance between it and the plot boundary. Similarly, the 2 detached garages on the opposite side of the road at 8 Walkwood Rise are set off the plot boundary and have much less effect that I envisage arising from the appeal scheme. The most comparable feature is the garage at No 1A Wattleton Road which, notwithstanding the landscaping, does not represent a successful addition to the area in my judgement and so does not set a desirable precedent.
8. The appellant also states that the area for the proposed garage would be used for car parking and so the effects on the area would be similar. The details of the approval submitted by the appellant indicates that the proposed garage would remove/replace mainly landscaping and would appear to remove the only meaningful area of greenery within that frontage.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies EP3 and H13 of the South Bucks District Local Plan and its guidance at Appendix 8. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR