



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 December 2020

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/D/20/3258856

8 Burkes Close, Beaconsfield HP9 1ES

- 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 Jarman against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council
 - The application Ref PL/20/1657/FA, dated 29 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2020
 - The development proposed is 'replacement detached garage with loft accommodation'.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling within a residential close. The road is narrow and fronted by dwellings on one side only; on the opposite side of the road is a mature hedge bounding the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Penington Road. The host dwelling, alike others in the vicinity, is set back from the road in a garden of generous depth but limited width. The setback of the dwellings creates a sense of openness and the landscaping within the gardens combined with the hedgerow along the rear gardens of Penington Road creates a verdant character.
4. Several dwellings, including the appeal site, feature small garages and outbuildings close to the front boundary, at a distance from the main house. There is also a prevalence of verdant frontages, such as short stretches of boundary hedge. The proportionately narrow frontages of the plots make the open character of the close sensitive to built development forward of the dwellings and additional enclosure. The existing garage buildings are predominantly modest in size, as are the lengths of boundary hedge and they thus avoid interrupting the open appearance of the streetscene. There are some other large garage buildings in the vicinity, though these tend to be sited closer to the dwelling, away from the frontage.
5. In contrast, the appeal proposal would introduce a large building with accommodation in the roofspace along the front boundary of the site. None of the existing garages would be of the same scale as that proposed. In the

context of the close, the size, siting and features of the building would appear prominent and intrude on the openness of the frontage, eroding the open character of that side of the close., or the host dwelling has a particularly open frontage.

6. Whilst it is acknowledged the existing hedge would be removed, which would also affect the verdant character of the area, it could be replaced and appropriate landscaping could have been secured through a condition.
7. Other garages in the vicinity have a clear subservient relationship with the dwelling and appear as simple garages. Only one garage has a single dormer window and its siting at the end of the close means it is not viewed in the immediate context of its dwelling. In contrast, the scale of the proposed garage, combined with its domestic architectural features would make it appear substantial and residential. Whilst the host dwelling for the appeal proposal is substantial in size, the scale of the dwelling and its siting of the garage at a distance from the dwelling would further prevent the garage from maintaining a subservient appearance. This would adversely affect the character of the host dwelling and would appear discordant with the characteristic set-back of dwellings in the street scene.
8. The existing garage is in keeping with the character of the area in respect of its design, siting and scale. Therefore its replacement would not represent a benefit of the appeal proposal.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character of the area and host dwelling, contrary to policies EP3 and H13 and Appendix 8 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted 1999) (LP) and the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design of ancillary buildings and other development, which respects the character of the site and area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the area and host dwelling, contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR