



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 March 2021

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/20/3263155

34 Syke Cluan, Iver SL0 9EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kand against Buckinghamshire Council - South Area (South Bucks).
 - The application Ref PL/20/2638/FA, is dated 13 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is new front fencing and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's appeal statement sets out the grounds on which the Council would have refused planning permission if it had been in a position to determine the application as well as other outstanding concerns. I have given regard to these matters in defining the main issues.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Syke Cluan is characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from front boundaries, more often with frontages of an open nature. Where boundary treatments are in place to front boundaries, these often consist of low walls or soft planting. The existing low wall and the open access points to the front boundary of the appeal site are consistent with these surroundings. Together with the grass verges and tree planting within the street, these characteristics provide a pleasant and spacious suburban residential environment.
5. The Chiltern and South Bucks Townscape Character Study (TCS) (2017) identifies Syke Cluan under a 'Suburban Roads' typology where there is a general level of consistency in boundary treatments along individual roads with boundary treatments low in height allowing the building to be clearly visible from the road. The TCS identifies amongst other things the introduction of high boundary treatments and gates as a threat to the character of such areas.
6. The height and span of the development would be at odds with the generally more open appearance of frontages on the road. The incorporation of railings within the boundary treatment and the provision of a privet hedge to the rear

of the boundary wall would not disguise the overall scale, predominantly hard composition and the enclosing impact that the development would have on the site frontage. Consequently, the development would appear obtrusive within the streetscene and would detract from the prevailing spacious characteristics of Syke Cluan.

7. My attention has been drawn to several examples of boundary treatments in the area. The boundary treatment at No 31 Syke Cluan is not comparable to the appeal proposal given it predominantly consists of a hedgerow and the access points are open. The other examples on Syke Cluan are not visible from the site, are few in number and do not define the overriding characteristics of the street. A prevalence of high boundary treatments and enclosed frontages on other roads in the area does not persuade me that the development would be a positive addition to Syke Cluan.
8. With regards to the Council's Highway Officer's comments, these relate specifically to the proposals relationship with the highway and are not material to an assessment of the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.
9. I conclude the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that particular regard the development would conflict with the requirements which seek to protect the character and appearance in Saved Policy EP3 (The Use Design and Layout of Development) of the South Bucks District Local Plan (LP) (1999) and Core Policy 8 (Built and Historic Environment) of the South Bucks District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011).
10. The Council has also referred to Policy TR7 (Parking Provision) of the LP in its statement of case. This policy is not relevant to matters of character and appearance and has not therefore been material to my assessment. Even so, this does not overcome the conflict with other policies of the development plan identified above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR