
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/21/3281447

17 Deancroft Road, Chalfont St Peter SL9 0HF

- 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 Rajwant Gill against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/21/1724/FA, dated 24 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached garage to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. Deancroft Road has a spacious character owing to the sizeable gaps between the dwellings, which enables views of mature trees to the rear. The dwellings are set back from the road behind front gardens that are largely open with only low-level boundary walls or fences. The soft landscaping and openness provided by the front gardens contributes to the spacious, suburban feel of the street scene. Any garages are either to the side or rear of the properties and I saw no buildings in the front gardens.
4. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of a detached double garage in the front garden, which would be set back approximately 2.5 metres from the front boundary at its closest point. Whilst the front garden is wider than most properties in the street scene due to its position adjacent to a road bend, the proposed garage would cover a significant proportion of the depth of the garden, sited close to the front wall of the dwelling and the front boundary. This would result in a cramped appearance. In context of the site's surroundings, where front gardens are largely open and free of buildings, the size and position of the proposed garage close to the front boundary would appear prominent and visually intrusive in the street scene, visibly eroding the spacious character. In this regard, the proposal would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the street scene.
5. I note the presence of a hedge along the front boundary, however this would provide only limited screening, and the garage would be conspicuous in views from the north-west and south-east. Furthermore, given that the hedge is a

natural feature, it could not be relied upon in perpetuity to screen the proposed development. I have had regard to the appellant's reference to other front garages in the wider area, however these examples are not located in the same street and so they are viewed in a different context. Full details of the plans and circumstances that led to the approval of those garages are not before me and I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits, which I have done in this case.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved Policies GC1, H13(ii) and H20 of the Chiltern District Local Plan 1997 (including Adopted Alterations May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 & November 2011, Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District (Adopted November 2011), Policy H6 of the Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2028 and guidance in the Residential Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document Adopted September 2013. Amongst other things, these policies require that new development is of a high standard of design which reflects and respects the character of the surrounding area and those features which contribute to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

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

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR