
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Martin Chandler BSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/21/3283256

Hillview Farm, Dean Farm Lane, Soulbury, Buckinghamshire LU7 0DE

- 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 Philip Haupt against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref 21/00642/APP, dated 11 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Detached Store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a detached store, at Hillview Farm, Dean Farm Lane, Soulbury, Buckinghamshire LU7 0DE, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 21/00642/APP, dated 11 February 2021, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing numbers: DH/2021/0203 and 2021/0203/01.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a large, detached dwelling which is set back from the highway and benefits from a generous and wide area of hardstanding to the front. Beyond the appeal site, to the right when viewed from the road, is a recent residential development. The houses are comparable to the building on the appeal site in terms of bulk and layout, as well as space between and to the front of the buildings. Elsewhere in close proximity to the site, the mix of dwellings is varied, although a consistent theme of space to the front of properties is apparent. Moreover, the open countryside beyond the appeal site helps to provide a semi-rural character and appearance to the surroundings.
4. To the front of the newly constructed dwellings are detached structures with generous hipped roofs. Although large, due to the space to the front of the buildings and the space between, the structures are not overly dominant or intrusive. Instead, they are respectful to the scale of the existing buildings and benefit from space about them. Accordingly, the detached outbuildings are

sympathetic to the prevailing character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. The proposed outbuilding would be similar in form, scale and appearance to those in front of the new dwellings. It would also have a similar relationship with the parent dwelling. As a consequence, the proposed building would not represent an alien or discordant feature within the street scene. Instead, it would be experienced in the context established by the newly constructed buildings.
6. The building would be well contained by the existing boundary treatments. This includes a well-established, tall and dense evergreen hedge which would screen much of the proposed building in views from the south. I note the Council's concerns that the proximity of the building may compromise the integrity of this hedge, however, I have no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the hedge could not be protected. Moreover, even if the hedge was heavily pruned, or even removed, due to the surrounding context and prevailing pattern of development, should the proposed building be more visible, I am satisfied that this would not compromise the composition of the street scene.
7. Accordingly, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies BE2 and NE8 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2021). Taken together, these seek amongst other things, development which respects and complements the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. In light of my findings set out above, conditions are necessary in the interests of precision and clarity to establish the time limit for commencing development, as well as to list the approved drawing numbers.
9. Subject to these conditions, for the reasons identified above, the appeal should be allowed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR