



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2023

**by D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 July 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/22/3311395**

**2A Crossleys, Chalfont St Giles, Bucks HP8 4QR**

- 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 Paul Griffin against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
  - The application Ref PL/22/1572/FA, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2022.
  - The development proposed is erection of a new three bedroom detached house.
- 

## 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 surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is a parcel of land to the side of 2 Crossleys (No 2) which is a semi-detached house within a large plot with an open frontage. Crossleys is accessed from Bowstridge Lane which is residential on one side of the road and bordered by fields on the opposite side. The large gap between No 2 and 55 Bowstridge Lane (No 55) is prominent and it contributes positively to the open character and appearance of the area.
4. Dwellings in the area are predominantly terraced and semi-detached, particularly those in view from the site along Bowstridge Lane and Crossleys. The properties are regularly spaced and have consistent building lines and frontages which creates a rhythm in the street scene.
5. The proposal is to construct a detached house within the gap and the new property would be orientated to face towards Bowstridge Lane. The design for the proposed dwelling includes a full width, single-storey element to the front which would extend forward of both No 2 and No 55, breaching the established building line.
6. I note that there is some irregularity in the frontages of dwellings and that many properties in the area do have porches and small extensions that extend forward of the principal elevation, including No 2. However these are generally small extensions and porches that do not disrupt the prevailing pattern of development significantly. However, the full width of the building would extend forward of the neighbouring dwellings and it would therefore stand out as

- inharmonious. Furthermore, the location of the development in the prominent open gap would interrupt the regular spacing of buildings.
7. Parking in the area tends to be narrow strips to the side of the dwellings and allows for tandem parking. Whilst I note the photographs from the appellant showing dwellings with larger parking areas and hardstanding to the front, this is not a common feature in the area, particularly those dwellings nearby and within view from the appeal site.
  8. The proposal would utilise an existing access, however parking would need to be provided for No 2 and the proposed dwelling. As a result, a large area of the frontage would be gravelled to allow for this. I acknowledge that the gravel would allow water to soak through, an area of grass would be retained and hedgerows would be planted. However, the general appearance would be uncharacteristic of the area.
  9. The appellant has provided a number of photographs of the area. Whilst it is unclear exactly where these photographs have been taken, they generally do show that properties are set back from the road, with front gardens and wide grass verges which does give the area an open character and appearance.
  10. The appellant's survey of the estate supports my findings that the area is made up of predominantly terraced and semi-detached houses. I note that a small percentage of dwellings on the estate are the same house type and position of No 2. However, whilst this may be the case it does not outweigh the harm the proposal would cause to the open character and appearance of the area or the rhythm of the frontages of the other dwellings in the area.
  11. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to policy GC1 of the Chiltern District Local Plan Adopted 1 September 1997 (Including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 (LP) and November 2011 and policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District adopted November 2011 (CS).
  12. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. It would also go against the objectives of good design set out in the National Design Guide<sup>1</sup>.

### **Other Matters**

13. I note that the application was intended to address the Council's concerns over a previous application. Be that as it may, I have determined the appeal on its merits and found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Planning Balance**

14. The proposal would be contrary to policies GC1 of the LP and CS20 of the CS. These policies are consistent with the Framework in seeking to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Design Guide – Planning practise guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places – Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

15. The Council concedes that it is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with paragraph 74 of the Framework. It quotes a supply figure of 4.18 years, and this is not challenged by the appellant. Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework indicates that, in such circumstances where the requisite housing land supply cannot be shown, the policies which are most important for determining the application should be deemed out-of-date and permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
16. The proposal would contribute to the supply of new homes in a situation where there is a shortfall. However, the benefits of housing delivery, to which I have attached significant weight, are tempered by the fact that the provision of one additional unit would make little difference to housing supply. In this instance, the adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very modest benefits and as such the proposal would not constitute a sustainable form of development in terms of the Framework.
17. Consequently, when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

### **Conclusion**

18. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

*D Wilson*

INSPECTOR