



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/D/25/3361096

55 Hundred Acres Lane, Amersham HP7 9EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stuart Mackenzie against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/3102/FA.
 - The development proposed is a new carport and garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a semi-detached dwelling facing onto Hundred Acres Lane at the junction with Longwood Lane. Development in the vicinity in the same road is characterised by a fairly consistent building line set back significantly from the street. There is a general absence of built structures in front gardens and there are none at the appeal site. There are frontage hedges, including at no 55. However, these are generally insufficiently large and extensive to prevent the pleasant sense of openness and spaciousness from being clearly apparent to passers-by.
4. The new outbuilding would be single storey with a flat roof at a height of 2.4m. The carport part would be open on three sides with the store enclosed, while being built with brick, cladding and a green roof. There is sufficient space to the front of the property to accommodate the development and the new structure would enable cars to be parked within it. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the appeal does not concern any Listed Buildings.
5. Regardless of matters such as these and the corner location, the development would intrude into the open area beyond the front building line of the host dwelling. Moreover, despite its height, the footprint would be a significant proportion of that of the associated house with a fairly similar depth. In these circumstances it would be an unduly strident and obtrusive feature, unacceptably at odds with the pattern of development and the character of nearby frontages.
6. The existing hedge at the appeal site would provide some screening. Moreover, a new hedge would be planted in conjunction with the permitted extension at the appeal site and could be required by condition in the event of this appeal being

- allowed. Nevertheless, despite this planting the unsympathetic presence of the outbuilding would be readily apparent in views from the street through the access anyway. Moreover, the new structure would be likely to be a longer lasting feature of the locality than a hedge, which could die or be removed by future occupiers.
7. The property at the junction with Sheepfold Lane in the photograph provided by the Appellant is fairly near the appeal site but on the other side of Hundred Acres Lane. The attached garage to the side projects towards the boundary onto Sheepfold Lane. A single storey part of the dwelling on the opposite corner also projects towards the site boundary in Sheepfold Lane. These dwellings therefore reflect each other in this regard and both have their front elevations facing onto Hundred Acres Lane but the garages project into their side gardens and not to the front of the properties. In this case the new outbuilding would be located to the front of the host dwelling towards the street in Hundred Acres Lane.
 8. Details have been provided relating to a carport that was permitted by the Council to the front of the dwelling at Eaton House, Brindle Lane. However, the Council's report on this application indicates that the streetscene includes outbuildings to the front of properties. Therefore, this case can also be clearly distinguished from the current proposal where this does not apply.
 9. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed development would harm the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality. In these circumstances there would be conflict with Policy GC1 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (LP) 1997 and Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District 2011. Among other things, these indicate that development should achieve a high standard of design, including in terms of the relationship to its surroundings.
 10. The Appellant suggests that the proposal would comply with LP Policy H20 (i) regarding size and subordination. However, even if this was accepted this also requires compliance with the principles indicated in other Policies. It is therefore made clear that the aims of Policy H15 also apply to ancillary residential buildings and not just extensions. The aims of Policy H15 include seeking to ensure that extensions relate well to the streetscene and are not obtrusive. Because this would not be achieved in relation to the outbuilding it would be contrary to LP Policies H15 and H20.
 11. There would also be conflict with the advice in the Council's Residential Extensions and Householder Development, Supplementary Planning Document, 2013. This indicates that in areas characterised by open frontages clear of built form it is unlikely to be acceptable to site an outbuilding forward of a dwelling as this would disrupt the existing pattern of development.
 12. The Appellant indicates that the opportunity for discussion with the Council was not available during consideration of the application. Nevertheless, this does not, in itself, confer acceptability and I must consider the appeal on its own merits.
 13. Because of the harm that would arise and taking account of all other matters raised, it is determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR