



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on the 25th May 2021.

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/20/3259327

25 Oxford Road, Oakley, AYLESBURY, HP18 9RD

- 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 Darren Drew against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref. 20/01667/APP, dated 1 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new 3 bay garage/ car port with office above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed building on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a detached house which lies on the corner of Oxford Road and Lynns View in a residential area on the edge of Oakley. It is proposed to erect a large garage /car port with an office/shower room at first floor in the front garden of the property.

Effect on character and appearance

4. The site lies at the entrance to the village when travelling from the open countryside to the west and the proposed carport/office would be prominent to view to the public realm. The structure would be sited well in front of the apparent building line of the appeal site house and the neighbouring properties to the east. It would also be of a significant height projecting well above the height of the existing boundary walls and shrubs. Even taking into account that the proposed garage/office would replace a low storage structure, I find that its two storey scale and front location would have an imposing and harmful visual effect on the appearance of the area. It would dominate the open residential character of the frontage at a prominent point at the entrance to the village.
5. I noted at the visit that there is a large double garage to the front of the property on the opposite side of Oxford Road (No.26) but this is materially different to the appeal proposal in that it is single storey and more set back

from the road frontage. Therefore, it does not have the same visual impact as the appeal scheme would have. The appellant also refers to other examples of large structures to the front of properties, but I did not see prominent examples of such structures around the village at my site visit and I am not able to place much weight on this aspect. In any event the appeal proposal has to be considered on its individual merits.

6. The appellant offers to reduce the height of the garage to 6.1m, delete the dormer windows and reinstate the boundary hedge line to reduce the impact on the street scene. However, the Council calculates that the structure as proposed would be 6m high. Deleting the dormer windows (and presumably replace with roof lights) could reduce some of the apparent bulk of the structure, but the impact caused by the height and forward siting would remain and still be problematic. Finally, while boundary landscaping could be introduced, there appears to be little space available for meaningful new hedge planting; this would take some time to mature and would be unlikely to screen the full impact of the proposed structure. I have therefore not given these potential alterations much weight.
7. Overall on the main issue I find that the proposal would not accord with the provisions of saved policy GP.35 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (2004) which seeks to ensure that new development should respect and complement the physical characterises of a site and its surroundings. The Council also advises that Policy BE2 of the emerging Local Plan should also be given moderate weight because of the stage it has reached in the Examination process and this has a consistent and continuing need for new development to respect the character of the surroundings of a site and the effect on public views. This adds to the policy objection.
8. The local visual harm and the conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by any other consideration and this indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

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

David Murray

INSPECTOR