
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/W/21/327244

Quarry Dene, Burford Road, Brize Norton, OX13 3NN

- 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 Terry Hinchly against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03445/FUL, dated 10 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion and extension of detached garage to form new 2 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021 after the submission of the appeal statements. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on its changed significance or otherwise.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within Brize Norton village and there is a substantial development to the south, but this is separated by a field and this part of the village has a rural character. The appeal site is part of a well established frontage of dwellings to Burford Road, which are characterised by their informality in their mix of styles and large front gardens. The appeal site includes a garage and domestic grounds which are to the side and associated with Quarry Dene. Both the garage and Quarry Dene are visible from the public realm on Burford Road.
5. Quarry Dene is a one and a half storey and hipped roof dwelling with a spacious frontage, including planting around an open parking area.
6. The existing garage has a pitched roof and extends back into the rear garden, albeit with a break in the roofline. It also is narrow, typically single car width, abutting the neighbouring boundary hedge.

7. The proposal would replace the existing garage with a substantially taller and wider structure. The proposed 4.2 m width would leave minimal space with the boundary hedge.
8. The resulting structure due to its width would appear cramped against the side of the dwelling and boundary hedge. Its height would add to the perception of the bulk of the building and increase its prominence. The proposal would also compete with the existing dwelling and appear out of place, undermining the sense of spaciousness to the frontage of Burford Road.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. The West Oxfordshire Local Plan Policies OS2 and OS4 require new development to be appropriate in scale and respect the locality. Policy H2 which allows for new residential development refers to other policies. Paragraph 126 of the Framework requires the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. Paragraph 130 requires that development is sympathetic to local character. The proposal would be in conflict with these policies.

Other matters

11. The footprint of the proposed dwelling would be unduly small for a two bedroom dwelling, particularly in terms of the resulting room sizes after circulatory space has been provided. This is commensurate with my finding that the external appearance would appear cramped. I note the reference to the size of the nearby Devonia but that is an existing dwelling.
12. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling which would have social and economic benefits. However, that would not outweigh the harm above.
13. I note the suggestion of amending the siting of the proposed dwelling however I am only able to consider the current proposal as such a change would need to be the subject of formal re-consultation. I also note the suggestion of natural stone walling and timber windows but that would not resolve the impact. The lapsed 2015 planning permission shows a garage and other structures to the side of Oakdene. Whilst they have a significant footprint, they would have been regarded in connection with the dwelling and not seen as a separate entity.

Conclusion

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR