



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2023

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/23/3323425

3 Byron Way, Bicester, OX26 2YP

- 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 Peter Osborne against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00149/F, dated 19 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey detached garage.
-

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 streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached single-storey bungalow, which is situated on a residential estate, where house types, building positions and plot sizes vary. However, a notable characteristic of the streetscene in the vicinity of the appeal property is the large open front gardens with the dwellings set well-back from the road. This gives the streetscene a distinctive spacious appearance.
4. The proposal is to erect a detached double garage in the front of the existing bungalow. The Council contends that the garage would be visually incongruous and would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene. It argues that the proposal would conflict with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and with Saved Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality and is sympathetic to the character of the local area.
5. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the fact that the neighbouring dwelling, at number 1 Byron Way, sits well in front of the appeal property and that the proposed garage would be partly screened by number 1, particularly when approaching from the southern direction. I also accept that the design of the garage would be in keeping with the site and its surroundings.

6. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed garage would appear at odds with its surroundings where built development in front garden areas is not a common feature. The garage would be unduly prominent when approaching the site from the north and it would appear as an alien and incongruous feature in the streetscene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan and with The Framework, as referred to above.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of garages that have been built in front of dwellings. I viewed these at my site visit, but, in my opinion, their positions and impact on the streetscenes are not comparable to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR