



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/24/3356577

2 New Meadow, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire HP21 7AN

- 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 Munir Hussain against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02557/APP.
 - The development proposed is described as a garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Procedural Matter

2. I have had regard to the site's long planning history, as summarised in the Council's delegated report and included in the appellant's statement.
3. There is currently a double garage on part of the site. As depicted on drawing no. 3452-01A it would be reduced to a single garage and provided with a pitched roof, with the area to the side returned to soft landscaping. However, whilst on the appeal form and in the Council's decision the scheme is described as the reduction of the double garage to a single garage, as that structure does not benefit from planning permission, I have dealt with the scheme as a proposed garage.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site falls within the Bedgrove housing estate, where the dwellings are typically set back from the roads behind front gardens and parking forecourts. There are typically verges or areas of grass around road junctions, including here, on both sides of New Meadow at its junction with Queens Mead. The properties on this part of New Meadow and many of those on nearby roads, are arranged in semi-detached pairs. This layout, including the open land, contribute to the estate's well-designed, spacious and landscaped, locally distinctive character.
6. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pair. That part of it where the garage would be located was formerly part of the larger area of amenity land to the north, prior to it being separated from it by a fence and hedgerow, and the construction of the garage and hardstanding.

7. In a recently dismissed appeal¹, and with reference to an earlier appeal decision, the appointed Inspector observed that the hardstanding and double garage had resulted in a significant encroachment into the open space, and that this had clearly harmed the character and appearance of the area. Whilst a single garage is now proposed that structure would still nevertheless intrude into this formerly open space, thus harming the area's spacious and locally distinctive character.
8. Additionally, by reference to the site's planning history and as observed on my visit, the host has already been significantly enlarged with a large two storey side extension, along with front and rear projections. Whilst, by itself, the proposed garage would be a modest addition which would be faced in matching materials, considered together with previous extensions, it would result in an elongated and rambling form of development, which would not be subordinate to the original building. As the resultant property would be more akin to a terrace, it would be at odds with the prevailing character of more compact semi-detached pairs.
9. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Design Supplementary Planning Document 2023 ('SPD') sets out that once extensions begin to match or exceed the size of the original building, then its architectural integrity tends to become lost. Given the resultant property's scale and form, and having regard to cumulative impacts, that outcome would apply here.
10. As confirmed by an informative attached to the Council's decision, this part of the site can be lawfully used as a garden/drive incidental to the dwellinghouse at 2 New Meadow². The appellant maintains that, should the appeal be dismissed, he will have no choice but to park on the site causing the grass to turn to mud, which will spread and become a hazard on this congested stretch of highway. However, whilst that would be harmful, it does not justify the erection of the proposed single garage to house a vehicle.
11. For the above reasons, and notwithstanding proposed soft landscaping, which could be secured by means of a condition should the appeal be allowed, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (2021) which, amongst other things, sets out that development should respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and its surroundings, and the local distinctiveness and character of the locality; and it would fail to accord with the advice in the SPD.
12. With reference to the appellant's statement, as the scheme would not be good design, it would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for the planning system to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
13. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: APP/J0405/W/23/3328903

² Ref: APP/J0405/X/22/3290102