



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/25/3359715

2 Perrin Street, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 7AS

- 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 Ronald Gould against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02238/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as “this retrospective planning application seeks the approval to erect boundary walls”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as “this retrospective planning application seeks the approval to erect boundary walls” at 2 Perrin Street, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 7AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02238/FUL, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted is as shown on approved plan reference: Garden fence – proposed plans dated 03/09/2024.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I am satisfied that the description on the application form, which I have used above, accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates. In addition, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published between the determination of the planning application and this appeal. The substantive parts of the new 2024 version do not however differ from the previous insofar as they relate to the main issue. The cases of the main parties will not therefore be prejudiced by my reference to the new version.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a corner plot, the development fronts both streets. The boundary treatments to surrounding dwellings to both front and rear gardens are varied in

their height and material as well as age and form the context of the scheme. Resultantly, there is an established mixed and contrasting look to the street scene.

6. The appeal proposal has been constructed from high quality materials with pleasant proportions which represent a well-executed wall. Additionally, it results in a nodal point on the corner. There is a break in the wall to facilitate the vehicular access which lessens its impression overall. Whilst it is taller than the boundary treatment previously in place, this does not detract from the wider varied character. Other tall walls in the area that border rear gardens, and non-residential buildings, still make a noticeable contribution to the street scene with which the appeal scheme sits harmoniously.
7. The development is a brick wall abutting a rendered elevation which is a strong contrast. However, the street scene contains other examples of juxtaposed materials including on terraced houses opposite the appeal site. Such an effect is therefore neither uncommon nor unwelcome. Resultantly, the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would comply with Policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036, Policy GSP4 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan and the Framework which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard amongst other things.

Other Matter

8. Concerns have been raised by third parties surrounding highway safety by virtue of the height of the wall. This was not a reason for refusal by the Council and given the nature of surrounding streets and space for vehicular access into and out of the appeal site I have no reason to take a different view.

Conditions

9. I have not included a time condition or the materials to match due to the retrospective nature of the scheme and my findings. I have referred to the approved plan for identification and enforcement purposes as opposed to works being carried out in accordance therewith.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the above condition.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the condition set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR