
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/16/3151435

10 King Alfred Drive, Didcot, Oxfordshire OX11 7NU

- 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 and Mrs P Little against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P16/S0247/FUL, dated 25 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 1 bedroom house at the side of 10 King Alfred Drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 1 bedroom house at the side of 10 King Alfred Drive at 10 King Alfred Drive, Didcot, Oxfordshire OX11 7NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P16/S0247/FUL, dated 25 January 2016 subject to the conditions set out in Schedule 1 of this Decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Background

3. I have been made aware that a previous planning application on this site (Ref P15/S2517/FUL) for a single dwelling was refused. The single reason for refusal related to the effects of the proposal on trees. Subsequently the appellants submitted an arboricultural report which concluded that the scheme could be constructed without any unacceptable effects on trees. The Council have accepted the findings of the arboricultural report.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the built up area of Didcot and the principle of the development is accepted by Policies CSDID3 and SOCS, subject to compliance with the detailed Policy H4. H4 requires that the proposal is acceptable in relation to: open space and views; design, height, scale and materials; the character of the area; amenity of neighbours and highways impacts; if it constitutes backland development.
 5. The proposal would be a modest, 1 bedroom property attached to the side of the existing 2 storey house, at No 10 King Alfred Drive. No 10 sits in a larger
-

plot than many of its neighbours, with its flank abutting King Alfred Drive. The proposal would have a lower overall height than the existing house, a lower eaves line and less width. Its flank would extend closer to the boundary with King Alfred Drive, but space would exist for planting or screening along this boundary.

6. Although many of the houses in the locality are set back from the boundary with the roads, I noted that a number of properties within the Bosleys Orchard estate have their flank wall sited close to the plot boundary with the road. Taking account of this and the relatively modest size of the proposal, I consider that it would have no unacceptable effects on the character of the area, in this respect. Taking the scheme overall, I consider that it would not result in an unacceptable reduction in open space and it would accord with the character of the area in respect of scale, siting, design and massing. As a consequence, I find no conflict with Policy H4 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, there is no conflict with Policies CSQ3 of the Core Strategy and G2 and D1 of the Local Plan. There is also added weight in favour of the proposal as it would provide an additional home in an area where the Council is unable to demonstrate a suitable supply of housing land.

Conditions

7. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I shall include the standard time-limit condition and a condition relating to the approved plan in order for clarity and certainty. Due to the disposition of the site a condition which removes permitted development for outbuildings and enclosures is justified in this individual case.
8. The existing parking area is provided for the occupants of Nos 8 and 10 King Alfred Drive, which are both larger dwellings and so likely to have a greater demand for parking. On this basis I shall include a condition which requires that the existing parking area should be for Nos 8 and 10. So that the character of the area is not harmed conditions for the protection and retention of the trees and for the approval of building materials are necessary.

Conclusion

9. I have taken account of all matters raised in the representations but I find nothing which leads me to a different conclusion. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE 1 CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: KAD.201.REV A.
- 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no building, enclosure or swimming pool as described in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Order shall be erected/constructed without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
- 4) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 5) The existing parking area shall be used solely in connection with Nos 8 and 10 King Alfred Drive.
- 6) The existing trees on the land shall be protected as set out in the amended arboricultural method statement, whilst development operations are in progress, in accordance with a scheme to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the development and kept in place during the entire course of development.