
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2017

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/D/17/3172967

58 Wallingford Road, Cholsey, Wallingford, OX10 9LB

- 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 & Mrs Elliott against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P16/S3803/HH, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new build oak frame garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new build oak frame garage at 58 Wallingford Road, Cholsey, Wallingford, OX10 9LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P16/S3803/HH, dated 14 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A100 Rev B, A101 Rev A, A103 Rev B, A104 Rev B, A105.
 - 3) No development shall commence until a schedule of materials to be used in the construction of the garage hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the garage on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 58 Wallingford Road is a detached two storey property. It sits in a row of well-spaced residential properties of varying styles which stretch along Wallingford Road away from the centre of Cholsey. No 58 is located towards the end of this row at a point where development meets open countryside and as such the area has a semi-rural character.
4. The proposed garage would fit easily into the frontage of No 58 whilst maintaining good separation from the boundaries and the main house, and retaining areas of front garden. The garage would be viewed against the back

drop of No 58 and in the wider context of the row of properties and would not appear out of place in this domestic setting. It would therefore result in no harm to the streetscene or the wider rural environs.

5. The close proximity of the garage to two existing ash trees could result in their loss. However, the Council have not raised a strong objection in this respect and I find no reason to conclude otherwise. Consequently I do not consider a condition requiring the replacement of these trees to be necessary.
6. The proposed garage would sit forward of the building line of No 58. However, 60 and 62 Wallingford Road are a pair of semi-detached properties which sit closer to the highway than the appeal property. Furthermore, there is a detached garage to the front of 58a Wallingford Road. The proposed garage would be no closer to the highway than these adjacent structures. I therefore do not consider that it would appear overly prominent or out of keeping given the established pattern of surrounding development.
7. The Council suggest that the developments referred to at Nos 60, 62 and 58a above should be disregarded, Nos 60 and 62 being an anomaly in terms of their forward siting and the garage at No 58a being acceptable as it sits adjacent to the side of No 60. However, I disagree. There is variation in the building line along Wallingford Road and these properties are examples of just this. They also provide immediate context to the appeal site and as such are a material consideration of significant weight.
8. For the above reasons I find no harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It follows therefore that I find no conflict with Policies G2, C4, D1 and H13 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (2011) or Policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012 which, broadly speaking, seek to protect the character and appearance of the countryside and the settlements within it.
9. The Council refer to an appeal in 2006 at 48 Wallingford Road where a development of two new dwellings to the front of an existing was dismissed (APP/Q3115/A/06/2016501). This is a materially different development to that which is before me and as such does not alter my findings above. Finally, given that I have concluded that the proposal would be acceptable, whether or not the appellant could park to the side of the house is immaterial.
10. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. To ensure a satisfactory appearance I have also included a condition requiring the submission of a schedule of materials. Subject to these conditions, the appeal is allowed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR