



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/20/3244382

17 Lee Avenue, Abingdon OX14 3UT

- 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 Vince against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P19/V2408/HH, dated 28 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is double-storey extension to side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural matters

3. The application form stated the name of the applicant as, "Mr Vince", whereas the appeal form stated, "Mr Nadeem Khan". However, the appellant's Agent has since confirmed that the applicant and the appellant is Mr Vince. The appeal has been determined on this basis.
4. It is clear from the Council's decision that it has no objection to the rear extension. I have no evidence before me to reach a contrary view to the Council in this regard and therefore the consideration of this appeal focuses on the effect of the double-storey side extension.
5. The Council referred to the Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015 in its decision notice, but relevant parts of the document were not provided, and I am therefore unable to assess the proposal against it.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the double-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site consists of a link detached house, which is connected to the neighbouring property by a single-storey garage. Whilst there is a variety of house sizes on this street, one of the important and common characteristics of Lee Avenue is the detached or link-detached form of the dwellings with gaps between the houses, often above single-storey garages. These gaps break up the mass of built form and contribute to the spaciousness of the area.
8. The proposed side extension would effectively fill the gap between the host property and its neighbour. It would result in the extended dwelling being semi-detached which would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area and erode the coherence of the appearance of the existing property. The extended dwelling would be noticeably incongruous in the local area and erode the open character of it. It is recognised that the proposal would mirror the height and angles of the existing dwelling, and that it would not extend to the side by a great margin, but these factors would not sufficiently offset the harm identified.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed double-storey side extension would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policy CP37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (adopted December 2016) ('Local Plan'), which promotes development that reinforces local identity. The proposal also conflicts with paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), which aims to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Highway Safety

10. The proposed side extension would remove the garage. However, notwithstanding that the size of the parking spaces may not meet the Council's standards, I observed two cars comfortably parked in front of the property. Additionally, there was ample space for parking available on the road. Although a 'snapshot' in time, there is nothing before me to suggest my observations were untypical.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed double-storey side extension would not be harmful to highway safety. The proposal complies with Policies CP35 and CP37 of the Local Plan which seek to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and ensure that the needs of vehicular traffic does not dominate at the expense of other modes of transport. There would also be no conflict with paragraph 109 of the Framework, which provides that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, neither of which apply in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Whilst I have found the proposal to be acceptable in terms of highway safety, this does not overcome the conflict with the development plan in relation to matters of character and appearance. The lack of objection from Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council does not alter this conclusion.

13. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR