
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/W/20/3253100

Tudor Cottage, Lamborough Hill, Wootton, Abingdon OX13 6BY

- 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 Stephen Studds against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P19/V3054/FUL, dated 15 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is to separate existing detached 'Granny Annexe' completed 2014 to a separate dwelling from the main house known as Tudor Cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the area and (b) the future living conditions of the occupants of the proposed separate dwelling, having regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling, Tudor Cottage, and behind this an annexe building. The annexe currently shares a vehicular access from Matthews Way with Tudor Cottage, with its parking and access generally located to the front of the main building. The annexe has a condition restricting its use to ancillary accommodation in connection with Tudor Cottage.
4. Tudor Cottage and the dwellings along Lamborough Hill are large and generally consist of linear and substantial plots. Dwellings behind this road, on Matthews Way and Hawkins Way, are on smaller plots but nevertheless the area still retains attractive spacious qualities due to dwellings generally being set back from the road and having large rear gardens.
5. There would be no new building associated with the new separate independent dwelling. The separate dwelling itself would be largely unchanged in external appearance compared to the annexe. The plot would have an area of approximately 274m² which would result in an acceptable area of private outdoor space to serve a one-bedroom dwelling.

6. However, there would be fenced boundary treatments separating the two dwellings. The boundary would take the form of a semi-circular shaped fence alongside the vehicle access and parking areas serving the separate dwelling. The existing access from Matthews Way would also be reinstated to allow access for this dwelling. Through this access and frontage, there would be vehicular and pedestrian activity associated with the new dwelling and some personalisation of the entrance, such as property number/name, would be likely to take place.
7. These changes would change the appearance and character of the site and would highlight its cramped nature. In this regard, the smaller plot size of the separate dwelling, relative to most in the surrounding area, would be noticeable. Additionally, the confined and restricted nature of the rear garden behind one end of the Tudor Cottage and the hard surfacing of the parking and access serving the separate dwelling would markedly stand out in the street scene. Such site arrangements would appear visually out of kilter in an area where the majority of dwellings possess traditional layouts, consisting of frontage vehicular parking and access, set in spacious plots. For all these reasons, the development would be cramped which would be visible from Matthews Way.
8. There have been two developments for dwellings permitted in Basselsleigh Road and Home Close. In Basselsleigh Road, the new dwelling was similar in design and close to the road, with the site area less than that of the appeal proposal. At Home Close, the dwelling was much larger on a site only slightly smaller than the appeal proposal. However, these examples are not sited within the immediate context of the appeal site, being located some distance away. Notwithstanding this, they are the exception to the character and appearance of the areas surrounding these sites. Therefore, there are significant differences between developments and the appeal proposal before me. In any case, every proposal has to be considered on its own particular planning merits.
9. For all these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policy CP37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LP Part 1) (2016), policy DP03 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LP Part 2) (2019) and policy DG1.1 of the Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031 (NDP) (2019).

Living conditions

10. Tudor Cottage has two dormers facing the separate dwelling and its frontage, comprising garden, vehicle parking area and access. Given their elevation, the dormers would also not cause any loss of privacy to the occupiers using the ground floor of the new dwelling. There would also be no loss of privacy to the parking areas and access by reason of their use. In respect of the new dwelling's garden, there would be sufficient separation provided by Tudor Cottage's garden to avoid significant overlooking. The separate dwelling would have high level rooflights stopping any intervisibility with the dormers of the Tudor Cottage.
11. For all these reasons, the development would not harm the living conditions of the future occupiers of the new separate dwelling. Accordingly, the proposal

would comply with LP Part 2 policies DP03 and DP23 (in respect of living conditions).

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with LP Part 1, LP Part 2 and NDP policies and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, this appeal is dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR