



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by Mr S Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/21/3270082

Magnolia View Faringdon Road, Southmoor, ABINGDON, OX13 5AF

- 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 David Fell against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P19/V2609/HH, dated 24 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension to provide additional bedroom and new porch to main entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension to provide additional bedroom and a new porch to main entrance, at Magnolia View, Faringdon Road, Southmoor, ABINGDON, OX13 5AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P19/V2609/HH, dated 24 October 2019, subject to the following 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 plans: 1299 01; 1299 02 B; 1299/03; and 1299/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would be a front extension to a house on a main road through the centre of this village. This is a residential street, made up primarily of detached dwellings in spacious grounds. What was particularly notable to me on my site visit is the extensive range of house types and styles, often reflecting the time it was built. Magnolia View has a distinctive front elevation catslide roof, but there are neighbouring properties which have dormers, with others having front gable projections. There is no clear uniform design within this street scene.

4. The proposed extension would essentially replace the catslide roof element and create a front two storey projecting gable with pitched roof. Whilst this would significantly alter the front elevation appearance and not be a subservient addition, there is no substantive reason why this would be harmful. The front elevation is not of such architectural merit that it should be preserved from significant change and given the mix of designs within the street it would not appear out of keeping with the proposed extension. Indeed, there are other examples of front elevation two storey gable projections in the area close to Magnolia View which I observed.
5. The proposed extension would be prominent within the street scene as it is to the front elevation. I also note the advice within the Design Guide regarding front elevations. However, I do not regard the proposed extension as having a significantly adverse impact to the street scene or a damaging effect on the appearance of the house. In this particular context, even if prominent, it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area as it would be a suitably designed extended front elevation set within a mixed street scene. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Core Policy 37 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1. This policy requires that development responds positively to site surroundings and is visually attractive. The proposal also broadly accords with the Vale of White Horse Design Guide SPD.
6. Furthermore, the proposed porch would not cause harm to the visual amenity of the area being that it is a modest addition with matching materials proposed.

Conditions

7. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR