



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2021

by R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/21/3278014

**Gate Cottage, road alongside Lower Common, Uffington, Oxfordshire
SN7 7SG**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr. and Mrs. Ed Preece against Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P21/V0009/HH, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 28th April 2021
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension, single-storey side and rear extensions, glazed link and the erection of a one and a half storey outbuilding, incorporating a garage, annexe and home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension, single-storey side and rear extensions, glazed link and the erection of a one and a half storey outbuilding, incorporating a garage, annexe and home office at Gate Cottage, road alongside Lower Common, Uffington, Oxfordshire SN7 7SG, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P21/V0009/HH, dated 22 December 2020 and 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 drawings: 1143-PL-800; 1143-PL-801 and 1143-PL-802a.
 - 3) The rooflights on the eastern elevation of the new outbuilding shall be installed with a sill height of not less than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the rooms in which they are fitted and thereafter shall be retained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Gate Cottage, is an attractive thatched roofed dwelling with rendered walls and evenly proportioned windows, set back from the highway. Modern additions extend from its rear and side, while a flat roof garage is located a short

- distance to the dwelling's east. It is the last property in a row of traditional houses and benefits from a large curtilage.
4. The proposed 1.5 storey outbuilding would be located a short distance to the east of the dwelling along the same building line. Although it would adjoin the dwelling through the proposed glazed link, this addition would be modest and set back from the front elevation, to the extent that the outbuilding would appear detached from the dwelling from most vantage points.
 5. The outbuilding would have a gabled front elevation that would have a width of around 6.3m. In this context the dwelling's front elevation would be appreciably wider. In addition, the outbuilding's ridgeline and tapering roof would result in its upper storey having a slim appearance in contrast to the host dwelling's much wider thatched roof. These factors, together with the outbuilding's lower ridgeline (approximately 1.2m) and the perspective of it appearing detached, results in it having a subordinate relationship to the host dwelling that would not dominate or overwhelm it.
 6. Due to its position at the end of the street the outbuilding would be visible from various directions above the existing boundary features. However, this in itself does not make it unacceptable. Indeed, the outbuilding would not be unduly prominent because of its scale and in many views, it would be seen against the backdrop of the main house.
 7. The outbuilding would be constructed using clay tiles and oak board panelling. Architectural detailing would include clipped eaves and a partially open frontage surrounded by an oak frame with gallows brackets. The building's detailing and use of materials combine to create a vernacular design that would appear unobtrusive and acceptable in the context of the host dwelling and the street with its many traditional houses.
 8. A slender two storey side addition would be set back from the dwelling's front elevation and set down around 1m from its roof line. This would ensure that its original shape is maintained and understood from the property's forecourt and the public highway beyond.
 9. The proposal would also include a rear addition emanating from the proposed outbuilding and a further single storey rear lounge extension. In combination with the side addition, these would have the effect of increasing the footprint and scale of the property. However, together they would be modest in height, subordinate in scale and discretely located at the property's rear in a manner that does not alter the host dwelling's character.
 10. The Council has referred to examples elsewhere in the village where garages are single storey and more reduced in scale. No specific examples have been provided. However, in the cases where I saw garages next to dwellings, these were along streets where dwellings were generally sited closer together and did not have the same spatial arrangement or plot size as the appeal dwelling. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to any existing precedents.
 11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031, Part 1 and the Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015 SPD. These require that the scale, height, details and materials used in proposals are

appropriate for the site and surrounding area, while garage buildings should not dominate or overwhelm the scale of the main dwelling. The proposal also accords with the aims of Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they require proposals to respect local character, result in good architecture and reflect local design policies.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have considered it necessary to include a schedule of plans that the development relates to, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. Also, a condition specifying the position of rooflights above the finished floor level of the outbuilding is necessary in the interests of neighbouring living conditions, with particular reference to privacy.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR