



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2023

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/D/23/3324478

14 Wallingford Road, Goring, Reading, Oxfordshire RG8 0AH

- 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 Kayur Rughani against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P23/S0552/HH, dated 13 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is to convert existing built-in garage into living space. Add bay windows to front of the property on both sides. Add a rough rendered finish to the property to soften the appearance. Add a front porch and enlarged bathroom above. Add a side extension for a 'boot and utility room'. Convert the loft to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite shower room and a home office / study.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to Convert existing built-in garage into living space. Add bay windows to front of the property on both sides. Add a rough rendered finish to the property to soften the appearance. Add a front porch and enlarged bathroom above. Add a side extension for a 'boot and utility room'. Convert the loft to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite shower room and a home office / study, at 14 Wallingford Road, Goring, Reading, Oxfordshire RG8 0AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P23/S0552/HH, dated 13 February 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: LOC-001, PR-E1 D, PR-E2 D, PR-E3 D, PR-E4 D, PR-E5 D, PR-P1 D, PR-P0 D, PR-P2 D, PR-P3 D, PR-S1 D, PR-S2 D.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area, and on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. Adjacent to the appeal site, Wallingford Road is made up of detached dwellings of varying scale and appearance, with gables, front dormers, hipped roofs, half hipped roof elements, pitched roofs, bay windows and porches visible from the highway. There is also a variety of materials, with differing coloured brick

evident, in addition to rendered finishes. As such, there is little consistency in the appearance of the properties and a variety in roof form.

4. The alterations to the roof would result in the addition of a mansard style flat element to the ridge at the rear. However, there is an existing first floor element at the rear with a similar roof, and therefore this additional element would not appear incongruous. Similarly, the addition of a front gable would not look out of place in the context of the existing two gables. The dormers are limited in size and would sit comfortably within the existing roof form.
5. The roof extension would lead to some additional bulk and massing being introduced, however in the context of the existing substantial roof, this would be a modest increase which would not overwhelm nor over complicate the existing form of the property. It would not prevent its original character and appearance from being readily apparent and would not appear inappropriate in this respect. As such, it would not result in poor design.
6. The other proposed additions to the property are limited in their visual effect and even collectively, would not harm the character and appearance of the existing property. These elements would also not appear incongruous nor out of place with the mixed character of the surrounding dwellings.
7. Whilst not replicated in totality elsewhere, individual elements of the proposed roof form are present in the mixed roof forms in the surrounding area. As such, the extended roof form would not appear incongruous within the surrounding area.
8. Whilst located within the AONB, the appeal property is located within the settlement of Goring, surrounded by built form and the railway line opposite. As such, given the limited scale of development, there would be limited effect upon the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB, which the Goring Neighbourhood Plan (2019) (NP) sets out as including '*the chalk escarpment with areas of flower-rich downland, broadleaved woodlands, open rolling countryside, tranquil valleys, the network of ancient routes and footpaths and the river valley*'. Moreover, I have found that the proposed development would be appropriate in its visual effect on the existing property and surroundings. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would conserve the character and natural beauty of the AONB.
9. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area and would conserve the character and natural beauty of the AONB. There is no conflict with Policies DES1, DES2 and H20 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011-2035 (2020) (LP) and NP Policy 16, which collectively and amongst other matters, require high quality design that reflects and responds positively to the character and design of the local area. There is also no conflict with the wider conservation and enhancement of the AONB's special landscape qualities goals of LP Policy ENV1, NP Policy 11 and paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There is also no conflict with the general design advice set out in the Supplementary Planning Document Joint Design Guide (2022).

Other Matters

10. Whilst sited at a higher level, the additional second floor windows are not located nearer to the rear boundary than the existing first floor windows. As such, I am satisfied that there is no increase in overlooking to the properties behind the appeal site. A condition to obscure glaze these windows, as suggested by the Council, is not therefore necessary. I note that previous planning application decisions (and appeal decisions) are referenced by the Council in relation to this matter, however I have not been provided with sufficient details of these proposals to compare with the proposal before me.
11. The single storey side extension would sit in close proximity to the boundary with No 2 Milldown Avenue, however, its modest height would have a limited effect upon the light reaching this neighbouring property. The outlook from the rear of No 2 would also remain mostly of the two-storey side flank of the appeal property. I am also therefore satisfied that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of No 2 with respect to light and outlook.

Conditions

12. Suggested conditions has been provided that the Council. I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
13. In addition to the standard time limit condition and compliance with the application plans, a condition relating to the materials of the external surfaces matching the existing property is not appropriate, given the differing materials proposed, such as render, and the mixed surrounding material palette.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR