
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by Veronica Bond LLB (Hons), Solicitor (non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21st November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/16/3157276

24 Lakefield Road, Oxford, Ox's OX4 4LZ

- 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 M Dave Tayloy against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01079/FUL, dated 11 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is front and side single and double storey extension to form extra bedroom and living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's name above is taken from the application form. It would appear though that this should in fact be 'Mr Dave Taylor'.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a fairly modern end terrace dwelling located within a cul-de-sac. Another row of terraced houses is opposite. Properties within the cul-de-sac show some similar architectural features with development to front elevations generally limited to canopy or small enclosed porches. This creates a consistency of design and contributes to the estate style character of the immediate area.
5. The proposed extension to the front elevation would be of a large size relative to the host property, particularly given its position. It would include both a two storey element along with a single storey section of significant depth. It would dominate the appeal dwelling and would unbalance the two rows of terraced properties. Given the open entrance to the cul-de-sac and forward position of the extension, it would be a prominent and visually discordant feature in the street scene.
6. I have taken into account the appellant's view that the highway, off street parking areas and two storey garage building dominate the area between the two terraces. I acknowledge also the open backdrop of the school grounds.

However, I do not consider that these would distract from the jarring presence of the proposed extension, which would remain clearly visible. I have noted also the intention for the proposal to be subservient in design, materials and massing and of small scale in keeping with adjoining residential development. However, for the reasons outlined above, these aims have not been achieved.

7. The appellant takes the view that development in the area displays little architectural merit. Nonetheless, I have identified that there would be harm to local character. The absence of objections, including as regards the living conditions of local residents, also does not overcome this harm.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not comply with Policies CP1, CP8 and CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 (adopted 11 November 2005). These seek, amongst other things, development which respects the character and appearance of the area and results in the streetscape being maintained or enhanced; together with extended buildings which create an appropriate visual relationship with the surrounding area.
9. The appellant queries the relevance of Policy CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026 (adopted 14 March 2011) and Policy HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026 (adopted February 2013). However, I also find conflict with the aims of these policies, which include requiring development to be appropriate to the site and surroundings and responsive to the overall character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Veronica Bond
INSPECTOR