

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Rory Cridland LLB (Hons)

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

Decision date: 06 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/16/3160630
66 Cricket Road, Oxford OX4 3DQ

- 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 S Khanam against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01897/FUL, dated 13 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the street scene and on the living conditions of occupiers of No 64 Cricket Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area characterised by properties of a similar size and design. However, the appeal property itself is one of a number of narrower buildings which occupy corner plots along Cricket Road. These detached buildings are situated at the end of rows of semi-detached properties, each forming one of a corresponding pair and occupying prominent positions within the street scene. The site itself sits alongside an access track which leads to the allotments to the rear of Cricket Road.
 4. The Council is concerned that, in view of its prominent position, the increase in length along the side elevation would be visually jarring within the street scene. I agree with that assessment. The proposal would add a considerable sized two storey rear extension, extending further an already lengthy side elevation. In view of its position, it would be highly prominent within this part of the street, where its size and bulk would appear in stark contrast to the more modest properties opposite and adjacent. This would have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
 5. Furthermore, the proposed extension would result in a featureless and blank two storey flank wall along the boundary with neighbouring No 64. In view of its elongated length, it would appear as an overbearing addition, creating a significant sense of enclosure and materially affecting the outlook of those who reside there. This would, in my view, be materially detrimental to their living conditions.
-

6. Consequently, I consider the proposal would be harmful to both the street scene and the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring No 64. This would be contrary to Policies CP1, CP8 & CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016¹, Policy CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy² and Policy H9 of the Sites and Houses Plan (2011-2026)³ (SHP). These policies require, amongst other things, that new development is of a high standard that relates well to its setting and respects the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would also be in conflict with Policy HP14 of the SHP which restricts planning permission which has an overbearing impact on existing homes.

Other matters

7. While I note the Council has referred to a loss of light in its second reason for refusal, it accepts in the officer report that any loss of light to adjacent windows would not be of a level which would justify refusal. I agree with that assessment and accordingly have not dealt with it in my reasoning above.
8. I acknowledge that the property may benefit from other permitted development rights. However, these do not provide sufficient justification for the development proposed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rory Cridland

INSPECTOR

¹ (2005)

² (2011)

³ (2013)