

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2017

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI MRSB

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

Decision date: 22nd March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/16/3165779
18 New Street, Bicester, Oxon, OX26 6EY

- 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 Graham Payne, Bicester Golf & Country Club, against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02001/F, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey front and single storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The submitted evidence includes a plan ref. SK.16-722-20 showing "Alternative Elevations". This plan is not referred to in the evidence of either main party and is not listed on the original application form. I have no evidence that it has been considered by the Council or has been the subject of any wider consultation. In the absence of any explanation for this plan I cannot be satisfied that it is properly before me to consider and I have not therefore had regard to it in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of New Street.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey, semi-detached, post war dwelling, situated at one end of New Street, a street comprising other similar dwellings and a small number of more recent additions of modern character and design. Owing to its end-plot position and relationship with properties in Buckingham Road the plot has a wider frontage than other similar dwellings in the street. There is thus ample space to the side of the existing dwelling to accommodate the proposed single storey garage. The Council does not object to this part of the proposal and I consider it acceptable.
-

5. Although not referred to in the description of development, the submitted plans show a proposed single storey rear extension that would replace an existing conservatory. The proposed location was not visible to me during my unaccompanied site visit and I do not consider that this part of the development is before me to consider. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the two storey front extension.
6. The proposed front extension would infill an area between the main façade of the dwelling and an original two storey side projection which is set back about 2m from the main façade. It would thus be flush with the existing main front elevation. An existing porch would, as now, project further forward. The eaves of the extension would match those of the dwelling. Up to eaves height the extension would blend sympathetically with the original dwelling and would not result in an incongruous or unduly prominent addition.
7. However, the roof of the proposed two storey extension would be substantially separated from the main roof so as to form a hipped section above the extension that would tie in to the ridge of the existing set back, two storey, side projection. This would result in an over complicated roof profile that would jar with the existing roof form, resulting in an incongruous and unsympathetic addition. Notwithstanding that the proposed roof would be lower than and subservient to the existing main roof, it would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of New Street.
8. The appellant suggests that the proposed roof would not be out of place in a street where a variety of designs are evident and where new dwellings of different design have been allowed. However, it is primarily the poor relationship between the proposed roof and that of the host dwelling that would have an unacceptable effect.
9. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed two storey front extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of New Street. It would therefore conflict with Policy ESD 15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, adopted 2015, saved Policy C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan, November 1996, and the National Planning Policy Framework which, taken together, expect new development to be of a high standard of design such that it complements and enhances the character of its context. In particular, in the case of new housing including extensions, it should be compatible with the appearance and character of existing dwellings in the vicinity, including the host dwelling, and thus compatible with the character of the street scene.
10. Although I find that the single storey side extension would be acceptable this would not outweigh the identified harm that would arise from the proposed two storey front extension.
11. Therefore, for the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objection from Bicester Town Council, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR