



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020

by David Carter BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/D/19/3241771

9 Park Side, Woodstock OX20 1UR

- 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 Stephen Gwilym against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02015/HHD, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension at 9 Park Side, Woodstock OX20 1UR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02015/HHD, dated 9 July 2019, subject to 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 approved plans listed in the following schedule:

Location Plan Ref: #870231,
Block Plan, Ref: 0066.A.01.1,
Existing Elevations, Ref: A.04.02,
Existing Floor Plans, Ref: A.03.1,
Proposed Elevations, Ref: A.04.01,
Proposed Floor Plans, Ref: A.03.2,
Proposed View, Ref: A.35.7.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an extended link detached dwelling lying at the end of a cul-de-sac of a modern housing estate. The side of the proposed extension would face onto an adjoining playing field and replace an existing lean-to. The

design of the extension would provide a saltbox styled roof the ridge of which would be lower and subservient to the existing main roof of the host dwelling.

4. The proposed extension would project forward by a short distance to allow natural lighting without requiring a first-floor window facing towards the house on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac. The depth of this forward extension would be less than the existing porch extension, although this would be the first forward projection at first-floor level on this particular property.
5. The design of the proposed extension with its saltbox roof would be unique to Park Side but this styling can be found on a number of properties nearby within the wider estate including the dwelling opposite to the junction of Park Side with Princes Ride. While the roof design is unconventional it would contrast successfully with the existing pattern of roof design in the immediate vicinity.
6. Previously built forward extensions at both ground and first floors are also apparent on the estate including the dwelling directly opposite the appeal site on Park Side. The design of a number of dwellings on Park Side, including the host dwelling, are quite linear in nature and the proposed extension would add interest to, rather than detract from, the street-scene.
7. It has been suggested that the proposed extension would not form a proportionate addition to the host dwelling but, on this particular point I do not agree and consider the extension, including the forward element, to be both well designed and appropriate in its context at the end of the cul-de-sac.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would be an appropriate addition that would add character to the host dwelling without causing harm to the character and appearance of Park Side more generally. As such I find that the proposal would be consistent with the approach in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (adopted September 2018) including: Policy OS2 which permits development of a proportionate and appropriate scale in Woodstock whilst protecting its historic character; Policy OS4 which seeks high quality design having regard to more detailed advice in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) , and; Policy H6 which requires that extensions respect the character of the surrounding area. The approach in the local plan is consistent with that set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 127. The SPG (West Oxfordshire Design Guide 14: Extensions and Alterations, 2016) provides general guidance on key design principles and indicates whether or to what extent alterations or extensions are possible depends on the individual context of the property in question.

Conditions

9. I have considered conditions in relation to the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy Guidance. All of the conditions are considered to be reasonable and necessary to make the approved development acceptable.
10. Condition 1 refers to the standard time limit with condition 2 defining the plans with which the scheme shall accord. This will provide certainty regarding the scope of the permission. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, condition 3 requires that external materials to be used for the development match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated above the appeal is allowed, subject to conditions.

David Carter

INSPECTOR