



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/20/3254499

32 Bartholomew Road, Oxford OX4 3QQ

- 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 H Caan against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00388/FUL, dated 12 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as side extension to first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the Council's refusal of the scheme, the Council adopted the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (the LP) on the 8 June 2020. Therefore, policies referred to in the Council's decision notice in regard to the 2005 Oxford Local Plan, Core Strategy and Sites and Housing Plan, no longer form part of the statutory development plan and have been replaced with similar policies within the LP. Policies in the then emerging plan were identified in the officers report and decision notice. The appellant is also aware of the adoption of the new plan and the relevant policies in respect of this appeal, as referenced in their appeal statement. I will therefore have regard to the policies in the LP as they are now part of the development plan for the area and which I am required to determine the appeal in accordance with unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I do not consider this would cause prejudice to any party.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling to which it relates and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The semi-detached appeal property is sited on the corner of Bartholomew Road and Rahere Road. Both are pleasant, suburban residential roads, mostly characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind

gardens and parking areas. There is a consistent building line evident and, whilst there are examples nearby of dwellings slightly forward of the building line, corner plots, such as the appeal site, are mostly largely visually open, which contributes to the area's open, spacious character.

6. The proposed extension would be limited in depth and would be substantially set down and set back from the existing ridge and front elevation. As such and taken in isolation, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the existing property and not detract from its character and appearance nor that of the attached neighbour.
7. However, given the corner position of the appeal dwelling, the side extension would be prominently sited within the street scene. Like the dwelling on the opposite side of Rahere Road (No 34), the appeal property has an existing single storey side projection forward of the building line along Rahere Road, however given its limited scale, its visual impact is limited, and the sense of openness is maintained. The addition of a first-floor extension in this position which extends up close to the side boundary of the property would be visually far more prominent, would close the visual gap and would appear as an incongruous addition in the street scene.
8. The appellant points to numerous examples of similar developments in the vicinity in support of the proposal. Whilst no addresses are provided, corner semi-detached dwellings at Liddell Road, Dodgson Road and Gaisford Road are referenced. None of the examples provided appear to involve first floor side extensions and are not directly comparable with the development proposed. In addition, each application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits, and this is the approach that I have taken in my consideration of this appeal.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal would represent an efficient redevelopment of an existing site and make effective use of land and I attach moderate weight to these matters. Whilst the proposal would improve the family home for the appellant, this is at the expense of the character and appearance of the street scene. Any benefit to local economic development is unquantifiable and would, given the scale of development, be likely to be limited. As such I only give this matter little weight.
10. Against these benefits is the substantial harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. I find therefore that the benefits of the scheme do not individually, or cumulatively, outweigh the harmful impact identified. This identified harm to the street scene means the development would not represent sustainable development.
11. In light of the foregoing I conclude that the proposed extension would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in conflict with LP Policy DH1 which seeks to ensure that development should be appropriate to the immediate context and be of a high quality that creates or enhances distinctiveness.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR