



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/D/20/3257477

53 Henley Road, Sandford-on-Thames, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX4 4YW

- 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 & Mrs W. Fox against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P20/S1630/HH, dated 11 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is side and rear 2 storey extensions, rear single storey extension (Revised Application P14/S2509/HH).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear 2 storey extensions, rear single storey extension (Revised Application P14/S2509/HH) at 53 Henley Road, Sandford-on-Thames, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX4 4YW in accordance with application ref: P20/S1630/HH, dated 10 February 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) 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;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: 08/0906/P/BP1; 08/0906/P/BP2; 08/0906/P13(A) – A3; 08/0906/P14 – A3; 08/0906/P15; and 08/0906/P16(C); and
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no windows or other openings other than those shown on the approved plans shall be inserted in the walls or roof of the side elevations of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) whether the proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt; and
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 51 Henley Road, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

3. Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, an identified exception to this is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
4. The Council have raised no objection to this aspect of the proposal and based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree. The development would be suitably respectful to the existing dwelling and would not be disproportionate in terms of size and scale. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. It would therefore accord with the Green Belt protection aims set out within the Framework as well as Policy H13 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012 (CS) which seeks to control extensions within the Green Belt.

Living conditions

5. Much of the development proposed already benefits from planning permission, and as I observed on site, much of the work is already complete. The Council have raised no objection to these elements of the scheme, but their concerns manifest themselves within the single storey lean-to extension to the side of the two-storey addition.
6. The proposed single storey extension would be sited adjacent to the shared boundary with No 51. However, due to its staggered eaves line, the extension would be of a low height on the boundary. The roof would also slope away from the shared boundary, thereby reducing its mass when viewed from the adjoining neighbour. Moreover, the single storey addition would be experienced against the backdrop of the consented first floor extension. The proposal would be the same depth as this much larger addition and when viewed in such context, due to the low eaves height and the lean-to roof, I am satisfied that the proposed enlargement would not materially alter the outlook from the adjoining property.
7. The extension would be viewed against the silhouette of a substantially larger and more bulky structure. As a consequence, it would not have an incongruous or overbearing effect upon the adjoining property. It would also not be intrusive or unneighbourly. Instead, I am satisfied that it would be suitably respectful to the larger addition that has already been granted consent.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of No 51. It would therefore comply with Policies G2 and H13 of the CS, which taken together, seek amongst other things, development which does not materially harm the amenity of nearby occupants and protects the district's countryside.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. In light of my findings set out above, conditions are necessary in the interests of precision and clarity to establish the time limit for the commencement of

development and to list the approved drawing numbers. In addition, a condition is necessary in relation to external materials to ensure the development complements the existing dwelling. Finally, due to the depth of the rear projection, a condition is necessary to restrict side facing windows in the interests of safeguarding existing levels of privacy.

10. Subject to these conditions, and for the reasons identified above, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR