



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2021 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1325/D/20/3261432

Normans, 3 Church Road, Chadlington OX7 3LY

- 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 Michael Smith against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01279/HHD, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development is described as a 2 storey rear extension - replacing an existing single storey extension. Also a new garage and works to an existing pigsty.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Amended plans were submitted prior to the determination of the planning application, which reduced the scale of the extension in various minor ways. These amended plans were determined by the Council, and I shall do the same.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The semi-detached appeal property is located at the end of row of modest traditional cottages, variously extended at the rear. The terrace is sited on a road extending out of the village and the dwelling sits opposite open agricultural land. The site is located within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
6. The existing traditional pitched roofed cottage, finished in stone, render and slate, appears to have been previously extended, including to the rear at single storey level, which would be removed and replaced by a two-storey rear extension. The West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2016) sets out that extensions that are of an inappropriate scale, or likely to obscure or significantly alter the form or character of the original property, are unlikely to be supported.

7. The Council has raised no concerns regarding the proposed garage to the rear or to the alterations to the outhouse. From everything which has been seen on the site visit and in submissions, I have no reason to disagree.
8. The existing single storey rear projection and conservatory would be replaced by the proposed extension; however, the proposal would result in a substantial increase in the footprint of the original dwelling and extend across a significant proportion of the existing rear elevation at a two-storey level. The consequential increase in volume and mass would result in a bulky addition which would fail to appear subservient to the existing dwelling.
9. The use of differing materials such as extensive glazing and contemporary design would provide some visual relief and the ridge height would be lower than the main house. However, the proposed high-level flat roof element would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the traditional form of the original dwelling. Moreover, due to its scale, the proposal would dominate the dwelling and the original form and character would not be readily apparent.
10. Whilst, given the scale of development, it would not affect the landscape and scenic beauty of the wider AONB, due to the depth and height of the proposed extension, it would be briefly visible from the highway between the property and its northern neighbour. Furthermore, the significant mass and bulk of the proposal would also be apparent from the rear of neighbouring properties. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. It is acknowledged that the development would be suitably located, and the extensions would improve the functionality and usability of the property; however, it would do so in a manner which would harm the character and appearance of the existing original property. It is noted that the proposal did not attract objections from neighbouring residents nor the Parish Council, however, this does not alter my conclusions on the main issue.
12. Reference is made to other examples of rear extensions along the same street and within the locality. No approved drawings are provided and as such it is not possible to make a direct comparison which limits the weight which I can attach to these cases in my Decision. Furthermore, each case is determined on its own merits.
13. In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area, in conflict with Policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (2018), which seek to ensure that development is of a proportionate and appropriate scale to its context, respect the character of the surrounding area and be of a high quality. These policies are in broad accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition, the proposal conflicts with the general design advice set out in the West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2016).

Recommendation

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

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Caroline Mulloy

INSPECTOR