



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 June 2021

by Mr S Rennie BSc (Hons), BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/21/3271511

112 Ferry Road, Marston, OXFORD, OX3 0EX

- 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 MS LOUISE HOLMAN against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02978/FUL, dated 24 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is to construct a 2nd floor extension on an existing two storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the house and the area.

Reasons

3. No 112 Ferry Road is set within a residential area of Oxford. This is a long street where there is a clear mix of dwelling types and designs, which reflect the different periods they were developed. However, what is generally consistent is that the dwellings are mostly two storey which have similar eaves height. There are some dwellings which appear to have habitable accommodation above two storey level, but this is generally within the roof void area.
4. The proposal would be to raise the height (ridge and eaves) of the existing house by a little under 2m. Particularly due to raised eaves, the resultant dwelling would appear as a three storey house rather than two storey with a loft room. I understand this may be needed to provide sufficient head-height internally, but the result would be a three storey house in a street where two storey is the prevailing character.
5. The two storey front gable section would not be extended upwards, but this would only serve to draw attention to the proposed main roof which would be considerably higher. Furthermore, the eaves heights for dwellings in this part of Ferry Road are quite consistent, which is the case for No 112 and its adjacent neighbours. However, the proposed extension would mean that No 112 would have significantly higher eaves than Nos 110 and 114. For these reasons, the dwelling would appear overly-dominant and incongruous within the street scene.

6. The extended dwelling at No 112 may not be evident from some more distanced views within the street, but closer and towards the front of the house, when viewed between the neighbouring houses, the incongruous form of the extension would be clearly evident. The use of matching materials, for example, would not mitigate this harm.
7. There is an exception at No 93 Ferry Road as this is a three storey house, but this appears as an anomaly within the street scene as it is very different from the others around it in terms of appearing three storey with high ridge and eaves height. This single example is not reason to consider that the proposed extension at No 112 would not appear incongruous within the street scene as a whole.
8. There are some other examples brought to my attention, but not all are in the same section of Ferry Road and therefore not part of the immediate context of No 112 where it will be seen. Furthermore, the example of Avalon differs from the proposal at No 112 as it appears more as a two storey dwelling (with eaves height similar to the adjacent dwellings to the side) with a room in the roof void, whereas No 112 would appear as a three storey house set between two storey neighbouring houses.
9. I am aware of the Government 'permitted development' changes and additions in recent years, including the possibility of building upwards on houses. However, this is based on issues to be considered with a 'Prior Approval' submission. In this case, the proposed extension would result in a harmful visual impact within the street scene.
10. For these reasons the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036, which requires development to be of a high quality design.

Other Matters

11. As set out in the Statement of Case, I recognise that the appellant works locally in a school and has local connections, thereby not wanting to move from the area. However, I am not convinced that there is not a more appropriate way to extend the dwelling, although I do note the constraints of the site. However, this is not sufficient reason to allow the appeal as it does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR