



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/21/3271541

2 York Avenue, Headington, OXFORD, OX3 8NS

- 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 Kate De Ban against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02797/FUL, dated 5 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear conservatory and front porch. Erection of a part single, part two storey, rear extension. Alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear conservatory and front porch, erection of a part single part two storey rear extension, alterations to fenestration, at 2 York Avenue, Headington, OXFORD, OX3 8NS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02797/FUL, dated 5 November 2020, 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 following approved plans and drawings: 279/PL 04; 279/PL 05; 279/PL 06 and 279/PL 07.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The dwelling at No 2 York Avenue is a detached dormer bungalow with rooms within the roof, set in a residential area. The proposed extensions would be all to the rear of the dwelling, with all aspects being flat roof with 'Cedral cladding in grey'. This is a contemporary approach to extending the existing dwelling, which has a more traditional pitched roof form.
4. Whilst the proposed extensions are significant in their scale in relation to the existing dwelling, the flat roof extension and dormer are set down from the ridge and also in from the sides of the roof. This allows the original form of the dwelling to remain clearly apparent. The proposed extensions are not over-scaled for this dwelling and do not overdevelop this spacious plot. I also note

- that the use of flat roofs rather than pitched roofs reduces the potential volume and bulk of the proposed extensions.
5. The subservient scale of the proposed rear extensions and the use of flat roofs, being all to the rear elevation, means that these additions would not be bulky or visually dominating within the street scene.
 6. The design approach is distinct from the existing dwelling, although there is no particular need to replicate the original form and materials of the dwelling to ensure good design. I would regard the form, scale and fenestration to be of a sufficient standard of design, especially considering these are rear extensions that would be largely screened from public views. The main view would be glimpses of the side of the dormer, but this would not be visually harmful within the street scene, especially with other flat roof dormers being in the area.
 7. Overall, the proposed extensions would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal is in accordance with policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036, and policies GSP4 and CIP1 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan. These policies require development to be of a high quality design, respond appropriately to the site and the character of the surrounding area, amongst other things.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and the Framework. The conditions I have included from the recommended list have been subject to some alterations to improve clarity and ensure consistency with the Framework and PPG.
9. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty.
10. I have not included a condition for matching materials, as the proposed extensions are to be clad in a material not currently on the dormer bungalow. There are sufficient details of the proposed materials with the appeal, which I consider as being acceptable for this development.
11. Having been to the site and seen the proposed plans, I do not regard there to be the necessary justification to restrict permitted development rights relating to first floor side elevation windows in the interests of neighbour amenity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR

