



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: 14 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/21/3271747

91 Mallards Way, BICESTER, OX26 6WT

- 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 Mrs Lorna Nichol against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03542/F, dated 9 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension at principal elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at the principal elevation of 91 Mallards Way, BICESTER, OX26 6WT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03542/F, dated 9 December 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: 05 Version 03; 06 Version 01; and 07.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a single storey front extension in a modern housing estate. No 91 is to the end of a short terrace, where the middle two properties (Nos 87 and 89) are tall town houses, but No 85 and 91 are lower two storey houses. This short terrace was clearly designed with a symmetry of the dwellings a feature, with No 85 and 91 being symmetrical opposites.
4. The proposed extension, being to the front elevation, would disrupt this symmetry. However, the proposed extension is very modest in size and single storey only. It would also be screened to some extent by adjacent garages and the front boundary treatment. Whilst still likely to be visible, I would not regard it to be prominent. Much of the symmetry will remain and the balance of these dwellings would not be significantly affected by the proposed extension. It

would also be a subservient addition, being set back from the front of No 89 and generally a small extension.

5. As the proposed extension would effectively widen the existing porch, which is a lean-to structure, the proposed extension of matching materials and lean-to form would be a sympathetic addition. Although wider and deeper than neighbouring porches, it would not appear incongruous within the street scene.
6. I note the Design Guide comment about preferable extensions to the rear, but I also acknowledge this dwelling does not have a large rear garden and so, from a living conditions perspective, a front extension in this circumstance is justified.
7. As such, the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, thus being in accordance with policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan. These policies require development to complement and enhance the character of its context, amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. I note some concerns about a right of access if the extension is built. However, it appears as though the design has allowed for this and so this access should still be maintained. From a planning perspective, this is acceptable.
9. There may be some disruption from the construction process, but this is a modest size development and this period should be relatively short and temporary.

Conditions

10. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

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

Mr S Rennie

INSPECTOR

