



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/21/3281227

25 Broad Close, Barford St. Michael OX15 0RW

- 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 Simon Bannister against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/01756/F, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side and rear extension, including removal of existing conservatory
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side and rear extension, including removal of existing conservatory at 25 Broad Close, Barford St. Michael OX15 0RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/01756/F, dated 26 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100; 101; 110; and 120.
 - 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 relevant to this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a detached dwelling located within a residential area. The appellant's dwelling has previously been extended. In addition, some of the surrounding dwellings have previously been extended or altered. This creates a more varied character to the surrounding area. The side boundary of the appellant's dwelling faces a road.
4. Whilst the proposed development would result in an enlarged dwelling, the development would have a reasonably subordinate appearance owing to the set back form the front elevation and the lower height of the extension. In addition, the development would be constructed from materials that are

complimentary to the surrounding dwelling. This would ensure that the proposal would harmonise with the original dwelling.

5. The proposed development would, in part, be visible from the public highway. However, owing to the relatively low height of the proposed development and the screening effect offered by the site's boundary treatments and other buildings in the surrounding area, the parts of the proposed development that would be visible would be relatively small. This arrangement would therefore reduce the prominence of the proposed development.
6. Although elements of the development would be visible from the road, these would be relatively small and limited to the roof section of the proposed extension. In consequence, I do not believe that the extension would be a prominent addition when viewed from the surrounding area, nor would it result in harm to the character and appearance of the vicinity.
7. The appeal proposal would be viewed alongside several other extensions within the surrounding area. In consequence, the character of the surrounding area is, in part, defined by the presence of dwellings of varying designs and proportions. In result, the proposed development would not be incongruous.
8. The proposed extension would take place alongside existing developments at the appeal site. Whilst the cumulative effect of these would result in a dwelling larger than originally constructed, the variety of buildings in the surrounding area means that the character of the vicinity would not be eroded. Therefore, the proposed extension would be of a scale that is compatible with the proportions of the existing house.
9. The appeal scheme would result in the dwelling being extended closer to the highway edge. However, this area currently features outbuildings and boundary treatment. In result, this section of Broad Close does not have a particularly open character. Therefore, the development would not result in harm to the area's character in this regard. On my site visit, I noted an existing side extension on the opposite side of Broad Close.
10. The proposed development would replace existing outbuildings. I have not been provided with the planning circumstances of this installation. However, owing to the style of construction, I have no reason to believe that the outbuilding would be removed within the foreseeable future. In consequence, the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in the overall level of built form.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, would comply with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (2015); and Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan (1996). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that developments contribute positively to an area's character; that developments are sympathetic to the context of the development; and that extensions are compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition is necessary that specifies the approved plans in the interests of precision. A condition ensuring that the extension is constructed from materials that are

complementary to the existing dwelling is necessary and reasonable so that the development harmonises with its surroundings.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR