



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2022

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/D/21/3286519

8 High Street, Chinnor, Oxfordshire OX39 4DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Ingram against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P21/S3360/PDS, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is upwards extension of principle part of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) permits development consisting of the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of up to one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, together with any reasonably necessary engineering operations. Development is permitted under Class AA subject to limitations and conditions and a requirement that the developer applies for prior approval to the local planning authority.
3. The provisions of sub-paragraph (3) of Paragraph AA.2 of Part 1 require the developer to apply for prior approval with respect to several different matters. The Council's reason for refusal (RfR) refers to (a)(ii) 'the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway'. Its reasoning also draws on the effect of the proposal on the pair of semi-detached bungalows and the wider area.
4. The appellant has referred to an appeal decision¹ in which the Inspector focused on the dwellinghouse itself and no other parts of the relevant street scene. However, I take a different view as I am mindful that the term 'including' used in the GPDO denotes that the list of relevant considerations is not closed, but it should be of the same kind. How successful the external appearance of a dwellinghouse may be in assimilating with the other attached dwellings and its surroundings can therefore be relevant factors in the consideration of this matter. Accordingly, the matters raised in the RfR can be

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/X1735/D/21/3269472.

grouped under the aforementioned considerations and addressed in the prior approval determination.

5. There is no dispute between the main parties regarding the compliance of the proposal with the limitations expressed paragraph AA.1, but these and the subsequent conditions in paragraph AA.2 are deliberately separated. Therefore, in determining the appeal, I have considered the effect of the size and height of the proposal in considering its design.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether prior approval should be granted for the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, with particular regard to the existing pair of semi-detached bungalows and their surroundings.

Reasons

7. The appeal relates to the right-hand bungalow in a pair of such properties arranged parallel to the street with gables at both ends and identical gabled forward projections. The appeal property is smaller than the left-hand bungalow (No 10) but has a dormer window on its rear roof slope. Given the longer frontage of No 10, the pair is clearly not balanced, but their simple form, appearance, and detailing are consistent. Like many other properties in High Street, the bungalows are elevated above the road, but are also adjacent to the junction with Grafton Orchard. While the front and rear roof slopes of the bungalows are both evident within their surroundings, the properties currently appear unassuming and make a modest contribution to its character.
8. The proposed additional storey would project above the other bungalow in the pair. The elongated height of the appeal property would appear cumbersome and ungainly alongside No 10 and the resultant contrast from the coherent design characteristics of the pair of bungalows would be significantly harmful to their external appearance and that of their surroundings.
9. The proposed extension would be constructed with an identical roof pitch and matching materials, particularly tiles which would be re-used from the existing roof. The forward projecting gable would also be retained. These aspects of the proposal would provide evidence of the alteration of the pair of properties.
10. Despite these factors, I conclude that the proposed development would appear as a discordant addition, which would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, with particular regard to the existing pair of semi-detached bungalows and their surroundings. Accordingly, given that I have identified that the external appearance of the dwellinghouse would be harmed, prior approval should be refused.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR