



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/22/3313838

19 St Leonards Road, Oxford, OX3 8AD

- 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 Dr Levent Altinay against the decision of the Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02046/FUL, dated 17 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single part two storey rear/side extension. Formation of a loft conversion and the installation of 1 no air source heat pump.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached 2 storey house on a corner at the junction of St Leonards Road and Wharton Road. Houses close to the site on both roads are semi-detached. Most have exposed brickwork on the ground floor and are rendered above. Originally pairs of houses would have had hipped roofs, but several have had hip to gable extensions. The appeal property has a side door and wall that attaches to a single storey garage adjacent to the neighbour's boundary. The house is set back from the road with a garden that extends to the front and side, because of its corner position, and is significantly larger than the rear garden. In addition to common design elements shared with nearby houses, the gap between the appeal property and neighbouring house, No 21, above the garage and side wall also contributes to the character and appearance of the street.
4. The proposed 2 storey side extension would have a hipped roof that would be set below the main house roof ridge. It would attach to the gable end created by the proposed hip to gable roof extension. The difference in angle and height of these 2 proposed elements would be visually awkward and incongruous and would harm the appearance of the host property, and because of its prominent position that of the surrounding area. The existing garage has a parapet wall above the door. This would be replaced with a longer parapet wall extending above the proposed ground floor side extensions. It would meet the main house above the level of the existing exposed ground floor brickwork drawing

attention to the differences in height and therefore fail to integrate well with the host property. A shallow pitched roof behind it would add to the visual confusion caused by these different elements which together would reduce the gap between the host property and No 21 that I have identified as contributing to the street scene.

5. There is no dispute between the parties that elements of the scheme would be permitted development or that houses close to the appeal site have had roof alterations, and extensions to the side and rear, including hip to gable extensions and rear dormers as proposed. Nonetheless, it is the combination of extensions and their failure to integrate with each other and the host property that would cause harm. I have had regard to examples of extensions in the surrounding area provided by the appellant. However, none were directly comparable in terms of the extent of alterations and diversity of roof forms and their effect on their respective host buildings. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the house and surrounding area and the proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (2020) and CIP1 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan (2017) which require high quality development that enhances local character.

Other Matters

6. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the absence of public representations, existing site constraints, homeworking arrangements and the accommodation requirements of the appellant's extended family. However, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR