



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/23/3314616

16 Charlbury Road, Oxford OX2 6UT

- 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 Karina Stern against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application 22/01339/FUL, dated 01 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a single storey side and rear extension'.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of development was changed following submission of the application. The amended description better describes the proposed development and therefore that is the description I have utilised for the purposes of the appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; particularly whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the significance of the North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two and a half storey large detached Victorian dwelling within the CA. It is typical of dwellings in the CA in that it is in the grand villa and gothic style of the Victorian era. The appeal site is an attractive building which not only makes a very positive contribution to the CA, but also which may be regarded as undesignated heritage asset in its own right.
5. The appeal scheme would demolish the existing modern-style rear extension and introduce a larger wrap-around side and rear extension.
6. The site does benefit from a very generous sized plot by virtue of additional land acquired from a neighbouring property, which does provide some capacity for extension to the dwelling.

7. However, the proposed new extension would have a sprawling footprint which would extend up to, or even beyond, the original curtilage of the dwelling. This would fail to respect the scale, proportions and spatial qualities of the appeal site which contribute to the significance of the CA, character of surrounding area and the character of the dwelling itself.
8. Moreover, the extension would not respect the detailed and intricate design of the existing dwelling. Whilst one approach to the design of modern extensions to heritage buildings is to introduce starkly modern additions rather than create a pastiche of the original design, such additions should nonetheless respect the design proportions of the original dwelling. The appeal scheme would not do so. Indeed, the overhanging eaves of the flat roof and large fenestration details would be entirely out of scale and jarring with the proportions of the dwelling. As such, despite the overall height of the host dwelling, the proposed extension would overwhelm its ground floor and elevations.
9. Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension would not necessarily be visible year round due to surrounding development and boundary treatments, it would be visible in private views, which are nonetheless part of the CA and the size and spatial quality of the plots in the vicinity contribute positively to the significance of the CA. Further, the extensions would be visible within the site itself and the harm to the character of the dwelling could not be screened.
10. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, be out of keeping with the character of the area and would cause harm to the character of the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies DH1 and DH3 of the Oxford Local Plan, adopted 2020, policies HOS2 and HOS3 of the Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Plan, made 2019, and the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, a high quality of design which responds to local character and which preserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets.

Other Considerations

11. The Appellant has identified no public benefits arising from the scheme which would outweigh the less than substantial harm resulting from the scheme's failure to preserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR