



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/22/3309648

2 Cottage View, Great Close Road, Yarnton, Oxfordshire OX5 1QW

- 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 Matthew Tolley against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02210/F, dated 20 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is remove existing garage and rear extension. Build new single and two storey extensions to provide new garage and additional living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The area primarily consists of dwellings arranged in a modern, suburban layout. The appellant has referred me to examples of dwellings locally where extensions have infilled existing gaps. Nevertheless, the pattern and form of dwellings generally give the area a reasonably spacious appearance. The appeal site is on the corner of Great Close Road and Cassington Road and is prominent in public views from either road.
4. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a slightly lower ridge height than the existing dwelling. It would also have a somewhat smaller depth, with much of it being set back from the front elevation of its host. The proposal also represents a reduction in the size and form of the extensions from those considered by the Council during a previous planning application¹.
5. Even so, the width of the side extension would be greater than the width of the existing dwelling. This would be contrary to the Council's Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide, dated March 2007, which generally restricts side extensions to be no more than half the width of the existing front elevation. This is to ensure the subservience of extensions to their host, to be visually attractive. In this case, the excessive width and resultant mass of the proposal would be appreciably out of proportion with the existing dwelling, such that it

¹ LPA reference 21/04246/F

would be dominated by the extension. This would result in a building that would appear odd and incongruous in the street scene.

6. The large size of the proposal would essentially fill the width of the plot and would extend the property beyond the existing building line along Cassington Road. This protrusion would diminish the consistency of the design and layout of the area, part of which is formed by the existing building line. Furthermore, in contrast to the current side elevation, the proposal would result in a largely blank and unrelieved elevation facing close onto Cassington Road. As such, the proposal would detract from the appearance of the street scene hereabouts, particularly given the prominent position of the site.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, adopted July 2015, which requires the siting and design of a proposal to complement and enhance the character of its context. It would also conflict with the similar requirements of saved Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan, adopted November 1996, including that extensions are compatible with the existing dwelling. For similar reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires a high standard of design.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would provide additional living space for the occupiers. I understand such a need, but this is essentially a private benefit. As such, it provides insufficient reason in the public interest to justify the harm I have found. I have noted comments made about the Council's handling of the case and the previous planning application, but this has had no bearing on my consideration of the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, there would be conflict with the Development Plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR