



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2023

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/23/3316480

32 Linden Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6PG

- 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 Lynda Dix against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02947/F dated 26 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear first floor extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling, terrace and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling which currently benefits from an existing ground floor rear extension. The Council's delegated report notes, in relevant planning history, that a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed development (for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear in order to facilitate a loft conversion) was permitted under application reference 20/03604/CLUP. I note that this has not been constructed at the point of my site visit or determination, however, it is shown in the proposed plans which are submitted as part of the proposals before me. In addition to this the appellant confirms, within their statement, that the proposal is to allow for rearrangement of the internal layout facilitated by the aforementioned loft conversion.
4. Whilst the dormer extension does not specifically form part of the appeal proposal before me it's inclusion upon the proposed plans, and within the explanatory comments provided, means I find that it is clearly intended to be implemented as part of the overall proposals along with the proposed first floor rear extension. It is, in my opinion, relative and fair to take the cumulative impact of these proposals into account when considering the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling, terrace and area.
5. The proposal would result in a first floor rear extension to the appeal site as a mid-terraced dwelling. At the time of my site visit, I entered the appeal site and viewed the host dwelling, and terraced row, from within the garden. I note that there are examples of roof dormers, to the rear roof slopes, on some

- properties as well as examples of ground floor extensions of varied styles within the vicinity of the appeal site. Despite this, there are no examples of the combined proposals that are before me that would result in a first floor extension, over an existing ground floor extension combined with a rear roof dormer. The proposals would therefore be uncharacteristic for the area.
6. The Cherwell District Council's Home Extension and Alterations Design Guide (2007) notes that extensions should normally match the original building and that the extension should not dominate the original or neighbouring buildings. The proposed rear extension would result in the rear of the host dwelling being completely unrecognisable with none of the original rear elevation visible. In addition to this, the stepped design of the first-floor extension is unsympathetic and is a contrived design to ensure no intrusion with the 45-degree line when taken from the mid-point of the nearest habitable room windows.
 7. The proposal would appear as a cramped form of development when combined with the rear dormer window and existing extension. Furthermore, looking at the side elevation in the proposed plans, the proposal would include a flat roof with eaves higher than those of the existing terrace, which further contributes to it being an incongruous addition to both the host property and the terrace within which the appeal site is located. As a result of the cumulative impact of these proposals, I find the first floor rear extension would appear as an alien feature when viewed in the context of the terraced row and this is exacerbated, in terms of impact on the appearance of the area, due to it being in a highly visible location from the public realm as a result of a public car park being to the rear of the appeal site.
 8. I note that the appellant has stated that the proposed extension would have been significantly smaller than some of the existing rear extensions along the terraced row. Despite this, no further evidence, from the appellant, has been submitted as to the rear extensions which are being referred to and indeed, I did not notice any first-floor rear extensions in the context of the appeal site at the time of my site visit. The rear terrace of Linden Road is characterised as a mix of varied styles, forms, and scales of extension but, as previously stated, I have no evidence before me to demonstrate that cumulative extensions as proposed are characteristic of the area. The proposal before me would be a visually incongruous form of development that would adversely affect both the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace within which it stands and the wider area.
 9. The proposal would be contrary to Cherwell Local Plan (Part 1) 2016 Policy ESD15, which confirms that new development proposals should contribute positively to an area character and identify and complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting, layout and high quality design. The proposal would also be contrary to Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Saved Policy C28, which seeks to ensure that all new development, including extensions, are sympathetic to the character of the urban context of that development. The proposal would also be contrary to Saved Policy C30 which applies design control to ensure that any proposal to extend an existing dwelling is compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the character of the streetscene.
 10. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 130 which seeks to ensure development will function well and

add to the overall quality of the area as well as being sympathetic to the local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. I note, from the Council's delegated report, an objection from Bicester Town Council. Despite this, the Town Council's observations on Planning Applications, which have been uploaded as part of this appeal, does not appear to include comments made in relation to the proposal that is before me. I am, in any case, dismissing this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR