
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2023

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/D/23/3317994

15 Oxford Road Woodstock Oxfordshire OX20 1UN

- 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 Graham Winstone against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03522/HHD, dated 20 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of rear flat roof extension and erection of a two-storey rear extension, including a carport to the side of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. This part of Oxford Road is characterised by good sized detached houses in substantial plots. The rear of the appeal property currently includes a number of components of varying forms. A flat roof single storey structure would be demolished and an existing hipped roof projection and a dormer roof side extension would be retained.
4. The appeal scheme would add a further two hipped roof projections to the rear elevation of the host dwelling, one which be of a similar scale to the existing projection and one which be substantially smaller. This accumulation of design features would give rise to a cluttered appearance, which would lack cohesion.
5. I note that the extension would have a similar footprint to the single storey flat roof structure to be demolished and would be set down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling. However, when considered cumulatively with the existing rear structures, the overall mass would be significant. As such, the proposals would not appear subservient to the main dwelling and would fail to represent a logical form or pattern of development.
6. I acknowledge that the hipped roof design and materials proposed would reflect the existing house. I also recognise that the original part of the house would

- be retained intact. However, these matters would not sufficiently mitigate the harm that I have described to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
7. Whilst the extension would not be seen from the front of the property, it would be visible from the garden of neighbouring properties, as well as the footpath which runs to the side of the house.
 8. The appeal scheme includes a carport to the side of the dwelling, which would be visible from the public realm to the front of the site. Only the basic form of the structure has been included within the submission. Whilst the hipped roof design of the structure would respond to the dwelling, critical details such as materials are not given. In the absence of a detailed scheme which would allow the visual impact of the carport to be properly assessed, I must assume that it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site.
 9. In view of the above, the proposals would unduly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policies OS2, OS4, EH2 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (2018), the West Oxford Design Guide (2016) and Section 12 of the NPPF which, taken together, seek to secure good quality design which protects the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Other matters

10. I note that the appellant was unable to discuss amendments to the proposals with the Council before the planning application was refused. However, this is not a matter for this appeal which I have determined on its planning merits.
11. The appellant has indicated that he would be willing to omit the proposed carport from the proposals. However, I must consider the appeal on the basis of the scheme and the plans which were before the Council when it made its decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR