



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2023

APP/D3125/W/23/3321201

10 Glovers close, Woodstock, Oxfordshire, OX20 1NS

- 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 & Mrs Ian Mutch against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03430/HHD, dated 6 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is single and two storey flat roof extensions to front and single two storey bay windows to rear.
-

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 2 storey detached house at the end of a cul de sac. It has a shallow pitched roof, a flat roofed canopy porch at the front and a single storey flat roofed side projection that appears to be a store/utility room, the back of which adjoins the neighbour's garage. House designs within the Close vary. Several have 2 storey gable wings projecting from their front elevation, others have single storey projecting porches or front rooms. Front gardens extend to the pavement edge without boundary walls giving the Close an open character.
4. The West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2016) (WODG) advises that extensions which obscure or significantly alter the form or character of the original property are unlikely to be supported. The proposed front extensions would comprise 3 flat roofed elements protruding at different depths and reaching across most of the front elevation. Two would be 2 storeys with their roof level with the main eaves and the third would be single storey. They would dominate the house substantially altering its appearance. The flat roofs would be out of keeping with the main pitched roof. Whereas front projecting elements on other houses nearby harmonise with their host property, in terms of their roof pitch or subordinate scale, the proposed development would appear unsympathetic and in combination with the rear extension excessive in terms of its scale. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031(2018), the WODG and the National Planning Policy

Framework (2021) which require high quality design of an appropriate scale that enhances the character of the area.

Other matters

5. I have had regard to the examples of house designs provided by the appellant, including at 19 Crecy Walk and 3 Briar Thicket for which extracts of the ground floor plans were provided. Whilst the examples included a mix of roof types, including some with flat roofed elements, they were either the original unaltered design, or where there were alterations they integrated well with the host building, rather than obscuring its original form, as is the case with the proposed development. They are not therefore comparable with the appeal proposal. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.
6. I understand that the proposed development would improve the building's energy performance and enable the appellants' family to stay when visiting. However, these matters 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