



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/23/3324039

296 Marston Road, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 0JA

- 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 Ovais Ziauddin against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00422/FUL, dated 24 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alteration to the existing family dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions and alteration to the existing family dwelling at 296 Marston Road, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 0JA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00422/FUL, dated 24 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Site Location Plan: 1036-WWA-B1-ZZ-A-0000-Rev:P03;
Existing floor plans and elevations: 1036-WWA-B1-ZZ-A-0100-Rev:P02;
Proposed floor plans and elevations: 1036-WWA-B1-ZZ-DR-A-0102-Rev:P06; and Proposed site layout: 1036-WWA-B1-ZZ-DR-A-0010-Rev-P03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be those as specified on the planning application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host property is a semi-detached dwelling which has already been substantially extended and altered. This includes a hip-to gable conversion and a large rear dormer. These and other alterations have altered the original design and appearance of this property. Indeed, the host property is different in scale with a distinct appearance, relative to the adjoining semi-detached property.
4. Both the proposed first-floor side and rear extensions would occupy the footprint of the existing ground floor extension. The side extension would be set down from the ridge of the existing roof. Furthermore, the host property is

set back from the highway and the side extension would be set back in relation to this. Consequently, the proposed first floor side extension would be a subservient addition that would have an appropriate visual relationship with the host property and area.

5. The proposed first floor rear extension would be of a limited depth and only extends part way across the rear elevation of the host property and therefore would be of a modest scale. The roof of this extension would incorporate a simple hipped form, a similar height at eaves to the main roof but with a lower ridge height. As a consequence of this step down in height relative to the main roof and dormer and its modest scale, the proposed first floor rear extension would clearly be a subservient addition to the host property.
6. Furthermore, the roof of the proposed rear extension would logically extend off the roof of the proposed side extension and extend across a small section of the dormer extension. Because of this arrangement and geometry, the roof of the proposed rear extension would comfortably fit in with the roof of the side extension and the existing dormer extension.
7. Also, in the limited views from along the rear of the host property, the design and arrangement of the roofs of the proposed side and rear extensions, would assist in absorbing the overall scale of the dormer extension.
8. For the above reasons, and in the context of an already extended and altered dwelling, the proposal would be of an acceptable scale and design, this would assimilate with the host property, reinforcing its distinctive appearance with no unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy DH1 of the Local Plan 2036, which supports development of high-quality design that creates or enhances local distinctiveness.

Conditions

10. In imposing conditions, I have had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring that the external materials used in the construction of the proposed extension, match those specified on the application form is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR