



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2024

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/D/24/3345765

15 Oxford Road, Woodstock, Oxfordshire, OX20 1UN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Graham Winstone against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00609/HHD.
 - The development proposed is Full Planning Application for the demolition of a rear flat roof extension and the erection of a 2-storey extension.
-

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 host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey detached house set in a substantial plot adjacent to a footpath that runs along the side of the property and past a bowling and tennis club to the rear of it. The area around the appeal site is suburban, comprising detached housing in similarly large plots.
4. The rear of the property has a single storey flat roofed extension. It is joined to a 2 storey hipped roof rear projecting wing, next to which a hipped roofed side extension has recently been added. The rear roof on the side extension extends down to the ground floor eaves and has a hipped roof dormer.
5. The proposed development would replace the ground floor rear extension with a 2 storey extension. The top of the roof would be flat. Although it would be positioned below the main roof ridge, and level with the ridge on the side extension rear dormer, it would appear out of character with the existing hipped roofed elements and as such fail to integrate with the host dwelling. Despite the roof being angled at the sides to reflect the roof pitch on the rest of the property, the flat roofed element would be visible from neighbouring rear gardens and the footpath to the side from where it would be seen as a substantial and incongruous addition.

6. The West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2016) (WODG) notes that extensions that would double the volume of a house are unlikely to be supported and I accept the appellant's assertion that the proposal falls below that threshold. Nonetheless, the WODG also refers to there being no fixed rule for the extent to which a property can be successfully enlarged, but that generally extensions should not lead to the primacy of the original dwelling being eroded. The proposed development, in combination with the existing side extension, would dominate the rear of the building substantially altering its character and appearance, and in this regard fail to conform with the WODG. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policies OS2, OS4, EH2 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (2018), Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), the National Design Guide (2021) and the WODG which require high quality development that is subservient to, and respects the character of, the original property.

Other Matter

7. The appellant has provided aerial images of flat roofed rear extensions close to the appeal site. However, some of these appear to be single storey rather than 2 storey. Other examples have been provided in a table but without details of their design and I am therefore unable to assess any direct comparability with the current 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.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR