



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/24/3341399

190 Headley Way, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 7TA

- 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 Ms Noreen Sarwar against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00030/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a "single storey rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 190 Headley Way (no 190) is a semi-detached property located along a suburban residential road. The area is predominantly characterised by semi-detached properties which are set back behind verges from a fairly wide, tree lined highway.
5. No 190 has undergone several extensions in the past, including a front porch addition, a hip-to-gable roof alteration, a large dormer window to the rear, a part single part two-storey side extension, a two-storey rear extension, a single-storey rear extension, a first-floor rear extension and an outbuilding at the back of the rear garden. Many neighbouring properties have been subject to alterations and extensions, but these generally remain subservient, thus ensuring that the character and appearance of Headley Way is cohesive, with a largely consistent building line to the front and rear. The original design and form of the properties remain identifiable, contributing to the overall uniformity of the street scene.
6. The proposed size and scale of the rear extension, on its own, would create a modest structure. However, when combined with the substantial existing rear extensions, the proposal would cumulatively overwhelm the original form of the house, significantly altering its character and appearance. As a result, the extension would unbalance the property and further disrupt the rear building

line along Headley Way and the established pattern of development, making the rear elevation of no 190 appear disproportionate and incongruous in depth compared to the original building and other nearby dwellings.

7. Consequently, an additional rear extension at no 190 would create an excessively elongated ground floor that would no longer appear subordinate to the original dwelling. Combined with the overall size of the existing extensions, this would harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area, to which I attach significant weight.
8. The appellant has referenced the rear extension at 192 Headley Way and other nearby examples. However, based on my observations and the evidence before me, none of the other properties in the area appear to have been extended to the same extent as no 190. While extensions at neighbouring properties are generally smaller in depth and originate from the original rear elevation, the existing rear extension at no 190 already projects significantly deeper into the rear garden than any comparable extension in the area. The proposed extension would further add to this, resulting in a property that would be disproportionately extended compared to neighbouring dwellings. While this may not be widely prominent within the public realm, the harm would nevertheless be evident from neighbouring properties.
9. The appellant argues that the existing garden is large enough to accommodate the extension while still providing ample amenity space for the occupants of no 190. While there is sufficient space within the rear garden to build the extension, this does not mitigate the previously mentioned harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. I therefore give this argument limited weight.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed rear addition would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with the design aims of Policy DH1 and the principles set out in Appendix 6.1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (adopted 2020), which notably seeks to ensure that alterations to existing buildings respect the form, scale, character and appearance of the existing building. It would also fail to accord with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, requires proposals to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR