



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/24/3353680

17 Read Place, Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, OX25 2BH.

- 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 Mr David Drabble against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01489/F.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey side extension at 17 Read Place, Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, OX25 2BH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01489/F, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location and Block Plan	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Existing Ground Floor	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Existing Elevations	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Proposed Ground Floor	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Proposed Elevations	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Demolish Ground Floor	Revision B dated 09/04/2024
Proposed Section	Revision B dated 09/04/2024

Procedural Matters

2. The Appellant complains of a lack of pre-application dialogue with the Council which could have led to modification of the design. That has no bearing on the appeal, which is decided strictly on a fresh assessment of the plans as refused by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property, No 15 Read Place, and the loss of off-street car parking space.

Reasons

Description

4. The proposed side extension would be entirely consistent in form and appearance with the existing modern, rectilinear architecture of No 17 Read Place and its neighbours in the wider street scene. The Council considers the inherent design to be acceptable, and I agree.
5. The development would remove an open ground floor car port, bridged by the first floor, and replace it with a ground floor bedroom, extending into the rear part of the property.

Amenity

6. The side extension would appear more prominent in the outlook from the kitchen and living room windows of No 15 next door, which stands on slightly lower ground. However, in my judgement this effect would not be so marked as to warrant substantive planning objection on amenity grounds, with respect to natural light or dominance.
7. I accordingly find no conflict with the requirements of Policy ESD15 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan that development should respect its unique built context with high design standards and consider the amenity of existing development and support the efficient use of land. I consider also that the proposed extension would be compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling and its curtilage in terms of saved Policy C30 of the earlier Local Plan.

Parking

8. Adopted parking policy would require No 17 Read Place to have two off-street parking spaces, including with the proposed extension in place. In practice, there is little space on the forecourt and the car port to be removed is visibly narrow for any but a small car and unlikely to be used. As a result, I do not see the proposed development as causing a significant increase in actual on-street parking demand.
9. Moreover, traffic conditions around Read Place appear quiet, with low speeds and some kerb-side parking available, such that I see no significant implications either for road safety.
10. Accordingly, I find no policy conflict either with respect to any loss of off-street parking space as an effect of the appeal scheme.

Conclusions

11. There were no other objections to the application and I have considered every matter raised for and against the proposed extension, including the family need to accommodate a disabled person, but neither this nor any other factor affects my judgement on the main issues.

12. The policies cited in the refusal, and to which I refer above, are essentially consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and, in my view, the appeal proposal is compliant with the development plan as a whole.
13. This leads to my final conclusion that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the standard conditions set out above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR