



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/W/24/3353730

Flat A, 79 Stanway Road, Oxford, OX3 8HY

- 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 & Mrs Pannappan against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01594/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue.

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, a flat, is contained within a pair of semi-detached dwellings, set in an area of the City displaying distinct suburban characteristics. The original dwelling was split horizontally into 2 flats, and a second entrance door added to the front elevation. The proposed extension is intended to serve the ground floor flat.
4. The Council clarifies that it has no objection in principle to an extension of this width and depth. It is the design and proposed materials which led to the refusal of planning permission. In this respect, the houses in this part of the City were designed with ground floor rear protrusions, which although of solid construction, have lean-to roofs. The Council considers that the proposed design does not take a holistic design approach and would represent an inappropriate addition for the reasons set out in the representations.
5. The appellants have gone to some lengths to explain why this particular form of design was chosen, and that the proposed design would appear better than other alternatives. They also say that the extension's position was such that it would not be visible from the public highway, a matter on which the parties disagree. There are other extensions seen locally. The appellants finally say that the issue boils down to a difference of opinion on what is, in essence, a subjective matter, hence the appeal.
6. The extension is modest in its' footprint, but I share the Council's view that the design pays very little attention or regard to the original dwelling's relatively unspoilt form either in terms of the shape of roof proposed, or in the use of materials. It

appears to me that the design pays greater regard to the appellants' personal preferences than to more specific design issues.

7. Since the property is located on the inside of a curve in the road, the gap between properties is wider than that existing between most other properties in the street. The extension would thus be clearly seen from the highway in the gap between Nos 77 & 79. The use of brickwork on the flank elevation would contrast sharply and inappropriately with the white render on the remainder of the side elevation, thus drawing the eye to the extension and highlighting the incongruity of the roof design and its clumsily designed junction with the host property. I share the appellants' view that on issues of design opinions may differ, but in this case I agree with the council's stance.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings to the disbenefit of local distinctiveness. Thus, a material conflict arises with the provisions of policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan (LP), when read in conjunction with the relevant aspects of Appendix 6.1, including those sections directed to responding to site character and context, and the design and alteration of buildings.

Other matters

9. All other matters raised have been considered and taken into account. In respect of the objections raised by a resident of No 81, I share the Council's view that the development would have no material impact on neighbouring living conditions for the same reasons as set out in the officer assessment of the original application.
10. I saw other examples of rear extensions nearby, but they would largely be screened from the public realm by other development.
11. I have also taken into account the references to the *National Planning Policy Framework* and I intend to follow its guidance that development that is not well designed should be refused permission.
12. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.
13. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR