

**Case Officer:** Nina Guy

**Applicant:** Mrs Gurmit Saran

**Proposal:** Prior Approval application for a single storey rear extension forming accessible bedroom - height to eaves 2.68m, length 5m, overall height 3.5m

**Ward:** Banbury Ruscote

**Councillors:** Councillors Mark Cherry, Isabel Creed and Amanda Watkins

**Reason for Referral:** Application submitted by a member of staff or Councillor of CDC acting as agent, advisor or consultant

**Expiry Date:** 17 April 2025

**Committee Date:** 10 April 2025

---

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: PRIOR APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED**

**MAIN REPORT**

**1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY**

1.1. The application relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, externally of brick with a tiled roof, facing east on to Orchard Way. There are no changes in the levels across the site that would significantly affect the application assessment. The site, which lies in the built form of Banbury, is bounded by residential properties to the north and south and residential gardens to the west.

**2. CONSTRAINTS**

2.1. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the building is not listed.

**3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

3.1. The applicant seeks householder prior approval for a single storey rear extension, with a shallow-pitched, gable-ended roof, of 2.68 metres eaves height and 3.5m ridge height, a width of 3.6m and a depth of 5 metres. It would have one window in its northern side elevation and one window in the western rear elevation with the back door to the dwelling in its southern side elevation.

**4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1. There is no planning history directly relevant to the proposal

**5. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS**

5.1. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal

**6. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY**

6.1. This application has been publicised by way of letters sent to properties adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The overall final date for comments was **2 April 2025**.

6.2. No comments have been raised by third parties.

## **7. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

7.1. The nature of the application is such that no consultations have been required.

## **8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

8.1. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) ('the GPDO')

8.2. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

## **9. APPRAISAL**

9.1. The dwellinghouse is not located on article 2(3) land.

9.2. The proposed development would not exceed the floor space parameters as detailed within the GPDO;

9.3. The enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2m of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, but the stated height of the eaves is 2.68m, which is within the 3m height restriction;

9.4. The stated depth (length) of the proposed enlargement is 5.0m, which is within the 6m restriction for semi-detached dwellings;

9.5. The stated maximum height of the proposed development is 3.5m, which is within the 4m height restriction; and

9.6. The proposed materials would be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

9.7. The proposed extension would be purely rearward of the existing dwelling.

9.8. The proposed extension meets the criteria set out in Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

9.9. The proposal would have some impact on the attached neighbour to the north in terms of light and outlook, but would be set off the common boundary by c.2.3m. It would also be c.2.8m from the detached neighbour to the south.

9.10. That said, there have been no neighbour objections to this larger homes prior approval application and there is therefore no need to make a prior approval assessment.

## **10. RECOMMENDATION**

Prior approval not required

CASE OFFICER: Nina Guy