



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2017

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/W/17/3173625 90 Bridge Street, Oxford, OX2 0BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Crawshaw against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03182/FUL, dated 12 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear in-fill extension, formation of roof dormer to rear roof-slope in association with loft conversion and replacement windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council issued a split decision whereby planning permission was granted for the single storey rear extension. This appeal therefore only relates to the refusal of planning permission for the roof dormer.
3. The appellant has submitted revised plans with the appeal which include a reduction in the size of the roof dormer. The appeal process should not, however, be used to evolve a scheme therefore I have to arrive at a decision based on the merits of the proposal on which the Council's decision was based.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the roof dormer on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Osney Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. Osney Town is a small island created by several branches of the River Thames. It comprises three long main streets of tightly packed 19th Century two and three storey terrace houses. These properties are generally well-preserved and as such they give the area an historic quality and character. Osney Town was designated as a Conservation Area (CA) on 16 July 1976.
6. 90 Bridge Street is a terrace property situated more or less mid-way along Bridge Street, the longest of the three main streets in Osney Town. A rear box dormer with window dormer detailing is proposed. This would fill almost the entire width of the rear roof slope of the property and would extend up to the

- main ridgeline. As a result it would dominate the rear roof of the property and much of the original rear roof slope would be obscured.
7. This would be harmful to the traditional character and appearance of the host property and the wider terrace and surrounding area generally. It would also neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. I therefore find conflict with Policies CP.1(a), CP.8 and HE.7 of the Oxford Local Plan which seek to protect local character including the special character and appearance of conservation areas.
 8. In terms of the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 134, the harm to the CA would be 'less than substantial' affecting only its immediate surroundings. However, that would still represent a harmful impact, adversely affecting the CA's significance as a heritage asset. No public benefits of the proposal have been brought to my attention.
 9. The appellant argues that there is a clear local precedent for the type of dormer proposed. No such dormers are identified on Bridge Street. Plans of three similar rear dormers permitted in West Street, which runs parallel to Bridge Street, are provided but I do not have full details of the reasons or circumstances behind these. Furthermore, West Street is quite long and the examples referred to are exceptions rather than the norm. The examples referred to do not, therefore, justify the proposal given the harm I have identified.
 10. I note that the appellant sought pre-application advice prior to submitting the application which forms the basis of this appeal and that this appears to be supportive of the rear dormer. However, the Council's decision contradicts this. Whilst frustrating for the appellant unfortunately this does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of this case.
 11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR