



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/D/25/3359138

2 Meadow Walk, Heathfield, Bletchington, Kidlington OX5 3FG

- 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 and Mrs Allen against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02403/F.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension to rear roofslope and rooflights to rear roofslope to facilitate conversion of loft to habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace property within a two-storey building comprising three residential properties. The building, a former stable block, is constructed of stone elevations with a pitched tiled roof and its conversion has retained its original traditional character and appearance. It comprises the western side of a courtyard of similar buildings with a 'grander' range located to the south side of the courtyard, constructed of similar stone elevations and tiled roof. This building also retains its traditional character with sympathetic small, pitched roof dormers that sit comfortably within the roof slope, the majority of which is retained. A further traditionally built building of similar external appearance is located on its northern side. The buildings are located within a small hamlet which includes a nursing home, equestrian buildings and former pub set within an open countryside location in the Oxford Green Belt.
4. The proposed flat roof dormer would extend across almost the whole width and height of the rear roof slope of the dwelling resulting in the loss of the existing rear slope. This would appear as an unduly large addition being of a design, size and bulk that would not be sympathetic to the simple pitched roof form of the existing building and wider terrace, notwithstanding the use of timber to assist in blending in with the existing building. Its design and considerable size would be an unsympathetic addition to the building and would appear incongruous within the courtyard of traditional rural buildings.

5. The appellant has noted that permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the nearby former pub to provide two dwellings and suggests that as a result the roof addition would not be visible from the public road which runs to the south of it. However, no details of the permission have been provided and whilst it may be the case that the approved dwellings obstruct much of the view from this location, having regard to the relative siting of the appeal site and this nearby site, the roof of the building would still be likely to be partially visible.
6. Furthermore, access to the parking area to serve the dwellings runs along the rear of the building from which position the rear roof is clearly visible. Whilst this is a private drive to serve the dwelling on the appeal site and its neighbours, it would still be visible to those using it. In any event, the achievement of high quality design involves ensuring that such additions are complementary to the style of the existing building; in this case the proposal would not be.
7. Overall, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. It would fail to comply with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031, Part 1 (2015) and Policies C28 and C30 of The Cherwell Local Plan (1996) which seek to ensure that development complements and enhances the character of its context, is of high quality design, sympathetic to the character of the rural context and that extensions that are compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling and character of the street scene.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR