



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/24/3354886

73 Fern Hill Road, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX4 2JW

- 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 Daniel Suraj against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00336/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a “part 1st Floor Rear Extension.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 73 Fern Hill Road (no 73) is a semi-detached property situated on a residential street lined with similar homes of comparable size and design. Whilst many nearby properties have undergone alterations and additions, sometimes unfortunate, the area is overall predominantly characterised by its uniform and pleasant suburban feel. No 73 has been subject to a number of alterations and additions, including a full-width single storey rear extension, a hip to gable extension and a large dormer window. The roof additions, particularly due to the size of the dormer window, largely conceal the original rear roof plane, except for a small section visible above the eaves.
5. The stepped appearance resulting from the addition of the first floor extension would not in isolation be harmful. However, the design and relationship of the proposed extension with the extended roof, particularly the dormer window, would result in an awkward and overly contrived development. Despite being smaller than an earlier proposal, notably to minimise the impact on neighbouring residents, it would appear as an ill-fitting addition, which would fail reflect the proportions of and harmonise with the existing property. The proposed extension would lead to a disjointed built form which, together with previous additions, would dominate and fail to respect the form, scale, character and appearance of the existing building, causing harm to the surrounding area.

6. The appellant has referenced several nearby developments to support their proposal. I have carefully considered the presented evidence but found that other than their relative proximity to no 73, none of the applications which were brought to my attention were of direct relevance to the appeal proposal, due to the individual circumstances of each case and, in some instances, national and local planning policies in force at the time of their consideration. In any case, from my observations, I have found that some of these examples illustrate the harm which some developments can cause to the established character and appearance of the area. I have also had regard to the fact that the proposed development would provide an additional bedroom to the property, but this is outweighed by the harm which I have identified.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed rear addition would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with the key design objectives and principles of Policy DH1 and Appendix 6.1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (adopted 2020). These respectively require alterations to development to be of a high quality design that creates or enhances local distinctiveness and to respect the form, scale, character and appearance of the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR