

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/D/25/3374851

1 Derwent Avenue, Oxford, Oxfordshire OX3 0AR

- 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 S Ibra against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01657/FUL.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's name was misspelled on the application form and, therefore, this is corrected in the above heading.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are whether the submitted drawings reflect the existing dwelling as built and any consequences for consideration of the proposal, and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Submitted drawings

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential road of similar properties. The surrounding area is residential in character.
 5. The submitted drawings show the existing dwelling with its original hipped roof as well as the more recent single storey extension, which the proposed extension would be positioned above. However, the dwelling as found at the inspection has undergone a hip to gable conversion, which accommodates a large rear dormer.
 6. The drawings of the proposed extension show this with a hipped roof to match the original roof form before the hip to gable conversion. Consequently, it would not be possible to accommodate the roof form of the proposed extension on the current built form of the appeal property.
-

7. The appellant indicates the intention to submit revised drawings to reflect the current built form in relation to the proposed extension. I am not aware, however, that any such drawings have been provided and therefore I must consider the proposal on the basis of the appeal submissions before me.
8. Based on these findings, the proposal is incapable of being implemented in its current form and consequently this must have a material bearing on my decision such that the appeal cannot succeed. I have nonetheless gone on to consider the Council's other reason for refusal.

Character and appearance

9. Many of the dwellings in Derwent Avenue have undergone varied alterations and extensions, including hip to gable conversions and the addition of dormer windows. A characteristic feature is the relatively large gaps between the paired dwellings, which is also the case between the appeal property and its neighbouring property, No 1B. The substantive gaps create a sense of visual relief and openness between the built forms and, as such, are a positive feature that contributes to the character and appearance of the street.
10. By largely infilling the gap between Nos 1 and 1B, the proposed extension would disrupt the regular layout of dwellings. Notwithstanding the lack of clarity about the roof form and taking account of the set back from the front elevation, the upper floor extension would result in a terracing effect between the dwellings. Moreover, combined with the hip to gable conversion, it would appear as a form of overdevelopment due to the proximity of this additional development to the side boundary and the closure of the characteristic gap between properties. These effects would be readily apparent from the public realm and surrounding dwellings, from which views the extended dwelling would appear incongruous and uncharacteristic in this setting.
11. The appellant draws attention to the limited gap between two dwellings on Cherwell Avenue by way of comparison with the appeal proposal. As this is one example from a different road and therefore not part of the same street scene, I give it limited weight in the context of this appeal.
12. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that notwithstanding the lack of certainty about the roof form, the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 (2020) concerning design and placemaking, which says that planning permission will only be granted for development of high quality design that creates or enhances local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR