

## 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: 15 December 2025

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/W/25/3371513**

### **9 Milestone Road, Carterton, Oxfordshire OX18 3RJ**

- 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 Paul Iacob against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/03162/FUL.
  - The development proposed is conversion of existing seven bedroom 12 person house in multiple occupation (HMO) into a seven bedroom 14 person HMO, along with erection of single and two storey extensions and associated bicycle and bin storage areas within rear garden (part retrospective).
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. The appellant indicates that the original description of development has changed. Therefore, the above description reflects the amended description shown on the appeal form.
3. I note the Council's comments about a lack of clarity relating to the internal layout of the property. This matter does not, however, have a direct bearing on consideration of the appeal in the light of the reason for refusal and main issue below.
4. I note also that a licence for the HMO use has been granted, although this involves a separate consent regime to the planning application, which is the subject of this appeal.

### **Main Issue**

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

### **Reasons**

6. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential road of mixed dwelling types. The surrounding area is residential in character.
-

7. Policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (2018), concerning development principles, high quality design and existing housing respectively, all include the requirement that development should respect the character of the surrounding area.
8. While Milestone Road includes a variety of property types there is uniformity within groups of neighbouring properties, such as the bungalows on the opposite side of the road to the appeal property. This is also the case with Nos 3, 5, 7 and 9 as these detached two storey dwellings appear to have been built as a group due their common size, design and materials.
9. Despite their different orientations to the road frontage, the group of dwellings are on a consistent building line fronting Milestone Road, each with a regular plan form with gable ends and a pitched roof. The single storey element to the front of the appeal property, which extends beyond the front building line of neighbouring dwellings on Marlborough Close, is an exception to this uniformity.
10. The proposal involves a two storey extension to the front and a single storey element to the side, facing Milestone Road. The two storey extension would be subordinate in height to the principal built form, but the new extension and existing single storey element would extend across the full width of the two storey building's front elevation. Consequently, the larger extension would obscure much of the original building and, together with the proposed side extension, would result in a confusing and incoherent amalgam of the principal two storey built form and three other elements all of different heights.
11. Furthermore, the hipped roof of the two storey extension and mono-pitch of the side extension would not integrate effectively with the existing pitched roofs of the two storey dwelling and single storey element. The extended dwelling as a whole would in this regard appear as incongruous and uncharacteristic compared to the simple pitched roofs and gable ends of neighbouring dwellings.
12. The two storey extension would bring built development closer to the front boundary on Marlborough Close. This would be contrary to the general layout of properties, which are set back from the road frontage on largely consistent building lines. Moreover, it would have the effect of materially reducing the openness at the junction of Marlborough Close with Milestone Road, particularly as No 11 on the opposite side of the junction is close to the road frontage. As such, the larger extension to the front would appear as a cramped form of overdevelopment.
13. Given the location of the appeal property on a corner plot and the proposed extensions to the side and front, the effects found above would be prominent within the street scene from which views the incongruous and uncharacteristic appearance of the extended dwelling would be readily apparent. These effects would not be mitigated by landscaping.
14. There have been changes to Nos 3 and 5 in the form of a bay window and porch, but these are minimal compared to the more substantive proposed extensions and their effect. While there is a relatively large outbuilding in front of No 7, this is of limited height and its prominence within the street scene is not comparable to the scale and effects of the proposed extensions, as found above.

15. I have had regard to the appellant's contention that the proposal would meet a recognised housing need and that it would make effective use of land, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, the Framework also requires that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment<sup>1</sup>. It has been found above that the proposal is in conflict with this requirement and with development plan policies that are consistent with it. As such, the matters raised do not overcome this policy conflict.
16. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extensions would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary in this regard to Policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031, as described. It is also contrary to the Framework, which advocates good design.

### **Other Matters**

17. I have had regard to the representations from interested parties. These do not, however, raise any additional matters to those addressed under the main issue which would lead to a different overall conclusion with regard to the appeal proposal.
18. I acknowledge that the appellant may be frustrated by the process leading to the Council's decision in this case. However, Council members are not bound to accept officers' advice and, in this case, a clear reason for refusal of the application was given. I have no other evidence before me, except for the appellant's assertion, that the decision-making process was unduly influenced by interested parties' objections, or by any other factors. Moreover, these are not properly matters for me to consider as part of this decision.
19. The appellant contends in support of the appeal that the proposal should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development included in the Framework. While I have had regard to this contention, in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Framework the presumption applies where development accords with the development plan or where there are no relevant policies or relevant policies are out-of-date, none of which applies in this case for the reasons given above. Accordingly, I give this matter limited weight, and it does not alter my overall conclusion.

### **Conclusion**

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

*J Bell-Williamson*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 135c).