



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/C3105/W/25/3371102**

#### **Little Brook, The Colony, 7 Colony Road, Sibford Gower OX15 5RY**

- 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 Miss Aysha Majid against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/03296/F.
  - The development proposed is revised roof slope from the consented drawings ref 2100437/F.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/C3105/Y/25/3371110**

#### **Little Brook, The Colony, 7 Colony Road, Sibford Gower OX15 5RY**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Miss Aysha Majid against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00007/LB.
  - The works proposed are revised roof to the garden room from the consented drawing Ref 2100438/LB.
- 

### **Decision**

1. Appeal A - The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a revised roof slope from the consented drawings ref 2100437/F at Little Brook, The Colony, Sibford Gower OX15 5RY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03296/F, and the plans submitted with it.
2. Appeal B - The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for revised roof to the garden room from the consented drawing Ref 2100438/LB, at Little Brook, The Colony, Sibford Gower OX15 5RY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/00007/LB and the plans submitted with it.

### **Preliminary Matters**

3. I have removed the words retrospective from the descriptions above as this does not describe development nor works. However, for clarification, I observed at my site visit that the works and development have been carried out in accordance with the plans before me and therefore I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development and works have already taken place.
4. As set out in the descriptions, an outbuilding was approved in 2021<sup>1</sup> in the same position. The works and development undertaken were not in accordance with the approved plans, and the appeal scheme seeks to regularise this.
5. The outbuilding is within the garden of and forms part of the boundary wall to the Grade II listed building known as Bartlett Cottage which, from the submitted

---

<sup>1</sup> Application references 21/00437/F and 21/00438/LB

evidence, has previously been 'treated as part of the listed building, by virtue of section 1(5)(a) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act). The site is also within the Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area (CA). In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

## Main Issues

6. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, in addition to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sibford Gower and Burdrop CA.

## Reasons

7. The appeals relate to an outbuilding sited within the garden of Little Brook, which is a Grade II listed property<sup>2</sup> (formerly known as 'Bartlett Cottage'). The property was listed in 1988 and consists of a two storey, rendered coursed rubble, slate roof with brick ridge and end stacks dwelling that the listing description sets out was formerly two cottages. The submitted heritage statement<sup>3</sup> puts the construction at between 1845-49 and states that they were built or funded by John Enoch (1796-1855), a local Quaker.
8. Whilst the property has been extended or altered to a minor degree, including an extension to rear of property<sup>4</sup> replacing an existing verandah, it retains much of its historic form, including evidence of being two cottages, with one side having timber casements, the other metal casements.
9. Through its use of local stone, modest scale, traditional windows and simple gable and lean-to forms, the building provides an aesthetically pleasing example of a vernacular former workers cottage(s).
10. From the evidence before me, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests as a good illustration of modest 19th century vernacular domestic architecture. Important contributors in these regards are its traditional construction and materials, surviving historic fabric and legible retained functional and rural architectural style.
11. Relevant to the appeals, the property sits in a large garden with mostly open field beyond, as befitting the original design of the cottages out in the heritage statement, with each provided with between 1½ and 2 acres of land for cultivation. The garden provides the primary surroundings within which the building is experienced, and, whilst, other than the appeal outbuilding, there is a large garage structure<sup>5</sup> and timber pagoda, the open space and soft landscaping also therefore allude to its previous historic agricultural use and helps ensure that this is appreciated. The boundary wall also provides a defined enclosure to the asset's immediate setting using traditional materials and construction techniques. Therefore, the listed building's immediate setting also, in part, supports and contributes in a positive way to its special interest and significance.

---

<sup>2</sup> List Entry Number: 1300059

<sup>3</sup> By Worlledge Associates, February 2024

<sup>4</sup> Application reference 09/01280/LB

<sup>5</sup> Application reference 02/01468/F

12. The three settlements of Sibford Ferris, Sibford Gower and Burdrop, known as Sibford Villages, make up two adjacent CA's. The character and appearance and therefore the special interest and significance of the Sibford Gower and Burdrop CA are mainly derived from its rural farming origins with converted barn buildings and original farmhouses. The intervisibility between settlements within a countryside setting, narrow roads, historic vernacular buildings and green spaces, all contribute to its distinctiveness.
13. Whilst sat apart from the historic core of each settlement, the appeal property, as a fine example of historic vernacular rural architecture, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
14. The outbuilding sits in close proximity to the listed dwelling and replaced a former log store/hovel, and before that a barn previously in the same position.
15. The building on site consists of a pitched roof garden room. It sits on the same footprint as the previously approved outbuilding referenced above. All dimensions and materials are as previously approved, except for the height of the eaves, the use of stone instead of timber cladding to the roadside elevation and the addition of one roof light to the south-west roof slope.
16. The Council measure the additional height of the eaves of the outbuilding at 1.2m taller than that previously approved. This increases the massing of the building and reduces the pitch of the roof, as the ridge height remains as approved.
17. The eaves height is slightly taller than that of the adjacent lean-to on the main property, however there is a clear visual gap between the two buildings. When viewed in the context of the wider two storey dwelling, which is substantial in scale and significantly taller, even if viewed as two original cottages, the outbuilding remains subservient visually. In particular, the massing and form of the gable ends, when viewed in the wider context of the considerable roadside frontage of the main building, are not incongruous nor overly prominent and the structure does not appear as a non-traditional building. It does not compete with nor obscure the architectural qualities of the listed building and appears as a domestic outbuilding with materials, such as stone, timber and metal roofing that ensures that it retains a suitably traditional character.
18. The shallow pitch of the roof does not prevent the building appearing in keeping with the simple vernacular main building.
19. The outbuilding therefore does not prevent or obscure the surrounding open space and soft landscaping alluding to the previous historic agricultural use of the listed building. It continues the alignment of the boundary wall, reinforcing the strong boundary treatment to the site. The development and works do not affect the authenticity of how Bartlett Cottage is experienced nor alter the ability to appreciate its significance.
20. This traditional appearance and limited scale also ensure that the outbuilding sits comfortably within the surrounding rural agricultural character and vernacular buildings of the CA, which I observed includes a number of outbuildings with differing roof pitches. It therefore preserves the character of the CA as a whole.
21. I conclude therefore that the proposals preserve the listed building and its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses; and

preserves the character and appearance of the Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area. For these reasons, the appeal scheme does not conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act and satisfies the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also no conflict with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (2015), and Policies C18 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan (1996) which, amongst other matters, require high standards that complement and enhance the character of its context, including conserving, sustaining and enhancing listed buildings and designated heritage assets.

### **Conditions**

22. The Council (nor any other party) has not suggested any conditions were the appeals to be allowed.

### **Conclusion**

23. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

*B Phillips*

INSPECTOR