

East Area Planning Committee

- 29th May 2012

Application Number: 12/00268/FUL

Decision Due by: 10th April 2012

Proposal: Erection of roof canopy to front elevation.

Site Address: 22 Merewood Avenue Oxford

Ward: Barton And Sandhills Ward

Agent: N/A

Applicant: Mr Mohammed Ramzan

The application needs to be determined by Committee because the applicant is a relative of a Council employee, in accordance with the Councils constitution. The report has been checked by the Councils Monitoring Officer.

Recommendation:

APPLICATION BE APPROVED

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal is acceptable in design terms and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. There would be no harmful impacts on neighbouring dwellings and no objections have been received. The proposal is considered to comply with policies CP1, CP8 and CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and policy CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026.
- 2 The Council considers that the proposal accords with the policies of the development plan as summarised below. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity. Any material harm that the development would otherwise give rise to can be offset by the conditions imposed.

subject to the following conditions, which have been imposed for the reasons stated:-

- 1 Development begun within time limit
- 2 Develop in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Materials as specified

Main Local Plan Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

CP1 - Development Proposals

CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context

CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs

Core Strategy

CS18_ - Urban design, town character, historic environment

Other Material Considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Site History:

None

Representations Received:

None

Statutory and Internal Consultees:

Risinghurst & Sandhills Parish Council – no objection

Issues:

Design and appearance

Officers Assessment:

Site

1. The application site comprises a two-storey detached family dwelling located on the northern side of Merewood Avenue in Sandhills. The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly modest sized semi-detached dwellings; this property is unique in appearance as it is a former post office. The area to the front and side of the building is paved.

Proposal

2. Planning permission is sought for a front canopy to be erected along the full-width of the front elevation. The canopy would have a pitched roof and would be supported by three pillars. It would have a maximum height of 3.1 metres and would be 1 metre deep. The roof of the canopy would be tiled in concrete tiles to match the existing building, and the pillars would be posts covered with round fibreglass tubes, in white.

Design and appearance

3. Policies CP1 and CP8 of the OLP state that planning permission will only be granted for development that respects the character and appearance of the area and which uses materials of a quality appropriate to the nature of the development, the site and its surroundings. Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will only be granted for development that demonstrates high quality urban design and responds appropriately to the site and its surroundings.
4. The existing front elevation of the building has a parapet wall running along the top which largely hides the pitched roof behind. This gives the

building a unique appearance and a dominant brick front façade. The proposed canopy, although wide at 5.9 metres (the full width of the building) would extend one metre out from the front wall. Officers consider that this relatively minor addition would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building, which would retain its distinctive form. Most of the houses in the locality have bay windows, and some have porch additions, on the street facing elevation whilst the application site has a plain façade with little ornamentation. The addition of a front canopy would add interest and a domestic feature to the building that officers do not consider would appear harmful or out of character in the area.

Conclusion: the erection of a front canopy would not significantly alter the appearance of the building, and would not amount to a harmful addition in the streetscene, particularly when taking into account the distinctiveness of the existing building. The application is recommended for approval.

Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to approve, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Background Papers: 12/00268/FUL

Contact Officer: Rona Gregory

Extension: 2157

Date: 15th May 2012

This page is intentionally left blank