

**West Area Planning Committee**

-2nd December 2015

**Application Number:** 15/00192/FUL

**Decision Due by:** 2nd April 2015

**Proposal:** Conversion of existing two storey side and single storey rear extension, to incorporate into the existing 4no. flats to create 2no. 1 bed flats and 2no. 2 bed flats. Provision of bin and cycle stores and additional landscaping (Retrospective) (Amended plans)

**Site Address:** 8 Jersey Road Oxford Oxfordshire OX4 4RT  
Site location – Appendix 1

**Ward:** Rose Hill And Iffley Ward

**Agent:** Mr Geoffrey Huntingford

**Applicant:** Ms H Kamal

**Application Called in –** by Councillors –Turner, Clarkson, Lygo and Coulter for the following reasons – concerns over whether the new proposals have an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring properties.

---

## **Recommendation:**

APPLICATION BE REFUSED

For the Following Reasons:-

- 1 Because of the cramped and cluttered provision of refuse and recycling storage, the three regimented and dominant car parking spaces and the limited amount of landscaping, the proposed development would result in a cluttered and chaotic site frontage, that would appear out of character with the surrounding area and visually jarring in the street scape, to the detriment of visual amenity and contrary to Policies CP1 and CP8 of the of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 and CS18 of the Core Strategy and Policy HP9 of the SHP Sites and Housing Plan.
- 2 The continued provision of four flats, coupled with their increased size and number of bedrooms over the current flats, would lead to an intensification of activity and use that would be out of character with surrounding uses and in excess of the capacity of the site, resulting in an unacceptable level of activity, increase in noise and disturbance contrary to Policies CP6, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP19, HP12 CP21 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 and HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

- 3 The site has capacity for four dwellings and no contribution to affordable housing has been agreed. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy HP4 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

### **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
- CP9** - Creating Successful New Places
- CP10** - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs
- CP11** - Landscape Design
- CS18\_** - Urban design, town character, historic environment

#### **Core Strategy**

- CS23\_** - Mix of housing

#### **Sites and Housing Plan**

- MP1** - Model Policy
- HP2\_** - Accessible and Adaptable Homes
- HP4\_** - Affordable Homes from Small Housing Sites
- HP12\_** - Indoor Space
- HP13\_** - Outdoor Space
- HP15\_** - Residential cycle parking
- HP16\_** - Residential car parking
- HP14\_** - Privacy and Daylight

#### **Other Material Considerations:**

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Appeal APP/G3110/A/13/2205805

#### **Relevant Site History:**

The following applications are contained in the Local Planning Authority's statutory register relating to the appeal site:

- 03/01677/FUL - Two storey side and rear extension. Granted planning permission 22nd October 2003.
- 03/02132/FUL - Erection of single storey rear extension. Granted planning permission 22nd December 2003.

- 12/00434/CEU - Application to certify that the conversion of a single family dwelling to 4 flats (4x1 bed) is lawful. Certificate issued 18th April 2012.
- 13/00757/FUL - Internal alterations to an existing, lawfully extended, building to provide enlarged flats (2 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed). Provision of vehicle parking, bin/cycle storage, communal amenity space and landscaping. (Amended plans). Refused at Appeal 17th March 2014.

### **Representations Received:**

Letters of comment have been received from the following addresses:

3, 6 and 7 Jersey Road  
 42 Thames View Road  
 70 Dashwood Road  
 47 and 118 Nowell Road  
 18 Rivermead Road  
 27 Mortimer Road  
 26, 40 and 44 Lambourne Road  
 16 Desborough Crescent  
 36 The Oval

These comments can be summarised as follows:

Objection on the grounds of - Overdevelopment, overcrowding, harmful to appearance of street and area, inadequate bin storage and car parking, inappropriate siting of cycle store, detrimental to Highway Safety

### **Statutory and Internal Consultees:**

Thames Water – no objection.

### **Issues:**

Visual impact  
 Lifetime Homes  
 Effect on adjacent occupiers  
 Internal environment  
 Outside space  
 Bin and cycle stores  
 Parking

### **Officers Assessment:**

#### Site description and background

1. The site is a semi-detached house on a residential road within the Rose Hill housing estate. The area is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced housing originally built for Local Authority Housing.

2. Permission was granted in 2003 for a two storey side and rear extension under application 03/01677/FUL. This permission was conditional (Condition 5) on the extension being occupied as part of the family dwelling house. The permission was subsequently implemented and the extension built. The extension is currently unoccupied and the areas within it are identified on the application drawings as being outside of the green line. A copy of the decision notice is attached at Appendix 2.
3. The original house is now in use as four flats. The use as flats has been on-going since at least 2007, and a Certificate of Lawful Use was issued in April 2012 under application 12/00434/CEU because the change of use was by then immune from enforcement action by the Local Planning Authority. A single storey rear extension granted permission under application 03/02132/FUL was not conditional on its use being as part of the original family dwelling and that area forms part of the existing lawful flats.
4. However, the two storey side and rear extension can only be used as part of the original family dwelling, which no longer exists. The situation is therefore that the construction of the extension is lawful, and the use of the original house as four flats is lawful, but it is not lawful to use the extension for any lawful use whilst the house remains as flats unless a further consent is granted by the Local Planning Authority. This is a perverse situation that was not of the Council's making, but was caused by an unlawful change of use, later regularised through the passage of time.
5. A previous application (13/00757/FUL) sought to address the issue described above by seeking to use the extension to provide 4No. flats within the original house and extensions. This application was not determined by the Council, but was the subject of an Appeal against non-determination to the Planning Inspectorate. Whilst not determined, the Inspector was provided with what would have been the likely reasons for refusal, which were as follows:
  1. *The application fails to demonstrate that the site is capable of providing an appropriate provision of car parking, secure and covered storage of cycles and safe, discrete and conveniently accessible storage of refuse and recycling or an acceptable level of privacy for the occupants of the ground floor flats. The development would be likely to result in an unacceptable level of residential amenity for future occupants and provide a cluttered and cramped frontage with inadequately screened refuse and recycling storage, insecure and uncovered cycle storage and would be likely to result in vehicles parked on the site overhanging the footway to the detriment highway safety and visual amenity, contrary to Policies CP1, CP10 and CP8 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001 -2016, CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy and HP13, HP14, HP15 and HP16 of the Sites and Housing Plan.*
  2. *The proposal is to provide 4 dwellings and therefore falls within the ambit of sites that are expected to make a contribution towards offsetting the need for affordable housing and in the absence of*

*such a contribution being agreed the need for affordable housing would not be met. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS23 of the Core Strategy and HP4 of the Sites and Housing Plan 2011 - 2026.*

6. The appeal was dismissed, with the Inspector concluding: "... the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and ... it would fail to make the necessary contributions to affordable housing needs within Oxford." The inspector's report makes it clear that the parking provision was acceptable in terms of number of spaces, but contributed to an unacceptable impact on visual amenity.

#### Main Issues

7. The main issues in this case are the suitability of the site, lack of contribution to affordable housing and the impact of appropriate car parking and other facilities on the frontage on visual amenity.

#### Site capacity and Intensity of use

8. Policy HP10 of the SHP makes it clear that the size of the plot to be developed must be of an appropriate size and shape to accommodate the proposal.
9. Whilst officers accept that the current one bedroom flats are lawful, they do not accept that the site is of an appropriate size and layout, or in a suitable location to provide four dwellings and if the current arrangement were to require permission, it is likely that such a proposal would be resisted, as per Condition 5 of the 2003 permission. The current scheme proposes four two bedroom flats and this increase in size and bedspaces will result in an increase in the number of occupants and a resultant intensification of use. The intensity of use would therefore be a further increase over a level that would ordinarily be refused.
10. This intensification of use would take the form of more comings and goings, both pedestrian and vehicular movements of occupants and incidental activity such as deliveries and visitors. The increase in the number of occupants will result in more noise and disturbance from the site and garden and an overall level of activity that is at odds with the character of surrounding site, which are generally single family dwellings and overall, the change would be harmful to the character of the surrounding area and the amenity of surrounding occupants, contrary to Policies CP6, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP19, HP12 CP21 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 and HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

#### Visual impact

11. Oxford City Council requires that all new development should demonstrate high quality urban design where the siting, massing and design creates an appropriate visual relationship with the built form of the local area. The Local Development Plan provides policies to support this aim and CP1, CP8, CS18 and HP9 are key in this regard.

12. There is no change proposed to the physical envelope of the building in terms of scale or overall appearance and the visual impact will be limited to the use of the site. In particular, the front garden of the property will provide a regimented bank of 3 parking spaces and refuse and recycling bin storage for all four flats. These are necessary operational provisions for four flats, but will result in an overly intensive use of the frontage that is out of character with the surrounding properties, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP8 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001 - 2016 and CS18 of the Core Strategy and Policy HP9 of the SHP Sites and Housing Plan. This position has been supported by the inspector at appeal.

#### Effect on adjacent occupiers

13. Oxford City Council requires development proposals to safeguard the privacy and amenities of adjoining occupiers and policies CP1 and CP10 of the OLP and Policy HS14 of the SHP support this aim.

14. Policies CP19 and CP21 of the OLP states that permission will be refused for development that causes unacceptable nuisance and noise and that where such nuisance is controllable, appropriate conditions will be imposed.

15. Whilst there will be no increase in overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing as a result of the development, adjacent occupiers will be impacted by the increased activity, noise and disturbance on the site and this would be detrimental to their amenity, contrary to Policies CP1, CP10, CP19 and CP21 of the OLP and HS14 of the SHP.

#### Internal environment and Lifetime Homes

16. The proposed flats will represent a considerable improvement over the current flats for their occupants, both in size and provision of accommodation, and also in terms of flexibility of space to accommodate changing future needs in accordance with Lifetime Homes and Policy HP2 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

#### Outside space

1. Policy CP10 of the OLP states that permission will only be granted where developments are sited to ensure that outdoor needs are properly accommodated, including private amenity space, where buildings are orientated to provide satisfactory light, outlook and privacy, and where the amenity of other properties is adequately protected.

18. The area of private open space proposed to the rear is considered adequate in size and can be easily accessed through the building by all four flats. The risk of overlooking of primary living accommodation to the flats on the ground floor from the shared garden has been addressed by the provision of small areas of defensible space to the rear of the ground floor flats and this can be secured by condition to prevent an unacceptable loss of residential amenity for the occupants of the ground floor flats and ensure the development complies with Policies CP10 and HP13.

### Bin stores

19. Policy HP13 of the SHP states that permission will not be granted for dwellings unless adequate provision is made for the safe, discrete and conveniently accessible storage of refuse and recycling.
20. Dedicated bin storage areas are shown on the proposed plans allowing decent level access out to the road and similar facilities were secured by condition when the existing 4 flats were approved in 2006.
21. If permission is granted, it is considered reasonable and appropriate to impose conditions to secure an acceptable provision of bin storage to ensure the needs of the new dwelling are successfully met and that the development complies with Policies HP13 of the SHP.

### Cycle stores

22. Policy HP15 of the SHP states that permission will only be granted for dwellings of up to 2 bedrooms that provide at least 2 cycle parking spaces per dwelling and that this storage should be secure, undercover, preferably enclosed and provide level, unobstructed access to the street. This is particularly important in relation to the current case, as the new dwelling will not be provided with a car parking space.
23. A dedicated cycle storage area is shown on the proposed plans allowing level access out to the road and similar facilities were secured by condition when the existing 4 flats were approved in 2006.
24. If permission is granted, it is considered reasonable and appropriate to impose conditions to secure an acceptable provision of cycle storage to ensure the needs of the new dwelling are successfully met and that the development complies with Policies HP15 of the SHP.

### Parking

25. Policy CP1 of the OLP states that permission will only be granted for development that is acceptable in terms of access, parking and highway safety. The Sites and Housing Plan makes it clear that different levels of parking will be suited to different areas and that the design of car parking spaces is vitally important to the success of development.
26. The application does not robustly demonstrate that the proposal will not worsen or create local parking congestion and as the site is not within a CPZ and the proposed level of car parking is less than one space per dwelling, the proposal fails to comply with Policy HP16.
27. However officers note the sustainable location of the site, the relatively low pressure on on-street parking and the finding of the inspector that three parking spaces are appropriate for four flats of this size in this location. The development is therefore considered to comply with Policy CP1 of the OLP and the Sites and Housing Plan.

## Flooding

28. Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy seeks to limit the effect of development on flood risk and expects all developments to incorporate sustainable drainage systems or techniques to limit or reduce surface water run-off.
29. The development of the site frontage will add to the level of non-porous surfaces on the site, resulting in an increased level of rain water run-off. However the increase is relatively modest and were the development to be otherwise acceptable, any grant of permission could be subject to a condition to ensure the development be carried out in accordance with the principles of Sustainable urban Drainage Systems, would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding and would comply with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy.

## Affordable Housing

30. Policy CS23 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will only be granted for development that delivers a balanced mix of housing. It will not always be possible to achieve this on small sites and Policy HP4 of the Sites and Housing Plan states that sites providing less than 10 homes should contribute to achieving a balanced community in Oxford and requires that sites that provide (or have the capacity to provide) 4 to 9 dwellings make a financial contribution of 15% of the total sale value of the development toward delivery of affordable housing elsewhere in Oxford. HP4 is a recently adopted policy of the SHP which forms part of the Local Plan and full weight should be given to it.
31. The current application is for four dwellings and proposes no financial contribution towards Affordable Housing. There are currently four dwellings on the site, however the proposed dwellings are materially different to the existing dwelling, some of them occupying an entirely different area of floor space and even the least amended flat would be altered and extended as part of the proposals. The Council does not therefore accept that the proposals amount to extensions to existing flats and takes the view that the current proposals would result in a site capacity of four dwellings, would trigger the requirements of HP4 and a financial contribution to Affordable Housing of 15% of the total sale value would be required in accordance with the Balance of Dwellings SPD and policy HP4. This position has been supported by Inspector at appeal.
32. No legal agreement or offer of such a contribution has been provided as part of the application, although the applicant has previously [under the previous application] been offered the opportunity to do so. The application therefore fails to comply with Policy HP4 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

## **Conclusion:**

The development would result in an over intensification of use on the site that would be harmful to visual and residential amenity and fail to provide a contribution to affordable housing on a qualifying site. The application should therefore be refused for the reasons set out above.



## Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to refuse this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

## 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 refuse planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

## **Background Papers: 15/00192/FUL**

**Contact Officer:** Tim Hunter

**Extension:** 2154

**Date:** 19th November 2015

**Appendix 1**

8 Jersey Road:



## Appendix 2

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2014

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 March 2014

**Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/A/13/2205805**

**8 Jersey Road, Oxford OX4 4RT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms H Kamal against Oxford City Council.
- The application Ref 13/00757/FUL, is dated 17 March 2013.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as '*Retention of existing 1 bedroom flat (flat 1). Retention of existing 1<sup>st</sup> floor rear and two storey side extensions & convert to extend flats 2, 3 & 4 to create:- Flat 2 – 2 bedroom flat, Flat 3 – 1 bedroom flat, Flat 4 – 2 bedroom flat. Car & cycle parking, means of enclosure, waste storage & landscaping*'.

### **Application for Costs**

1. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

### **Decision**

2. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

3. The name that was given for the applicant on the application form differs from the name that was given for the appellant on the appeal form. It has since been confirmed that the appeal is to proceed in the name of the original applicant, which I have recorded above.

4. During the course of the application Drg No 1785/Existing was superseded with

a revision A, which I have relied upon. Nevertheless, during my visit it was clear that there were a number of discrepancies between the actual internal layout of the property and that depicted on this plan. These amounted principally to the position of some partition walls and door locations. There is also inconsistency between the proposed floorplans and elevations with regard to window positions in the side elevation facing 6 Jersey Road. In addition, the existing first floor includes, what appears to be, a 'flying freehold' over the ground floor attached premises at 10 Jersey Road. This is also shown on the proposed layouts. However, Drg No 1785/Location Plan has the appeal site outlined in red and shows a straight line along a conventional party wall

Appeal Decision APP/G3110/A/13/2205805

2

boundary with No 10, effectively excluding this area of floorspace.

5. These inaccuracies have been noted although they have not been instrumental in my reasoning and overall conclusions.

### **Main Issues**

6. The Council has indicated that had they determined the planning application then they would have refused permission. In light of their stated reasons, the main issues in this case are: - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene; (ii) the effect of the proposal on highway safety; (iii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future

occupiers of the ground floor flats with regard to privacy; and (iv) whether the proposal should make contributions to affordable housing needs.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and Appearance*

7. The application showed a total of 3 parking spaces to the front of the site with a footway to the property's front entrance door and space for refuse bin storage and a cycle stand. The Oxfordshire County Council's original advice in relation to this arrangement, as the local highway authority (HA), was set out in their consultation response to the local planning authority dated 12 April 2013. This acknowledges that, despite these 3 spaces falling below the maximum parking standards that are set out within the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 (LP), in light of available parking spaces in the vicinity, the proposal to provide reduced parking provision would be satisfactory. In addition, the HA's advice stated that the proposed parking spaces would be practical and usable, a view I share having regard to measurements that were taken during my visit for the width and depth of the site's frontage, and which were agreed by both main parties.

8. Subsequent additional comments from the HA advised that six parking spaces would be required with only 2 capable of being provided and that, with pressure on on-street parking and the removal of some existing kerb-side parking in front of the site, there would be detriment to neighbouring properties. However, notwithstanding this revised advice, in the absence of any substantive evidence to demonstrate that there is insufficient parking capacity in the street to accommodate any additional demand, I find the provision of 3 parking spaces would not materially conflict with the Council's approach to residential car parking, as set out within their Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026 (SHP), adopted in 2013.

9. Nevertheless, the minimum measured depth of the site, at around 5.96m, from the back edge of the pavement to the forwardmost part of the original house, is shorter than that measured from the appeal plans, the discrepancy varying from between 0.5m and 0.9m depending upon which plan the measurement is taken from. In light of this, I am not satisfied that the communal wheelie bins, which in any event would sit unreasonably close to windows to the ground floor Flat 1, would comfortably fit in tandem with any parked car. Any alternative position for the bins, which although feasible, would be likely to erode the already limited amount of landscaping that is proposed adjacent to the boundary with No 10. When this is also considered with the necessary cycle  
Appeal Decision APP/G3110/A/13/2205805

3

stand and the regimented parking of cars, which would be dominant, I find that the site's frontage would be cramped and cluttered, appearing out of step with and unsympathetic to the majority of other properties along Jersey Road, which largely display traditional enclosures to their front boundaries and reasonable balance between utilitarian features and soft landscaped gardens.

10. As such, although 3 cars could be parked, I find that the proposal would display

an unacceptable standard of design by failing to respect the character and appearance of the area as it would neither maintain nor enhance the street frontage or streetscape along Jersey Road. This would be contrary to part a. of LP Policy CP.1 and part d. of LP Policy CP.10.

### *Highway Safety*

11. Despite the apparent difficulty that would be had in attempting to accommodate a parked car and refuse storage facilities into the depth of the site's frontage, I am satisfied that there would be sufficient space overall for cars to be parked clear of the pavement. There would therefore be no impact upon highway safety or conflict with the development plan in this regard.

### *Privacy of Future Occupiers*

12. The Council are concerned that use of the rear garden, to which all the occupiers of the flats would have direct access, could impact upon the privacy of the ground floor occupiers through direct looking into their bedroom windows. I accept that this could be harmful to these occupiers' living conditions. However, the appellant has demonstrated that the garden could be reasonably sub-divided in a manner that would provide private amenity space immediately adjacent to these windows and for the benefit only of those respective occupiers and I am satisfied that it could have been secured by condition had I been minded to allow the appeal.

### *Affordable Housing*

13. SHP Policy HP4 requires development for 4 to 9 dwellings to make a financial contribution towards delivering affordable housing elsewhere in Oxford. The appellant argues that the lawful use of the original dwelling at No 8, as 4 self-contained

flats confirmed with the grant of a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development (CLUD) in April 2012 (Ref 12/00434/CEU), means that no such contribution is required given that, according to the original Design and Access Statement, one of the flats would remain unaltered, and that there would be no net increase in homes on the site as a result of the proposal.

14. However, I have compared the floorplans that formed part of the CLUD with those submitted with the planning application, as for both existing and proposed. They do not indicate any consistency between the layouts for any of the flats. The appeal proposal is therefore for a fundamentally different form of development compared to that considered under the CLUD application. It is entirely dependent upon extensions that, according to both main parties, have been lawfully added to the original dwelling (planning permission refs 03/01677/FUL and 03/02132/FUL), but a significant proportion of which, at both ground and first floor levels, is unoccupied at the present time as occupancy is specifically restricted by a planning condition to use as part of a family dwelling at No 8.

Appeal Decision APP/G3110/A/13/2205805

4

15. In addition, as a result of the extensions, I saw that the layout that was considered as part of the CLUD application does not currently exist, with original external walls, a door to studio flat 2, and windows to some of the former main living spaces subsumed into the internal core of the existing building. It would therefore not be possible to occupy the existing building in accordance with the plan that was attached to the CLUD.

16. In light of all of this it is my assessment overall that, regardless of any lawful use of the original dwelling or the substandard nature of any such living accommodation, based on the proposal that is before me the site fulfils the test within Policy HP4, and its supporting text, by clearly having the gross development capacity to provide 4 dwellings.

17. The appellant has not challenged the housing needs that have been identified by the Council within Oxford and has provided no evidence to demonstrate that

any financial contribution would make the development unviable. I therefore find that the absence of any contribution towards affordable housing would fail to achieve the balanced community and mix of housing that is required by Policy HP4 and by Policy CS23 of the Council's Core Strategy 2026, adopted in 2011.

*Other Matters*

18. I have carefully considered further points raised by a number of other interested parties. The lawful nature, or otherwise, of the extensions that have been constructed is not a matter for me to determine as part of this S78 application. Furthermore, I note that the Council has not directly challenged their status in this regard. I have considered this appeal based on the proposed use of the existing building, which would have no effect upon 6 Jersey Road in terms of visual impact, daylight or sunlight.

19. I recognise that there is confusion over the position of any proposed windows that would face No 6 due to the inconsistencies between the plans. However, had I been minded to allow the appeal this could have been reasonably addressed by a condition to safeguard the neighbours' privacy.

**Conclusion**

20. Despite my findings with regard to highway safety and the living conditions of future occupiers, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and that it would fail to make the necessary contributions to affordable housing needs within Oxford. In this regard the proposal would not provide the supply of housing that is required to meet the needs of the community and, when seen in the round, would fail to achieve a sustainable form of development, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

21. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR