

WEST AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 July 2016

Application Number: 16/00752/FUL

Decision Due by: 12th May 2016

Proposal: Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension.
Erection of single storey side extension.(amended plans)

Site Address: 9 Chalfont Road Oxford Oxfordshire OX2 6TL

Ward: St Margarets Ward

Agent: Mr Ben Holland

Applicant: Ms Lynne Patmore

Recommendation:

APPLICATION BE APPROVED

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed development is acceptable in design terms and would not cause unacceptable levels of harm to the Conservation Area or amenities of the neighbouring properties. The proposal therefore accords with policies CP1, CP6, CP8, CP10 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan, CS18 of the Core Strategy and HP9 and HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan.
- 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 Samples in Conservation Area
- 4 Amenity no additional windows

Main Local Plan Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

CP1 - Development Proposals;

CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density;

CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context;

CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs;

HE7 - Conservation Areas;

MP1 - Model Policy;

Core Strategy

CS18 - Urb design, town character, historic env;

Sites and Housing Plan

HP9 - Design, Character and Context;

HP14 - Privacy and Daylight;

Other Material Considerations:

This application is in or affecting the North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area

National Planning Policy Framework
Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Site History:

06/01177/FUL - Removal of existing garden shed and erection of detached garden office and attached shed - Approved 16.08.2006.

Representations Received:

Amended plan were received and neighbours were re-consulted for 4 days on 9th May 2016.

Four objections were received to the original set of plans. Neighbours have concerns over the size or the extension, loss of light to neighbouring properties, increase in light pollution and the difference in ground levels making the extension appear overbearing.

Objections were maintained and reiterated following publication of second set of amended plans.

Statutory and other consultees:

Environmental Health – no objection.

Victorian Group (comment on original set of plans) – Object to the side extension closing the gap between the properties and consider the extension to the rear to not being in keeping with the property.

St Margaret's Area Society (object to both original and revised drawings) – object on grounds of light pollution, overbearing nature of extension and loss of light to neighbouring properties.

Issues:

- Design in the conservation area
- Impact upon neighbouring properties

Officers Assessment:

Application site:

1. The application site is a 3 storey residential property located within the 'North Oxford Victorian Suburb' Conservation Area. The site comprises the main house (subject of this application), and the garden office & shed that is located in the rear garden. Access to the rear garden is made via the North side of the house via a private driveway accessed from Chalfont Road. Parking is to the front of the property. The boundaries are defined to the rear and side by garden walls. Land levels alter along the road and this site is in an elevated position when compared with No.7 Chalfont Road.

Proposal

2. Planning permission is sought to remove the existing 7m deep timber frame and brick extension, and extend the original dwelling line on two storeys to the rear; the ground floor extension measures 8.4m deep and the first floor extension 1m deep. The side extension is proposed to the ground floor only and is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. Amended plans were received on the 9th May 2015 removing glazing, amending fenestration details and setting the extension further in from No.11 Chalfont Road.

Assessment of material considerations

Design in the Conservation Area

3. The property as existing is a matching pair with No.1 Chalfont Road. It's considered that the proposal to extend up to second floor by projecting a further 1m to the rear will have an impact upon the character of this pair and whilst it is regrettable that they won't remain identical, it is considered that the projection of 1m will not harm the character and appearance of the property or the conservation area so much as to warrant refusal. It is also considered that the extent of the alterations up to first floor level is not so great as to disproportionately alter the property from its original form.
4. The proposed single storey rear extension infills a side return and projects to the rear 1.4m further than the existing single storey rear element. It has a pitched roof with some glazing and fully glazed doors to the rear opening into the garden. A lean to element is retained close to the boundary with No.11 which retains a small connection between what is currently the matching pair.
5. It was considered that the extent of the proposed glazing applicable to the entire design was too great and detracted from the overall character of the property. As a result of the amendments made to the scheme it is considered that this has now been addressed and a balance has been achieved between a contemporary design and respecting the character of the original property.
6. The gaps between the properties will be reduced as a result of the proposals however the proposed extension to the rear does not seek to wrap around and extend the overall width of the property further than the extent of the side

elevation facing No.7.

7. Objections have also been raised about the introduction of a side porch extension with regard to maintaining gaps in the conservation area. It is considered that by virtue of its size and the fact the side extension is set back considerably from the front elevation, the gaps between the properties will still be perceptible and the original form appreciated.
8. It is considered that whilst the proposed extension provides a considerable amount of additional floor space, it still allows the original form of the building to be read and appreciated and will not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
9. Conditions will be applied to ensure that the materials and finish of the proposed works including doors and glazing are of an appropriately high quality that they would not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
10. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies CP1, CP6, CP8 and HE7 of the Local Plan, HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan and CS18 of the Core Strategy.

Residential amenity

11. Objection has been raised by both neighbouring properties as to the impact upon their amenity. The difference in land levels as described in the description of the application site is acknowledged and has been viewed whilst on site.
12. With regard to loss of privacy, one new window is proposed in the side elevation at first floor window. This window is proposed to be obscured as shown on Plan no. 03.05 revC. As a result of the obscurity, it is not considered that this window will give rise to overlooking or loss of privacy.
13. Concern has been raised regarding the extent of glazing in the new extension and an increase in light pollution. As a result of amended plans, the extent of glazing has been reduced. This amendment was sought on design grounds as explained above, as it is not considered that this proposal on a residential nature would give rise to unacceptable levels of light pollution however by virtue of the reduction in glazing, there will be a reduction in light spill.
14. The proposed extension complies with 45 degree guidelines under policy HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan. Despite this, it has been considered important to scrutinise the proposals with regard to the change in land levels. Whilst the gap between No.7 and No.9 will be reduced as part of these proposals a gap is still retained and the rear extension set in from the boundary. No.7 is also set in from the boundary to the rear of the property. As a result it is considered that the proposals will decrease the feeling of openness to the rear of the properties, the gaps that are maintained ensure that this will not have an impact upon No.7 that warrants refusal of this

application.

15. The single storey rear extension element of the proposals have been set in from the boundary with No.11. This meets the 45 degree test and the direction No.11 also lies to the south of No.9 meaning that as a result of the proposals there will not be a detrimental loss of light to the property.
16. The extension at first floor level alters the appearance of the rear of the property as described in the design assessment above however it is not considered that the modest increase in projection by 1m will result in a detrimental impact upon residential amenity .
17. Having assessed the proposal with regard to impact upon neighbouring amenity it is considered that they comply with policies CP10 of the Local Plan and HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

Conclusion:

18. Having had regard to the above it is considered that on balance the proposal comply with the policies listed above and it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to condition.

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: 16/00752/FUL

Contact Officer: Sarah Jones

Extension: 2186

Date: 3rd June 2016