

West Area Planning Committee

- 30th May 2012

Application Number: 12/00549/FUL

Decision Due by: 2nd May 2012

Proposal: Two storey side and rear extension (amended plans)

Site Address: 49 Meadow Prospect Oxford

Ward: Wolvercote Ward

Agent: Perioli Man Architects

Applicant: Ms Philippa Roberts

Application Called in – by Councillors – Goddard, Campbell, Fooks and Brundin.
For the following reasons – impact on views to Port Meadow and beyond; impact on light to no. 51 Meadow Prospect; design out of scale and character.

Recommendation:

APPLICATION BE APPROVED

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension would reduce the gap between no's 47 and 49 Meadow Prospect, however the extension would be set down from the main ridgeline and would be significantly set back from the existing building frontage to reinforce its subservience and to retain the sense of openness. Officers consider that the design is acceptable and that the character and appearance of the area would be preserved. The development would not result in any unacceptable levels of harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties and due to the relatively minor nature of the proposal there would be no increased risk of flooding. Officers consider that the proposal complies with policies CP1, CP6, CP8, CP10, HS19 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and policies CS11 and CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026.
- 2 Officers have considered carefully all objections to these proposals. Officers have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officers report, that the objections do not amount, individually or cumulatively, to a reason for refusal and that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.
- 3 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 approved
- 4 To be built in compliance with Flood Risk Assessment
- 5 Any grounds resurfacing shall be SUDS compliant (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems)

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

HS19 - Privacy & Amenity

HE7 - Conservation Areas

Core Strategy

CS18_ - Urban design, town character, historic environment

CS11_ - Flooding

Housing DPD – Proposed Submission

HP9_ - Design, Character and Context

HP14_ - Privacy and Daylight

Other Material Considerations:

National Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Site History:

None

Representations Received:

Objections received from: 26, 28, 33, 34, 36, 39 and 55 Meadow Prospect.

Comments can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of view through to Port Meadow and beyond
- Terracing effect being created by in-fill development
- Design out of character with existing building
- Loss of open feeling
- Over development of plot
- Increased risk of flooding
- Glazing and cladding out of character with existing building and surrounding area

Statutory and Internal Consultees:

Oxford Civic Society – extension is large and overbearing; object to glazing and gable

Highways Authority – no objection

Issues:

Design

Impact on character of area

Impact on neighbours

Flooding

Parking

Officers Assessment:

Site

The application site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Meadow Prospect in Wolvercote. The property backs on to Port Meadow. The property has an existing small single storey extension at the rear and a detached garage to the side. The site is located adjacent to, but not within, the Wolvercote with Godstow Conservation Area.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for single and two-storey extensions to the side and rear. The development would provide enlarged living accommodation on the ground floor and an additional bedroom with ensuite bathroom on the first floor. The garage would be demolished.

Amended plans have been sought to set the side element further back from the front building line; to change the half hip on the rear gable extension to a full gable; and to use timber cladding only on the single storey element and render on the rest.

Design/Impact on character of area

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.

The proposed two storey side element as visible from the street would measure 2.1 metres in width; would be set back 4.9 metres from the front building line; and would be set away from the common boundary with no. 47 Meadow Prospect by a minimum of 800mm at its nearest point, but widening deeper into the plot. The roof would be hipped and the roof pitch would match that of the existing roof. The ridge of the extension would be set down 800mm from the main ridgeline.

At the rear, the two storey extension would have a gable end with a large expanse of glazing and at ground floor level there would be a single storey extension to wrap around the two-storey element that would be clad in timber. The proposed gable end would match the gable end of the two-storey extension that has been built at the adjoining dwelling, no. 51 Meadow Prospect. The proposed single storey extension abutting the common boundary with no. 51 Meadow Prospect would be no deeper than the existing single storey extension that currently exists.

The proposals amount to a large extension that extensively increases the footprint of the original dwelling. The dwelling sits in a good sized plot that is large enough to accommodate an extension of this size with a large garden remaining. When viewed from the street the dwelling would not appear significantly altered and it would retain its original character and appearance. At the rear, and when viewed from Port Meadow, the extension would have a contemporary appearance that is achieved through the use of timber cladding on the ground floor and large glazing panels at upper level. Whilst these features are in contrast to the existing building, which is faced in painted render, officers do not consider that they would detract from the character and appearance of the existing building. The two storey element is set down from the main ridge line and so appears subservient to the main house, with the original form of the building remaining the dominant feature; and the roof pitch and use of matching render would ensure the extensions appears in keeping with the existing house. Many other houses in Meadow Prospect have had extensions of varying styles and sizes and officers do not consider that the development would appear out of character in this context.

Due to the angle of the houses at this part of the cul-de-sac and their positions within the plots, there is a larger than average gap between the application site and no. 47 Meadow Prospect, which allows for glimpses through to Port Meadow and beyond and adds to the feeling of openness. The proposal would partly infill this gap at first floor level, as it is already largely in-filled by the garages of both properties at ground floor level. No. 47 Meadow Prospect has not been extended to the side and the proposed side element would measure only 2.1 metres in width and would be set in from the boundary with no. 47. It would not therefore completely infill the gap or result in a terracing effect. Due to the significant set back from the building frontage and the set down from the main ridge, officers are of the view that the extension would not appear overbearing within the streetscene and would not erode the feeling of openness that currently exists.

Impact on neighbours

Policy HS19 of the OLP states that the Council must assess proposals in terms of the potential for overlooking, sense of enclosure, overbearing nature and sunlight and daylight standards.

The OLP sets out guidelines for assessing development in terms of whether it will allow adequate sunlight and daylight to reach the habitable rooms of neighbouring dwellings. This policy refers to the 45/25 degree code of practice, as detailed in Appendix 6 of the OLP.

The adjoining dwelling no. 51 Meadow Prospect has a single and two-storey extension at the rear. The element of the proposal closest to the boundary is single storey and would project out in line with the single storey extension at no 51. The two storey element would be set away 3 metres from the common boundary which officers consider is adequate to prevent the extension appearing overbearing. The proposal complies with the 45° guidance when measured from the cill of all of the rear facing ground and first floor windows of this property.

No. 47 Meadow is angled away from the application site and due to the separation distance between the two properties, the proposal comfortably complies with the 45° guidance.

Furthermore, the rears of these properties face south and would therefore receive adequate levels of sunlight for much of the day. Officers conclude that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable loss of light or outlook from neighbouring properties.

Flooding

The application site is located within a flood zone. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the application which satisfies any potential impact on flooding in the area, and incorporates mitigation techniques to ensure the safety of the occupiers. A condition has been imposed to require the application to be carried out in accordance with the details submitted in the FRA.

Parking

The proposal involves the loss of an existing garage but there is space on the frontage and driveway to provide adequate off-street parking. The Highway Authority does not object to the proposal subject to a condition stipulating that no surface water from the development shall be discharged onto the highway. The application does not include details of any intended treatment to the driveway or area to the front of the property and officers suggest attaching a condition requiring any ground resurfacing to be SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) compliant to prevent any localised flooding.

Conclusion: Officers were mindful of objections received but conclude that the proposed extensions are acceptable in design terms and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Officers are satisfied that there would be no unacceptable levels of harm to the living conditions of local residents as a

result of the development, and that there would be no increased risk of localised flooding. The proposal is considered to comply with policies CP1, CP6, CP8, CP10, HS19 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and policies CS11 and CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026 and is therefore recommended for approval.

Sustainability:

This proposal aims to make the best use of urban land and recognises one of the aims of sustainable development in that it will create extended accommodation on a brownfield site, within an existing residential area.

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: 12/00549/FUL

Contact Officer: Rona Gregory

Extension: 2157

Date: 16th May 2012