

East Area Planning Committee

- 29th May 2012

Application Number: 12/00393/FUL

Decision Due by: 13th April 2012

Proposal: Extension to existing property plus extension and alteration to form 2 x 3-bed and 1 x 2-bed chalet bungalows.
Provision of 1 car parking space per property, together with cycle and bin stores.

Site Address: 129 Lime Walk Oxford (**Appendix 1**)

Ward: Headington Ward

Agent: The Anderson Orr Partnership **Applicant:** Estate Of Mr R. J. Hey

Application Called in – by Councillors Wilkinson, Rundle, on the grounds of on street parking provision and the impact upon on street parking.

Recommendation: Application to be **approved**.

Reasons:

- 1 The development would make a more efficient use of the site, in a manner which would be sympathetic to visual and neighbouring residential amenity in accordance policy CP1, CP6, CP8, CP10 and HS19 of the Local Plan. It would provide an acceptable residential environment for future residents in accordance with policy CP10, HS20, HS19 and HS21 of the Local Plan. It would provide one off street car parking space per dwelling which is considered to be appropriate in such a sustainable location in accordance with policy TR3 and Appendix 3 of the Local Plan.
- 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.

Conditions:

- 1 Development begun within time limit
- 2 Develop in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Materials - matching
- 4 Boundary details before commencement
- 5 Landscape plan required
- 6 Landscape carry out after completion
- 7 Bin/Cycle Storage
- 8 Car parking in accordance with plans
- 9 Vision Splays
- 10 Development excluded from CPZ
- 11 Design - no additions to dwelling
- 12 Sustainability design/construction

Main Planning Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

- CP1 - Development Proposals
- CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density
- CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context
- CP9 - Creating Successful New Places
- CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs
- TR3 - Car Parking Standards
- TR4 - Pedestrian & Cycle Facilities
- HS19 - Privacy & Amenity
- HS20 - Local Residential Environment
- HS21 - Private Open Space

Oxford Core Strategy 2026

- CS2 - Previously developed and greenfield land
- CS9 - Energy and natural resources
- CS18 - Urban design, town character, historic environment
- CS23 - Mix of housing

Sites and Housing DPD – Proposed Submission (February 2012)

- HP9 - Design, Character and Context
- HP11 - Low Carbon Homes
- HP12 - Indoor Space
- HP13 - Outdoor Space
- HP14 - Privacy and Daylight
- HP15 - Residential cycle parking
- HP16 - Residential car parking

Other Material Considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Balance of Dwellings SPD
- Parking Standards SPD

Relevant Site History:

11/03084/FUL - Conversion and extension to existing dwelling including raising the roof height to provide 2x3 bedroom dwellings and 1x2 bedroom dwelling. Provision of car and cycle parking, bin stores and private amenity space. - **Withdrawn**

Third Party Representations Received: Letters of objection have been received from 113 Lime Walk and Oxford Civic Society. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Not clear if the car parking spaces are large enough
- New vehicular accesses close to junction which could cause safety and congestion problems
- Two bungalows would be better than 3. 3 feels too many

Statutory and Internal Consultees:

Highways And Traffic – No objection subject to conditions regarding visibility, porous hard surfaces and that the development is excluded from the CPZ

Water Utilities Limited – No objection

Officers Assessment:**Site Description and Proposals**

1. The application site comprises a detached bungalow at the southeastern end of Lime Walk. The property has an existing vehicular access leading to a garage at the side of the house.
2. Planning permission is sought to raise the roof of the bungalow and insert dormer windows front and back, along with a rear single storey extension. To convert the extended property into three chalet bungalows (1x2 bed and 2x3 bed). Two new vehicular accesses are proposed to accommodate a total of three cars on the frontage (1 per unit).
3. Officers consider the main determining issues in this case to be the principle of development, balance and mix of dwellings, form and appearance, proposed residential environment, impact on neighbouring properties, sustainability and car parking.

Principle of Development

4. Local Plan policy CP6 states that development proposals should make efficient use of land by making best use of site capacity. In this particular regard the development would make an efficient use of the site by accommodating 2 additional units in a manner which is compliant with other local planning policies.
5. Core Strategy policy CS23 explains that the predominance of one particular form of housing type within a locality may have unwelcome social implications. To remedy this policy CS23 supports a balance of dwelling types within any given locality. The Balance of Dwellings SPD (BoDs) supplements CS23 and has assessed the housing stock within

Oxford and identified areas of pressure. The aim of BoDs is to ensure that development provides a balanced and mixed community and as a result Neighbourhood Areas provide the framework for the assessment of new residential developments.

6. The application site falls within an area defined by the SPD as amber, which indicates that the scale of pressure is considerable and as such a proportion of family dwellings should form part of new development. In this area the SPD prohibits the net loss of family dwellings within developments of three or fewer units. The SPD defines 'Family Dwellings' as being three bed units with a floor area less than 110m². The existing house has a floor area of 83m² however the proposal would provide two new three bed dwellings each with a floor area of 85m² and as such would comply with BoDs.
7. In light of the above officers conclude that the proposals are acceptable in principle.

Form and Appearance

8. Local Plan policy CP8 states that the siting, massing and design of development should create an appropriate visual relationship with the form, grain, scale, materials and details of the surrounding area. Policy CP10 further explains that planning permission will only be granted where proposed developments are sited to ensure that street frontage and streetscape are maintained or enhanced or created.
9. The character of Lime Walk is considered to be varied in terms of the style of some of the individual or groups of buildings. The wider character is more homogenous. The street has a distinct building line with buildings set back a few metres from the footway behind low boundary walls or in some cases a hedge. The buildings are for the most part two storey in height and have a traditional form and a domestic appearance and scale. The palette of materials is limited but they have been used in a number of ways to enhance the sense of variety within the street.
10. Characteristically then the existing bungalow is out of context. However, being at the end of the street it acts as a full stop to the building line and due to the variety in the building styles it does not appear out of place. The alterations proposed would not drastically change this. The increase in height (between 0.5m and 1m) would still see the building substantially lower than its adjoining two storey neighbours, while the introduction of small box style dormer windows in the front roof slope would not appear out of context due to the characteristics of the existing house. To the rear the extensions would also be modest and in keeping with the scale and appearance of the existing building and its neighbours. The materials are proposed to match the existing building which is a mix of red brick, timber and tile.
11. The proposed car parking would require the creation of two new access points which will result in the removal of part of the front wall. This does

not require planning permission but officers would support this approach as it maintains the sense of enclosure to the street which is a defining characteristic of the street.

12. Officers are of the view that the extensions and the other external alterations are sympathetic to the scale and appearance of the existing house and the characteristics of the street.

Proposed Residential Environment

13. Local Plan policy HS21 states that residential development should have access to private amenity space and that in the case of family dwellings of 2 or more bedrooms this should be exclusive to the residential property and generally in excess of 10m in length. The proposed rear gardens for the 3 bed houses are 10m in length and between 6.4m and 8.2m in width. While the garden serving the two bed house measures 8m in length and 6m in width, this house also has a smaller space to the side of the rear kitchen extension measuring 6m in length and 2m in width. This garden is marginally below the 10m general requirement, however the width of this garden is generous and the narrower space to the side of the kitchen provides extra private space. Officers conclude that the gardens would be suitable for the accommodation proposed.
14. Neither the Local Plan nor Core Strategy set minimum floor area standards for dwelling houses, however the existing dwelling has a floor area of 83m² and the two replacement 3 bed dwellings would both have a floor area of 85m². The three houses are well laid out with habitable rooms well lit and ventilated. Officers therefore consider the internal environment to be acceptable.
15. Policy CP10 and HS19 of the Local Plan require each residential unit to provide bin and cycle storage. The proposals have demonstrated how provision can be accommodated at the front of each property; however officers recommend a condition to secure details of the external appearance of the stores.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

16. Local Plan policy HS19 states that planning permission will only be granted for developments that adequately provide for the protection of the privacy or amenity of the occupants of the proposed and existing neighbouring residential properties.
17. The proposal for the most part uses the existing structure and as such does not project further rearward or move closer to the properties on either side. However, the existing building does increase in height, by 0.5m on the northern half of the building and 1m on its southern half. These changes in height relate to the ridgeline and because the existing building would still be substantially lower than those to the north and south, it would not have a significant adverse impact on light to and outlook from neighbouring habitable room windows in their side and rear elevations.

18. A single storey rear extension is proposed to the northern end of the building. This extension would be set 2m away from the northern boundary and it would incorporate a hipped roof which pitches away from the boundary. The 45° code would not be breached when applied to the nearest habitable rear facing window of the adjoining northern property, No 125 Lime Walk, and as a result of the roof design and the distance from the boundary, the extension would not have an overbearing impact on or adversely affect light to No 125 Lime Walk.
19. The proposal would introduce new dormer windows in the front and rear roof slope. However these would be sufficient distance from properties across the road and to the rear, so that there would not be a significant adverse impact on the privacy of adjoining properties and those opposite.

Car Parking

20. One off street car parking is proposed per house. This level of provision is lower than the maximum standards set out in Appendix 3 of the Local Plan which states that up to 2 spaces should be provided. However reduced parking levels are supported in sustainable locations and where the reduced parking status can be controlled. The site is within a highly sustainable location and a Controlled Parking Zone. This is therefore considered to be a suitable site for a relaxation in the maximum parking standards. On the advice of the County Council as Highway Authority, officers recommend a condition to prohibit all of the new units from entitlement to both residents' and visitor parking permits.
21. The creation of two new vehicular access points results in the loss of one on street car parking bay. The Highway Authority has not raised any objection to this.
22. Concern has been raised by third parties that the new access points are too close to the junction and that the car parking spaces are too small. The new access points are in excess of 18m from the Old Road junction and the car parking spaces meet the standard dimensions required. The Highway Authority has raised no concern about the new accesses or the car parking spaces and in so doing are aware of the location of the application site.

Sustainability

23. The application site lies within a sustainable location, close to the Headington District Centre. The site therefore has excellent access to shops, services and public transport nodes. The proposal will make efficient use of the site.
24. Policy CS9 states that all applications for development are expected to minimise carbon emissions by incorporating sustainable design and construction methods into the development. The application is silent on this issue, however parts of the Building Regulations, in particular Part G (Sanitation, Hot Water Safety and Water Efficiency) and Part L

(Conservation of fuel and power), aim to help reduce carbon emissions and protect the environment.

25. Notwithstanding the requirements of the Building Regulations, officers recommend that if the Committee is minded to grant planning permission a condition be imposed requiring details of how sustainable design and construction methods would be incorporated into the building and how energy efficiency has been optimised through design and by utilising technology that helps achieve Zero Carbon Development.

Conclusion: The proposal is considered to make a more efficient use of the site, in a manner which would be appropriate to the character of the street and that would preserve the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. Subject to the conditions set out above officers recommend that planning permission be granted.

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

Background Papers: 12/00393/FUL

Contact Officer: Steven Roberts

Extension: 2221

Date: 14th May 2012

This page is intentionally left blank