

**Planning Review Committee**

**28<sup>th</sup> September 2012**

**Application Number:** 1. 12/01340/FUL  
2. 12/01341/CAC

**Decision Due by:** 1<sup>st</sup> August 2012

**Proposal:**

1. Erection of reconstructed stone wall to create new access and construction of 2 detached houses [2 x 3 beds]. Erection of garage for 32 Quarry High Street. Erection of 2 storey rear extension for 28 Quarry High Street.
2. Demolition of outbuildings and part stone wall.

**Site Address:** 28 Quarry High Street, Oxford [Appendix 1]

**Ward:** Quarry and Risinghurst Ward

**Agent:** Mr Huw Mellor

**Applicant:** Malcolm Griffiths  
Renovations

Applications called in by Councillors Baxter, Bance, Sinclair, Price, Clarkson, Kennedy, Van Noojen, Coulter, Fry, Turner, Rowley and Smith on grounds relating to impact in the Conservation Area, loss of garden land and increased risk to highway safety.

1. These applications were determined at the meeting of East Area Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2012 when Members unanimously resolved to approve the applications in accordance with the officer recommendations and subject to the conditions set out in the attached report.
2. A 12 member motion to call in the application to Planning Review Committee was received on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2012 on grounds that the proposals would adversely impact on the Headington Quarry Conservation Area which could be contrary to the Local Development Framework, would involve the loss of garden land and would increase the risk to highway safety.
3. The attached report and appeal decision dated June 2011 in respect of a previous scheme for 6 dwellings, attached as Appendix 2, addresses all of these issues in some detail. The Inspector dismissed the appeal but only on grounds that the size and massing of 6 new cottages, together with parking and driveways, would amount to such an extensive built intrusion that it would clearly be detrimental to the green and open character of the garden site.
4. Officers consider that the current proposal for 2 detached dwellings on the rear and lower part of the site is acceptable and overcomes the Inspector's concerns regarding visual intrusion and impact in the conservation area. The

rationale for this conclusion is set out in paragraphs 13 – 29 of the report. Planning Review Committee is therefore recommended to support the proposals subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**Background Papers:**

10/01210/FUL  
10/01209/CAC  
12/01340/FUL  
12/01341/CAC

**Contact Officer:** Angela Fettiplace

**Extension:** 2445

**Date:** 22nd August 2012