

West Area Planning Committee

-13th March 2013

Application Number: 12/03264/FUL and 12/03265/CAC

Decision Due by: 25th February 2013

Proposal: (i): 12/03265/CAC: Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 2 storey hipped roof side extension and detached pitched roof double garage.

(ii): 12/03264/FUL: Demolition of 2 storey hipped roof side extension and detached pitched roof double garage. Erection of two storey side and rear and single storey front extension at lower-ground and ground floor levels with integral garage. Erection of low level stone wall, piers and sliding gates to front garden / driveway.

Site Address: 30 Plantation Road, **Appendix 1.**

Ward: North Ward

Agent: The Anderson Orr Partnership **Applicant:** Mr & Mrs B Pickup Ltd

Application called in by Councillors Fry, Lygo, Pressel and Tanner for the following reason: development excessive for this sensitive conservation area

Recommendation: Planning permission and conservation area consent be granted.

(i): 12/03265/CAC

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed demolitions relate to modern additions. No part of the main house would be demolished and officers consider that their removal would not be harmful and that the character and appearance of the conservation area or the main building. The proposal is considered to comply with policies CP1 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and policy CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026.
- 2 The Council considers that the proposal, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the special character and appearance of the conservation area. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity.

subject to the following condition, which has been imposed for the reasons stated:-

1 Commencement of works LB/CAC consent

(ii): 12/03264/FUL:

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extensions would be read as contemporary additions that would not overbear the original building, would allow the main building to remain as the dominant feature and would preserve the character and appearance of the Walton Manor Conservation Area. The proposals would not result in unacceptable levels of harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties, and the proposals are acceptable in highway terms. The development complies with policies CP1, CP6, CP8, CP10, CP11, NE15 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026, and HP9 and HP14 of the Sites and Housing 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.

subject to the following conditions, which have been imposed for the reasons stated:-

- 1 Development begun within time limit
- 2 Deemed in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Samples in Conservation Area - Walton Manor,
- 4 Further details – railings, wall, gates and piers
- 5 Archaeology - Implementation of programme
- 6 Ground resurfacing - SUDS compliant
- 7 Landscape plan required
- 8 Landscape carry out after completion

Main Planning Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density

CP1 - Development Proposals

CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context

CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs

HE7 - Conservation Areas

NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows

CP11 - Landscape Design

Core Strategy

CS18 - Urban design, town character, historic environment

Sites and Housing Plan

HP9 - Design, Character and Context

HP14 - Privacy and Daylight

Other Material Considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- Application site falls within the Walton Manor Conservation Area.

Relevant Site History:

70/22814/AH: Extension at rear and erection of double garage for private car and internal alterations. Approved 26th May 1970.

12/00888/FUL: Demolition of existing extension and separate double garage. Erection of two storey front and side extension at lower-ground and ground floor levels with integral garage. Withdrawn 13th June 2012.

Public Consultation

Statutory and Other Consultees:

- Highways Authority – no objection subject to condition
- Oxford Preservation Trust – development out of scale with existing building; visually prominent; harmful to Conservation Area
- Oxford Civic Society – proposals come short of ideal
- Drainage Team Manager – development to drain using SUDs system, soak away, porous parking or green roof
- Oxford Architectural and Historic Society Victorian Group – design and materials out of keeping and harmful to existing building; front treatment out of keeping

Third Party Representations Received:

A petition was received, signed by 31 local residents.

Comments can be summarised as follows:

- Lack of clarity over materials
- Concern over height of side/rear extension
- Railings and gate out of keeping
- Drawings inaccurate and misleading
- Narrowing of road
- Scale of development out of keeping with neighbourhood
- Loss of light and privacy to houses and gardens on Arthur Garrard Close
- Impact on view and outlook from houses on Arthur Garrard Close
- Would devalue properties on Arthur Garrard Place
- Overlooking from windows
- Harmful to character and appearance of existing building
- Overbearing
- Structural damage to neighbouring properties

- Loss of attractive open space
- Character Assessment inaccurate
- Loss of trees
- Design too grand and dominant
- New windows out of character
- Rooflights inappropriate
- View Radcliffe Observatory obscured
- Party Wall implications

Officers Assessment:

Background to Proposals.

1. No. 30 Plantation Road is a detached stone-built dwelling located on the southern side of Plantation Road in north Oxford. The orientation of the building differs from others in the road as it sits at a right angle with its gable end addressing the street. The property has a large garden that is enclosed by a stone wall along the Plantation Road boundary. The building is the remnant of what was a more extensive range of buildings (a range existed on the west side extending the length of the plot and fronting onto Plantation Road and extensions to the south and east) and predates the development of the suburb. Part of it was in use as a bakery. The orientation of the building and its plot shape and size provide evidence of the buildings original form and context.
2. Plantation Road is a narrow road, bounded by residential properties and is one-way in a westerly direction, from its junction with Woodstock Road.
3. The property was extended in the 1970's with a two-storey extension to the side of the building. On the property frontage there is a double garage, also built in the 1970's and room for parking on a driveway. The frontage is currently enclosed by a timber picket style fence.
4. The conservation area consent application has been submitted to demolish the 1970's side extension and double garage, and planning permission sought for extensions to the front (east), side (south) and rear (west) of the dwelling. A single storey (and basement level) extension to the front of the dwelling, located on part of the footprint of the garage to be demolished, would house a media room and utility spaces at lower ground floor level and a garage, bedroom and study at ground floor level. To the side and rear a two-storey extension (and basement level) would house a kitchen / diner, staircase and master bedroom.
5. New railings and gates would be installed along the frontage and a bin store would be located, also to the front. New windows would be fitted to the existing house and a replacement porch erected. Planning permission is not required for the replacement windows and porch.
6. This application is a resubmission of a scheme that was withdrawn last year following concerns that officers had, in particular the design and scale

of the 'front' extension. This application seeks to address these concerns by reducing the height of that element of the proposal and simplifying the design. The design of the rear element also is shown modified.

7. Demolition of the side extension does not require conservation area consent, but the garage, because of its size does. Neither elements are on any age, dating from the 1970s. There are no objection to the removal of the these structures.
8. The determining issues in this case are:
 - Heritage and Conservation
 - Design and Visual impact
 - Impact on neighbouring properties
 - Trees
 - Parking and Highways
 - Archeology
 - Other matters

Heritage and Conservation.

9. Conservation principles, policy and practice seek to preserve and enhance the value of heritage assets. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains the government's aim that the historic environment and its heritage assets should be conserved and enjoyed for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations.
10. In relation to development affecting a designated heritage asset (e.g. a conservation area) the NPPF explains that (heritage) significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.
11. The NPPF explains that this does not preclude development but that the objective should be to secure good quality design in a manner that demonstrates understanding of a site's context and that will sustain what is important about an area's character and appearance.

Design and Visual Impact.

12. No. 30 Plantation Road occupies a prominent position in the street and is visible in views looking west down Plantation Road from Woodstock Road. This view of the building would be preserved as the extensions would be set well back from the street. The front extension would not come into view until walking past the property.
13. The garage extension to the front would read as a single storey flat roofed extension finished in ashlar stone and hardwood boarding. The extension would be 500mm lower in height than the existing garage structure so although it would be wider it would not appear unduly overbearing or prominent in the streetscene. The glimpsed view through to the Radcliffe

Observatory that can currently be seen between the garage and no. 32 Plantation Road would be retained.

14. The design principles advocated in the submission is for a new east extension that is minimalist and simple in design and detailing, to set it apart from the main house so that the original house remains the focus in the views and the dominant building on the site. The use of stone and timber are intended to give the appearance of a garden wall. The precise nature and detailing of the stone and timber would need to be controlled by condition, as the scale of the ashlar blocks shown on the drawing is not appropriate to the scale of the building and the context.
15. The proposed extensions together represent a considerable increase in the footprint of the building. However historically the plot has been occupied by several buildings so there is a precedent for having a larger footprint on the plot. Furthermore, the building sits in a large plot that can accommodate the extensions without appearing cramped and would still leave a large garden that positively contributes to the character of the area.
16. The replacement side extension would measure 1 metre higher than the existing extension but would have a hipped roof so as to reduce its bulk. The ridge and eaves height of this element would be set well below those of the original building so as to appear subservient and to allow the host building to remain the dominant feature.
17. The rear element is set lower still and would not compete with the host building and due to its position in the plot would not obstruct any views of the existing building.
18. The choice of materials and the contemporary design that contrast with the original building allow the extensions to be read as modern additions and enable the age of the building to be identified through the pallet of different materials.
19. The submitted drawings of the proposed wall and railings show a dense railing design and it is acknowledged that this is not appropriate for the site. A condition is therefore recommended to allow all details of the wall and railings to be agreed, in order to agree a design that is appropriate for the sites Phase 3 location as set out in the Oxford Preservation Trust's 'Railing Design Guide'.
20. The principle of defining the front boundary with new wall and railings is considered appropriate as it would enhance and define the narrowness of the street which is a characteristic of the road.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties.

21. Policy HP14 of SHP states that planning permission will only be granted for new residential development that provides reasonable privacy and

daylight for the occupants of both existing and new homes and that does not have an overbearing effect on existing homes. In respect of access to sunlight and daylight, the 45°/25° guidelines will be used, as illustrated in Appendix 7 of the SHP.

22. Some residents of Arthur Garrard Close have objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would result in a loss of light and privacy to their rear facing windows and gardens as well as affecting outlook and views. The properties of Arthur Garrard Close border the southern boundary of the site and their gardens back on to the site. The gardens have a length of approximately 10 metres.
23. The proposed side element would be set 1 metre closer to the southern boundary than the existing extension and the rear element would extend for 5.2 metres beyond the existing rear building line. This would introduce a greater building mass close to the rear gardens of properties on Arthur Garrard Close. A timber clad stairwell projection would be located on the southern elevation which would measure an additional 1.1 metres in depth, 2.6 metres in width and 4.8 metres in height from adjacent ground level.
24. The replacement side extension would have a hipped roof rather than the existing gable end so the eaves level on the southern elevation would be approximately 1.3 metres lower than the existing ridge, albeit set 1 metre closer to the boundary, and would still be set in from the boundary. The rear element although 2-storey would have an eaves height of 4.5 metres measured from adjacent ground level due to the drop in ground level.
25. Officers are of the view that the extensions would be sited a sufficient distance away from the rear facing windows of properties on Arthur Garrard Close to prevent any significant harm to light and outlook. The proposal comfortably complies with the 45° guidance in respect of all rear facing windows and whilst officers recognise that the extensions will be visible from these properties, and have an impact on outlook, the impact is not so great as to warrant refusal of planning permission. Furthermore, there are trees along the southern boundary which would help to screen the extension.
26. The proposed scheme reduces the number of south facing windows to 2 no. (high level) rooflights (into en suite and second floor landing) and 1 no. window into an upper ground floor study so there would be a reduction in the opportunities for overlooking. Furthermore, officers suggest attaching a condition requiring louvres to be installed over the nearest west facing bedroom window in order to prevent any overlooking into the gardens of the properties along Arthur Garrard Close.

Trees.

27. The existing trees and planting along the boundary within the gardens of the properties along Arthur Garrard Close would remain. The Council has no objection to the proposal which will have limited arboricultural

implications. A eucalyptus tree stands in an adjacent rear garden but this is not likely to be affected by the proposals.

Parking and Highways.

28. Adequate levels of off-street parking are proposed. The driveway could accommodate at least two cars and a third in the garage.
29. The proposal to provide off-street car parking spaces and alterations to the boundaries to include sliding gates is not considered to create risks to highway safety, when compared with the existing situation. Furthermore, the proposal is not likely to intensify traffic and parking, or create a highway safety concern in this sustainable location as the site lies within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
30. Several objectors have commented that the proposals for front boundary treatment would further narrow the road at this point causing problems for large vehicles. The proposals for a new wall and railings are wholly within the applicants land and replace an existing fence. It would be unreasonable not to allow the applicant to enclose the driveway.

Archaeology.

31. This application is of interest because it lies within an area of the Summertown Radley 2nd gravel terrace which is known to encompass an extensive landscape of Middle Neolithic to Early Bronze Age funerary monuments and subsequent landscape of dispersed Iron Age and Roman rural settlements with associated field systems and burials. This site is located 70m away from undated burials recorded in the 19th century (UAD No 677) and within a 100 radius of miscellaneous stray finds of Roman and Post-medieval date including a quern stone (UAD 676) and a possible clay pipe factory (UAD No 1441).
32. It is also noted that the Historic Environment Records (HER No 6667) notes that fragments of perpendicular tracery are set into re-built frontage wall of this property, in three niches. They are similar to the larger parts of window tracery thought to have come from the Royal Beaumont Palace. The architect has confirmed that these remain in place and will not be impacted by this development.
33. The National Planning Policy Framework states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Where appropriate local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly

accessible.

34. In this case, bearing in mind the small scale of the proposed basement development and in line with the advice in the NPPF a condition is recommended requiring a programme of archaeological work to be undertaken.

Sustainability.

35. The thermal efficiency of the building would be improved with new windows and internal insulation. The new extensions would be heavily insulated and would minimise heat loss. Large expanses of glazing would allow for high levels of solar heat gain and natural lighting. A photovoltaic array would be mounted on the flat roofed garage to generate electricity.

Other Matters.

36. In response to specific comments raised by third parties:
- the construction of the proposed bin store adjacent to the boundary with no. 32 Plantation Road will be subject to a Party Wall Notice and is a civil matter between the two parties.
 - the existing timber porch which is in a state of poor repair is to be replaced, like for like, in painted metal. This does not require planning permission.
 - the existing 1970's windows and the new windows to be installed are to be high performance hardwood frames to be painted in an off white heritage colour. This element of the proposal does not require planning permission.
 - several objectors have commented on the Character Assessment submitted with the application and disagree with the assessment that has been made. Some local residents have carried out and submitted their own Character Assessments.

Conclusion: For the reasons given above, the proposals are considered to comply with the relevant policies of the development plan and is recommended for approval.

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 proposals 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.

Contact Officer: Rona Gregory

Extension: 2157

Date: 1st March 2013