

West Area Planning Committee

13th August 2013

Application Number: 13/01354/FUL

Decision Due by: 29th July 2013

Proposal: Demolition of two-storey side extension. Erection of two-storey side and rear extensions and extension to front at ground floor and lower ground level

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

Ward: North

Agent: Mr Nik Lyzba

Applicant: Mr & Mrs B Pickup

Application Called in – by Councillors – Fry, Clarkson, Tanner and Canning. For the following reasons -The previous application was withdrawn after objections from neighbours on grounds of over-development and the latest application has attracted similar complaints from some neighbours.

Recommendation:

APPLICATION BE APPROVED

For the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed extension would be read as a contemporary addition 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 proposal would not result in unacceptable levels of harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. 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 Develop in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Samples of materials to be approved
- 4 Archaeology - Implementation of programme

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

CP11 - Landscape Design

HE7 - Conservation Areas

NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows

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

The application site lies within the Walton Manor Conservation Area.

Relevant Site History:

70/22814/A H - Extension at rear and erection of double garage for private car and internal alterations. PER 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.

12/00902/CAC - Demolition of existing extension and separate double garage.. Withdrawn 14th June 2012.

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.. Refused 25th March 2013.

12/03265/CAC - Demolition of 2 storey hipped roof side extension and detached pitched roof double garage.. PER 15th April 2013.

Representations Received:

45 Plantation Road – treatment of frontage; no details of stone; new windows inappropriate; scale and materials of rear extension; no details of new porch inaccurate character assessment; phased development?

61 Plantation Road – lack of information on materials; porch and windows should be painted white

4 Arthur Gerrard Close – overbearing impact, loss of light and outlook

Statutory and Internal Consultees:

Oxford Architectural And Historic Society Victorian Group – object to use of materials, new porch and windows

Officers Assessment:

Background to Case

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). The house at the application site also 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 1970s with a two-storey extension to the side of the building. On the property frontage there is a double garage, also built in the 1970s and room for parking on a driveway. The frontage is enclosed by a timber picket style fence.

4. This latest application has been submitted following a refusal at Committee in March 2013. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1). The extension to the property would overwhelm the existing building and the neighbouring properties due to its scale, form and the use of materials which fail to respect the character and appearance of the North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area, contrary to policies CP1, CP8, CP10 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026 and HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

2). The siting and scale of the extension would be harmful to the amenity of properties on Arthur Garrard Close in terms of outlook and would constitute development of an overbearing nature, contrary to policies CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

3). The existing forecourt area provides an important gap in the street and adds to the character and appearance of the area. Its loss by enclosing the frontage with railings and gates would be harmful to the streetscene, and would add to the overbearing impact of the development as a whole, contrary to policies CP1, CP8, CP10 and HE7 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, policy CS18 of the Core Strategy 2026 and policy HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan.

5. This submission seeks to address the reasons for refusal and the changes made are:

- Omission of garage extension, railings and gates
- Reduction in depth of rear element by 1.6 metres
- Omission of stairwell extension (near boundary with Arthur Garrard Close)
- Reduction in number of windows facing Arthur Garrard Close

6. The proposal has therefore been reduced in size considerably, and excludes the changes which were proposed to the forecourt, in order to overcome the concerns related to scale, impact on the conservation area, and impact on properties in Arthur Garrard Close.

7. Conservation Area Consent has been granted for the removal of the existing 1970's extension (ref. 12/03265/CAC).

8. The determining issues in this case are:

- Heritage and Conservation
- Design and Visual impact
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Trees
- 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 extension would be set well back from the street, and no changes are proposed to the forecourt area.
13. 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 extension without appearing cramped and would still leave a large garden that positively contributes to the character of the area.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. The front extension would be at lower ground floor level only, would project approx. 850mm above adjacent ground level with a green roof and would be set back at least 7 metres in the plot. Due to its height and position it would have a very limited impact on the streetscene and would be largely screened by a hedge and the existing garage building.

17. The choice of materials and the contemporary design contrast with the original building allowing the extension to be read as a modern addition and enabling the age of the building to be identified through the pallet of different materials. A condition is suggested requiring samples of materials (stone, stone coloured render and timber boarding) to be approved to ensure high quality materials are used appropriate for the site and its surroundings.
18. Officers are of the view that extension is of an appropriate scale and design and that due to the eaves heights and reduction in depth would not overwhelm the existing house.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

19. 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.
20. 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. An objection has been received from a resident of Arthur Garrard Close concerned that the proposal would result in a loss of light as well as affecting outlook and views.
21. The proposed side element would be set 500mm metre closer to the southern boundary than the existing extension and the rear element would extend for 3.6 metres beyond the existing rear building line (a reduction of 1.6 metres from the previous application). This amended scheme has therefore reduced the amount of development that would be viewed from properties on Arthur Garrard Close.
22. 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 and would 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.
23. 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 will have an impact on outlook, the impact has been reduced and is not so significant as to warrant refusal of planning permission. Furthermore, there are trees along the southern

boundary which would help to screen the extension.

24. The proposed scheme further reduces the number of south facing windows to 2. The first floor one would be obscure glazed, serving a bathroom, and the second serving a utility room. Furthermore the plans show 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 Gerrard Close.
25. Officers are satisfied that the height, depth and positioning of the extension would not result in an unduly overbearing form of development.

Archaeology

26. 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).
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.

Trees

30. The Council has no objection to the proposal which will have limited arboricultural implications and involve the removal of some fruit trees in the rear garden only. A eucalyptus tree stands in an adjacent rear garden but this is not likely to be affected by the proposals.

Other Matters

- 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.

Sustainability

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.

Conclusion: For the reasons given above, the proposals are considered to have overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the application 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 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.

Contact Officer: Rona Gregory

Extension: 2157

Date: 12th July 2013

This page is intentionally left blank