

West Area Planning Committee

13th October 2020

Application number: 20/01638/FUL
Decision due by 2nd September 2020
Extension of time 21st October 2020

Proposal Replacement of existing garage door with 3no. windows in association with conversion of existing garage into habitable space, erection of first floor rear extension, formation of rear juliet balcony to second floor, insertion of 2no. rooflights to rear elevation, installation of green roof to rear and installation of cladding to rear elevation. Alterations to existing front and rear fenestration, insertion of 2no. rooflights to front elevation, insertion of 6no. rooflights over stairwell to front elevation and alterations to existing first floor terrace.

Site address 30A Jericho Street, Oxford, OX2 6BU – see **Appendix 1** for block plan

Ward Jericho And Osney Ward

Case officer Sarah Greenall

Agent: Mr Theo Svoronos **Applicant:** Mr Robert Howatson

Reason at Committee The application is before the committee because it was called in by the Head of Planning Services following concerns from councillors about the impact on neighbouring amenity.

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1. West Area Planning Committee is recommended to:

1.1.1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission.

1.1.2. **agree to delegate authority** to the Head of Planning Services to:

- finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1. This report considers an application for the conversion of the existing garage into habitable space, erection of a first floor extension and various alterations to the rear, formation of a rear Juliet balcony to the second floor, insertion of 2 no. rooflights to the rear elevation and 2 no. rooflights to the front elevation, alterations to the existing front and rear fenestration, and alterations to existing first floor terrace.
- 2.2. The proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the Jericho Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset and the proposals therefore comply with the requirements of Policy DH3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
- 2.3. The proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity having had regard to the impact on light and privacy and the requirements of Policy H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
- 2.4. Officers consider that the proposal would accord with the policies of the development plan when considered as a whole and the range of material considerations support the grant of planning permission.
- 2.5. The scheme would also accord with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal would constitute sustainable development and given conformity with the development plan as a whole, paragraph 11 advises that the development proposal should be approved without delay. Furthermore there are not any material considerations that would outweigh the compliance with these national and local plan policies.

3. LEGAL AGREEMENT

- 3.1. This application is not subject to a legal agreement.

4. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 4.1. The proposal is not liable for CIL.

5. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 5.1. The site is located within a quiet residential area and faces south east onto Jericho Street. 30A Jericho Street is a three storey end of terrace dwelling erected as a later addition to the street in 1969. The site lies within the Jericho Conservation Area. The building is not listed, nor is it within close proximity to any surrounding listed buildings to the extent where it would impact upon on the setting of listed buildings.
- 5.2. The house is unique within the streetscene, finished in red/brown brick with large areas of glazing seen on the second floor of the front elevation of the building. While there are slight variations in building height seen within the area, 30A Jericho Street is significantly taller than surrounding properties. The main access to the building is through the front entrance on Jericho Street, however the property also benefits from an integral garage to the rear of the site opening into a shared parking court accessed via Cranham Street. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with The Harcourt Arms public

house located to the north east of the site. It is characterised by a mixture of close knit Victorian terraced housing with areas of modern infill from the 1960s/70s which fails to replicate the high quality detailing and strong vertical rhythms as the original terraces. Buildings within the area are finished in mostly red brick with slate tiled roofs, however there are some examples of buff coloured brick also seen within the streetscene.

5.3. The arrangement to the rear of the site is slightly unusual with most of the properties being served by first floor terraces overlooking the shared parking area. The main outdoor private amenity space serving the property is the first floor terrace with no additional garden space available.

5.4. See location plan below:



6. PROPOSAL

6.1. The application proposes the replacement of the existing garage door with windows in association with the conversion of the existing garage into habitable space, the erection of a first floor rear extension and the formation of a rear Juliet balcony to the second floor, the insertion of 2no. rooflights to the rear elevation and 2no. rooflights to the front elevation, various alterations to

the existing front and rear fenestration, and alterations to existing first floor terrace.

- 6.2. The first floor rear extension would measure approximately 5.8 metres in depth and 3 metres in width, running along the north-eastern boundary of the site. It would have a flat roof design with a height that gradually reduces towards the rear boundary. The extension would be set back from the rear elevation to create a visual break between the ground and first floor, finished in brick to match the existing. Dark grey aluminium capping is also proposed along with a green roof and timber cladding on the internal terrace-facing side elevation. The first section of the rear extension labelled part 1 in the Proposed West Side Elevation drawing would measure approximately 0.9 metres above the tallest section of this part of the existing north eastern boundary wall and 1.6 metres above the lower section of this part of the wall. The middle section of the extension labelled part 2 in the Proposed West Side Elevation drawing would measure approximately 1 metre above the taller section of this part of the north eastern boundary wall, and 1.5 metres taller than the lower section. The last section that is labelled part 3 in the Proposed West Side Elevation drawing would measure approximately 0.86 metres above the height of the existing north eastern boundary wall.
- 6.3. The first section of the extension closest to the rear boundary of the site would add an additional 0.86 metres to the height of the existing boundary wall. The second middle section would increase that height by a further 0.7 metres resulting in it being approximately 1.5 metres above the lower section of the existing boundary wall and 1 metre above the taller section. The third section closest to the existing rear elevation of the building would increase a further 0.6 metres in height resulting in it being 1.6 metres above the lower section of the wall and 0.9 metres above the taller section of the boundary wall in this location.
- 6.4. Alterations to the front elevation include proposed increases to the glazed area on the second floor to create ten fixed panels and two casements with hardwood framing with the existing boarded area retained but upgraded to a hardwood material, increasing the size of the window on the ground floor level with a dropped cill level to match the neighbouring window finished with hardwood framing and replacing the existing door and frame in a finish to match the rest of the openings. Two double glazed conservation style rooflights would also be included on the front roofslope proposed to be flush with roof.
- 6.5. Alterations to the rear elevation include the proposed insertion of a juliet balcony and increase in size and relocation of the window at second floor level, the insertion of glazed sliding doors on the rear elevation of the existing building and side elevation of the extension at first floor level finished in hardwood framing and the replacement of the garage door at ground floor level with an external hardwood framed door and windows with a timber rainscreen to match the hardwood frames. Planting is also proposed to be included along the rear boundary at first floor level to provide additional privacy and a visual break between ground floor and first floor level. There

would also be one fixed frameless rooflight and one double glazed conservation style rooflight, both flush with the roofline on the rear roofslope.

7. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

7.1. There is no planning history relevant to the proposals.

8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

8.1. The following policies are relevant to the application:

Topic	National Planning Policy Framework	Local Plan	Other planning documents	Neighbourhood Plans:
Design	117-123, 124-132	DH1, H14		
Conservation/Heritage	184-202	DH3		
Transport	117-123	M3, M5		
Environmental	117-121, 148-165, 170-183	RE3		
Miscellaneous	7-12	SR1, SR2		

9. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

9.1. Site notices were displayed around the application site on 16th July 2020 and an advertisement was published in The Oxford Times newspaper on 16th July 2020.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Oxfordshire County Council (Highways)

9.2. No objection. A condition has been requested for details of cycle parking.

Oxford Civic Society

9.3. No objection. A condition has been suggested to remove the properties entitlement to on street parking within the CPZ.

Public representations

9.4. 4 local people commented on this application from addresses in Cranham Street and Cranham Terrace.

9.5. In summary, the main points of objection (4 residents) were:

- Height of proposal
- Light – daylight/sunlight
- Effect on adjoining properties
- Effect on privacy
- General dislike or support for proposal
- Information missing from plans
- Amount of development on site
- Effect on character of the area
- Noise and disturbance
- Open space provision
- Effect on traffic/parking provision
- Effect on existing community facilities

Officer response

9.6. Officers have considered carefully the objections to these proposals. Officers have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officer's report, that the reasons for the objections do not amount individually or cumulatively to a reason for refusal. Amendments were sought to the proposals that attempt to respond to the neighbour's concerns and it is considered that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.

10. PLANNING MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

10.1. Officers consider the determining issues to be:

- i. Design
- ii. Impact on the Jericho Conservation Area
- iii. Neighbouring amenity
- iv. Transport
- v. Flooding

i. Design

10.2. Policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that a planning permission will only be granted for development of high quality design that creates or enhances local distinctiveness. Proposals must be designed to meet the key design objectives and principles for delivering high quality development, set out in Appendix 6.1.

- 10.3. The proposal includes significant alterations to the front of the building which would alter its character within the streetscene. While this is the case, the existing front elevation of the building is not considered to relate to the surrounding streetscene and is seen to be a low quality design. It is clear that the proposals make an effort to improve this elevation and the idea of a more modern approach could give rise to a higher quality design. While it is accepted that the character of the application property differs dramatically from the surrounding properties, it is noted that the charm of the area comes from the small, humble character of the Victorian housing. Reducing the amount of glazing that was originally proposed on the front elevation and roofslope would help to ensure that the building would not give the appearance of dwarfing the surrounding buildings and is considered a more appropriate approach.
- 10.4. The application property is also an end of terrace dwelling which would result in the north eastern side elevation of the rear extension being visible from the public domain along Jericho Street, as well as being a prominent addition visible within the shared parking area serving the application site and a number of properties along Cranham Street. The extension itself would not be considered to be a significant increase to the overall footprint of the building, however it is noted that it would extend into the courtyard area resulting in the outdoor amenity space serving the property being reduced from approximately 28.1 square metres to 14.5 square metres. While the loss of some of the outdoor amenity space is unfortunate, consideration is given to the fact this is not a typical family dwelling. The property is situated within a highly sustainable location within close proximity to a number of facilities, as well as being located approximately 0.5 miles or an 11 minute walk from Port Meadow, which is in an extensive area of public outdoor green space. As this is the case, it is considered the loss of the private amenity space within the courtyard would be acceptable on this occasion.
- 10.5. Care has been taken over the design to allow visual breaks between the ground and first floor of the building to ensure that the massing of the rear extension would not appear overbearing within the courtyard. While the extension would result in an increase to the height of the boundary wall along the north east of the site, it is not considered to be such an increase that would result in it being an overly dominant structure. The scheme proposes the introduction of planting along the rear elevation to further soften the impact of the proposal, and it is therefore considered the scale and massing would be acceptable within its surroundings. Further to this, amendments to the scheme have been made to ensure the materials of the extension match the existing building, and the use of timber frame windows and doors would ensure high quality materials are used that are in keeping with surrounding properties.
- 10.6. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and impact on the surrounding area, thus complying with Policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

ii. Impact on the Jericho Conservation Area

- 10.7. Policy DH3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that planning permission will be granted for development affecting a designated heritage asset that responds positively to the significance, character and distinctiveness of the heritage asset and locality. It goes on to state that great weight will be given to the conservation of that asset and to the setting of the asset where it contributes to the significance or appreciation of that significance.
- 10.8. The application site is situated within Jericho Conservation Area. The significance of the Conservation is derived from its character as an industrial suburb and the survival of Victorian housing. Whilst this is the case, this particular area is also characterised with some infill development that happened around the time of the proposed slum clearances in the 1950s and 1960s that can be regarded as harmful in the context of the overriding Victorian housing that typifies the Conservation Area. The regularity of the Victorian terraces provide the predominant overarching character of the area and it is particularly vulnerable to the further cumulative impact of inappropriate alterations to the elevations of buildings.
- 10.9. Officers are satisfied that there is no objection to the principle of a contemporary design approach in this instance as it is not considered that adopting a design approach which would seek to either replicate the architecture of the Victorian terraces or the later interwar development would be an appropriate or well-reasoned approach. 30A Jericho Street is an anomaly within the street, rising a half-storey higher than the surrounding properties and featuring fenestration of differing proportions and scale to the adjoining and adjacent terraces. For these reasons there is considered to be opportunity to enhance and improve the contribution that the building makes to the character and appearance of the Jericho Conservation Area.
- 10.10. While the overall principle of a more modern design was considered acceptable there were however some elements of the original proposals that were considered to have a negative impact on the surrounding Conservation Area. This included the proposed rooflights on the front roofslope. Amendments have since been submitted however and while there are still two rooflights proposed, these have been relocated centrally within the roofslope of the front elevation, with the lower glazing spanning the width of the property removed entirely. Given these rooflights would now be smaller conservation grade rooflights that would not be particularly prominent due to the height of the building and side parapet walls along the roof, this is considered to be an appropriate compromise for the building.
- 10.11. Further to this, there was also concern regarding the proposal to clad the majority of the rear elevation and first floor extension in timber boarding given the surrounding context is characterised by predominantly facing and painted brickwork. Given the first floor extension would be a conspicuous addition to the courtyard space it was considered the use of brickwork to match the existing building would help better integrate it into the surroundings. The amended plans now show the proposal to be finished in brick and painted brickwork with timber cladding to be used only in the inner terrace facing walls which would not be particularly prominent within the public domain. This is

considered to be more in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and Conservation Area and is regarded to be an acceptable design approach.

- 10.12. Overall with the inclusion of the above amendments to the scheme the modern approach to the proposed development is considered to enhance the Conservation Area as it alters the existing 1960s building that doesn't relate to the existing streetscene to create a more vernacular design that responds better to the character of the area.
- 10.13. Regard has been given to Paragraph 192 of the NPPF in reaching a decision. When applying the test outlined in Paragraph 196, it is considered the proposal would cause no harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposals would be acceptable in terms of their impact on this designated heritage asset.
- 10.14. Special attention has been paid to the statutory test of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which it is accepted is a higher duty. It had been concluded that the development would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and so the proposal accords with Section 72 of the Act.
- 10.15. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of its design and impact on the surrounding conservation area, thus complying with Policy DH3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

iii. Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 10.16. Policy H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that planning permission will only be granted for new development that provides reasonable privacy, daylight and sunlight for occupants of both existing and new homes. Policy H14 sets out guidelines for assessing development in terms of whether it will allow adequate sunlight and daylight to habitable rooms of the neighbouring dwellings.

Daylight

- 10.17. The submitted plans show that the proposed extension, while contravening slightly the 45 degree angle measured from the closest habitable room window on No. 30 Jericho Street, would be compliant with the 25 degree angle taken from the cill level of this window. As this is the case and given the orientation of the buildings, it is not considered the proposed extension would not result in any unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of light to this neighbour.
- 10.18. Officers have also carefully considered the impacts of the proposed development on No. 18 Cranham Street, due to the fact that the rooflight located to the north east of the site appears to be the only window that currently serves the kitchen of this property. As this is the case, it is important that the extension that spans across the north east boundary of the site would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to this room. While the proposal

does include an increase in height to the boundary wall currently found along the courtyard area of 30A Jericho Street to allow for the extension to be built, amendments have been made to the proposals to reduce the height at certain sections of the roof to reduce the impact of the height increase and the responding impact on the neighbouring rooflight at No 18. While the proposals may result in some loss of light, taking into consideration the orientation of the properties the existing building at the application site is already located in a position that blocks the light to this rooflight and it is not considered that the increase in the height to the wall would result in a such a significant increase to loss of light that would warrant a reason for refusal.

Privacy

- 10.19. The proposed alterations to the front elevation do result in an increase to the amount of glazing, however given the amount of glazing already present and the positioning of where the increase is located it is not considered it would result in additional overlooking to surrounding neighbouring properties. The interrelationship between properties in the streetscene results in a relatively small distance of between 7 and 9 metres between properties facing each other across the street, however this is similar to the existing arrangement and is commonplace in Jericho.
- 10.20. The first floor extension has been designed with the bathroom located along the rear boundary to ensure no glazing is proposed on the rear elevation that could impact on the privacy amenity of the opposite neighbours to the rear at 17 and 19 Cranham Street. There are no openings proposed on the north eastern side elevation that could impact on the private amenity of No. 18 Cranham Street, and while there are doors proposed along the south western side elevation these would face into the courtyard area which is already screened by the boundary wall separating the application site and No. 30 Jericho Street.

Overbearing

- 10.21. The proposed rear extension would be located at first floor level within the outdoor courtyard area currently serving the property. The extension has been designed with stepped heights that ensures the increase to sections of the boundary wall along the north east is kept to a minimum. The extension would be set away from both the boundary to the south west and the rear elevation, with the proposal also including planting along the rear elevation to create an additional visual break between the ground and first floor of the building. It is therefore not considered that the proposal would result in an overbearing addition to the building that would result in an unacceptable impact on the outlook amenity to any surrounding residential neighbours.
- 10.22. Concern has also been raised about the potential use of the garage conversion as a separate dwelling or rental unit that could impact on the amenity of surrounding neighbours. A condition has therefore been attached to ensure that the garage conversion could not be used as an individual unit without first gaining consent from the Local Planning Authority to do so.

10.23. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants, thus complying with Policy H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

iv. Transport

Parking Provision

10.24. Policy M3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that in Controlled Parking Zones or employer-linked housing areas where occupants do not have an operational need for a car where development is located within a 400m walk to frequent public transport services and within 800m walk to a local supermarket or equivalent facilities planning permission will only be granted for residential development that is car-free. In all other locations, M3 states that planning permission will only be granted where the relevant maximum standards set out in Appendix 7.3 are complied with.

10.25. The proposal would lead to the loss of a garage. However, it is not considered that the application would lead to a net change in car parking as the garage is undersized and not sufficiently wide to allow for the parking of modern vehicles. Furthermore, the application site is located in a highly sustainable location within close proximity to a number of facilities and public transport routes.

10.26. It is therefore not considered that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the local highway network in traffic and safety terms and the proposal is therefore compliant with Policy M3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

Cycle parking

10.27. Policy M5 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 states that planning permission will only be granted for development that complies with or exceeds the minimum bicycle parking provision as set out in Appendix 7.47.3. Bicycle parking should be, well designed and well-located, convenient, secure, covered (where possible enclosed) and provide level, unobstructed external access to the street. Bicycle parking should be designed to accommodate an appropriate amount of parking for the needs of disabled people, bicycle trailers and cargo bicycles, as well as and facilities for electric charging infrastructure.

10.28. The proposal would lead to the loss of the garage and presumably thereby also the location where any cycles may be stored. It is noted that the County Council Highways Authority has therefore requested a condition requiring new cycle parking to be provided to offset this assumed loss. While it is noted that two bicycle parking spaces have been included in the plans off the lobby on the ground floor of the dwelling, due to the nature of the proposal it would not be necessary to provide bicycle parking provision. Considering Paragraph 55 of the NPPF, planning officers do not consider that the inclusion of the condition would be proportionate or directly related to the development proposal and therefore it has not been included in the recommendation for approval.

10.29. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of cycle parking, thus complying with Policy M5 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

v. Flooding

10.30. Policy RE3 of the Oxford Local plan 2036 states that planning permission will not be granted for development within Flood Zone 3b except where it is for water-compatible uses or essential infrastructure; or where development is on previously developed land and will represent an improvement for the existing situation in terms of flood risk.

10.31. The application site falls within flood zone 2; which is a higher flood risk area. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application in accordance with the NPPF/DEFRA and EA Guidance and City Council Guidance. Although no flood level data has been provided, given the scale of the development, the mitigation measures proposed are considered to be sufficient. With Condition 5 recommended, it is therefore considered that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of flood risk and Policy RE3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

vi. Other matters

10.32. Most of the concerns raised during the consultation period were addressed in the above sections, where they have not been, they are addressed in this section.

10.33. Objections have been raised by the neighbouring occupiers and officers have been mindful of the comments raised when considering the acceptability of the proposed development. Specific concerns have been raised with regards to the impact of the proposed development on community facilities and noise, as well as waste bin storage at the site. This application is however for a householder extension and it is not considered the impact would significantly differ from the existing situations relating to these issues. Furthermore, issues relating to noise would be a matter for consideration by Environmental Health. It should also be noted that issues relating to party wall agreements and the location of gas supplies are civil matters and not material planning considerations. As such they have not been taken into consideration as part of this application.

10.34. The concerns relating to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and the possibility that some local residents may not have viewed site notices have been considered by officers. The Council has conducted a consultation in accordance with the requirements of S18 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. All planning applications are also published on the Council's website in the weekly list. Therefore, planning officers consider that a decision can be made on this basis

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. It is recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to the conditions set out in section 12 of the report.
- 11.2. Having regards to the matters discussed in the report, officers would make members aware that the starting point for the determination of this application is in accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which makes clear that proposals should be assessed in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 11.3. The NPPF recognises the need to take decisions in accordance with Section 38 (6) but also makes it clear that it is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application (paragraph 2). The main aim of the NPPF is to deliver Sustainable Development, with paragraph 11 the key principle for achieving this aim. The NPPF also goes on to state that development plan policies should be given due weight depending on their consistency with the aims and objectives of the Framework. The relevant development plan policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF.
- 11.4. Therefore it would be necessary to consider the degree to which the proposal complies with the policies of the development plan as a whole and whether there are any material considerations, such as the NPPF, which are inconsistent with the result of the application of the development plan as a whole.
- 11.5. In summary, the proposed development would be an acceptable addition to the site. The proposal is suitable in terms of local planning policy and complies with the relevant policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
- 11.6. Therefore officers consider that the development accords with the development plan as a whole.

Material consideration

- 11.7. The principal material considerations which arise are addressed above, and follow the analysis set out in earlier sections of this report.
- 11.8. National Planning Policy: the NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 11.9. NPPF paragraph 11 states that proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay, or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless: the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

- 11.10. Officers consider that the proposal would accord with the overall aims and objectives of the NPPF for the reasons set out within the report. Therefore in such circumstances, paragraph 11 is clear that planning permission should be granted without delay.
- 11.11. Officers would advise members that, having considered the application carefully, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations that would outweigh these policies.
- 11.12. It is recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to the conditions set out in section 12 below.

12. CONDITIONS

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The development permitted shall be constructed in complete accordance with the specifications in the application and approved plans listed below, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To avoid doubt and to ensure an acceptable development as indicated on the submitted drawings in accordance with Policy S1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

- 3 The materials to be used in the proposed development shall be as specified in the application hereby approved. There shall be no variation of these materials without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is visually satisfactory as required by Policies S1 and DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

- 4 The garage conversion hereby permitted shall be occupied as part of the family dwelling house at 30A Jericho Street and shall at no time be occupied as an independent and self-contained residential dwelling.

Reason:

- (i) To avoid doubt and to ensure that any future proposals for change of use or subdivision will be submitted for planning permission;
- (ii) in order to maintain the character of this residential area; and
- (iii) to maintain the stock of dwelling houses in Oxford in accordance with policy H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

- 5 Flood resilience and resistance measures suitable for the residual depth of flooding should be incorporated into the building. These should be in

accordance with the submitted Flood Risk statement, DEFRA/Environment Agency Planning Practice Guidance, and the DCLG publication 'Flood resilient construction of new buildings'.

Reason: To manage flood risk in accordance with the NPPF and Policy RE3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

13. APPENDICES

- **Appendix 1** – Site location plan

14. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998

- 14.1. Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to approve this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

15. SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

- 15.1. 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.

This page is intentionally left blank