

Application number:	25/00823/FUL		
Decision due by	28th May 2025		
Extension of time	To be confirmed		
Proposal	Demolition of existing detached garage and existing rear extension. Erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension. Erection of a two storey side extension. (Amended description and amended plans)		
Site address	11 Glebelands, Oxford, Oxfordshire, OX3 7EL – see Appendix 1 for site plan		
Ward	Lye Valley Ward		
Case officer	Mary Rowe		
Agent:	C/o Applicant	Applicant:	Mrs Ajita Jivan
Reason at Committee	Delegated Application called in by Councillors Rehman, Miles, Harley, Stares, Azad and Henwood for reasons of potential impact on the Lye Valley nature reserve, over development and massing of site, change of street scene and loss of semidetached appearance.		

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1. 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; and

1.1.2. **agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:

- finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary.
- and issue the planning permission.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1. This report considers a proposal to demolish the existing detached garage and existing rear extension and the erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension.

- 2.3 The proposed development is acceptable in regards of its design and would not cause any detrimental harm upon the character and appearance of the dwelling itself or the wider street scene. The proposals would not cause any detrimental impacts upon the amenity of any neighbouring dwellings, and nor would the proposals cause any impacts in regard to drainage or ecology, subject to conditions. As such the proposals are considered to comply with the policies of the Oxford Local Plan, and the NPPF.
- 2.4 Officers consider that the proposals would be acceptable and that the development would accord with the policies of the development plan when considered as a whole and against the range of material considerations and support the grant of planning permission.
- 2.5 It must be noted that amended plans were received during the course of the application amending the design. The rear dormer and front roof light were removed. It is these revised plans upon which the application is considered. Due to the minor changes made and the reduction in scale of the proposals, it was considered unnecessary to re-advertise the application.

3. LEGAL AGREEMENT

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

4. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

- 4.1.1. The proposal is not liable for CIL.

5. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 5.1. The application property relates to 11 Glebelands, which is a two storey dwelling located on the south -western side of Glebelands. The property was originally semi detached, however, the other half of the semi detached pair, 37 Coverley Road has extended (09/01855/FUL) with a two storey side extension and this is now a separate dwelling 37a Coverley Road. As such the application dwelling is now part of a short terrace. The property is finished in pebble dash render under a hipped tiled roof. The property is set back from the road with an area of garden and hardstanding to the front which is used for on-site parking. It currently benefits from a garage to the side of the plot and a single storey rear extension.
- 5.2. The property is located on a corner at the intersection between Glebelands and Coverley Road.
- 5.3. See block plan below:



6. PROPOSAL

6.1. The application proposes to demolish the garage and rear extension and erect a part single, part two storey side and rear extension

7. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

7.1. The table below sets out the relevant planning history for the application site:

25/00081/FUL - Change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (Use Class C4). Insertion of 1no. window to rear elevation. Provision of bin and cycle storage.. Approved 28th August 2025.

8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

8.1. The following policies are relevant to the application:

Topic	National Planning Policy Framework	Local Plan
Design	131-141	DH1 - High quality design and placemaking
Housing	61-84	H14 - Privacy, daylight and sunlight
Environmental	161-186, 187-201	RE4 - Sustainable and foul drainage, surface and groundwater flow G2 - Protection of biodiversity geo-diversity RE7 - Managing the impact of development
Transport	109-118	M3 – Motor vehicle parking
Miscellaneous	7-14	S1 - Sustainable development

9. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

9.1. Site notices were displayed around the application site on 24th April 2025. Whilst amended plans were received during the course of the application, given that the amendments removed the rear dormer and front roof light, there was no need to re-advertise the application given the minor changes and overall reduction in scale of the proposals.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Oxfordshire County Council (Highways)

9.2. No objection

Oxford Civic Society

9.3. Overdevelopment, poor design, inadequate information

Natural England

9.4. No objection is made subject to the design and maintenance of the proposed Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) being secured via planning condition.

Public representations

9.5. 11 local people commented on this application from addresses in Coverley Road, Glebelands, Town Furze.

9.6. In summary, the main points of objection were:

- Site notice not property displayed in a visible or accessible location.
- This will be for an HMO but this is not mentioned on the application
- Negative impact on the character of the area from too many HMOs
- Substantial side and rear extension is proposed for 8 en-suite bedrooms. Limited living or communal areas and no shared bathroom. Overdevelopment of the site
- Out of character with neighbouring properties
- This is a quiet residential area with limited parking and local amenities
- Loss of family housing
- Disruption to families living next door
- Loft is an overdevelopment
- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Impact on neighbouring gardens
- Inadequate amenity space for 9 adults
- Increased parking pressure
- The usual statement of no residential parking permits will be issued does not take into account the fact that residents can go to work in their car before 9.00am and return after 5.00 and not be effected by the parking restrictions leading to problems parking in evenings and weekends
- Additional pressure on antiquated water and sewage system
- The application 25/00081/FUL for a change of use from C3 (dwelling houses) to C4 (small HMOs) indicates a shift in the property's intended use. However, the current plans (25/00823/FUL) exceed the typical scope of a C4 HMO
- Infilling the corner plot would impact the character of the area. Although many other houses in the local area have been permitted to do this, it is having a wider impact on the character of the neighbourhood's look and feel with larger overbearing corner plot buildings
- Impact on Lye Valley
- Highway safety

Officer response

9.7. Where the above comments relate to material planning considerations (including design concerns, impact on neighbouring amenity, flooding) these have been considered in greater detail within the relevant sections of the officers committee report below.

- 9.8. Concerns raised in regard to the lack of site notice/public consultation are noted. However, officers visited the site on 24th April 2025 to put up site notices, both in front of the application dwelling and in Coverley Road. A site visit was also conducted on this date. In light of this, officers consider that the Council's duty to advertise the application in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended) has been discharged.
- 9.9. Concerns regarding the potential conversion of the property to an HMO are noted. Officers note that application 25/00081/FUL has gained permission for 'Change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (Use Class C4)'. The current application seeks permission for a residential extension only. A change of use to a large (Sui Generis) HMO would be subject to a separate planning application, that would be judged on its individual merits if that were to occur.
- 9.10. Concerns regarding the water and sewage system are not material planning considerations which can be taken into account as part of the determination of this application for extensions which will not materially impact the water and sewage system. Nonetheless a SuDs strategy has been submitted which is assessed further below
- 9.11. Concerns regarding taxis parking in front of a different property in the area are noted. However this is not relevant to the current planning application and separate regulatory regimes deal with taxi licensing.
- 9.12. Officers note concerns about noise. Separate regulatory regimes exist to deal with noise concerns.
- 9.13. Officers note concerns about parking, highway safety and the residents permit scheme. However, this is an application for a residential extension only.

10. PLANNING MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

10.1. Officers consider the determining issues to be:

- Design
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Drainage and impact upon SSSI
- Biodiversity

a. Design

10.2. Policy DH1 states that planning permission will only be granted for development

of high quality design that creates or enhances local distinctiveness, and where proposals are designed to meet the key design objectives and principles for delivering high quality development as set out in Appendix 6.

- 10.3. Glebelands comprises of two storey residential dwellings which are predominantly arranged in pairs of semi-detached properties. There are however detached properties located between these, and a few short terraces. The orientation of properties on Glebelands also varies; predominantly they are orientated parallel to the road, however on the corner plots there are pairs of semis which are orientated diagonally, facing the junctions between the roads. The application site is on a corner plot facing the junction between Glebelands and Coverley Road.
- 10.4. It is proposed to erect a part single, part two storey side and rear extension. The two storey side extension would extend for approximately 3.5m in width, would be set back from the principal elevation by approximately 0.35m, would extend for approximately 7.1m in depth, and would have a hipped roof which would be set down from the main ridgeline by approximately 0.3m. Behind this, the two storey element would step in from the side and wrap around the rear of the property. It would extend for approximately 2.9m in depth, span approximately 4.1m in width, and would be set in from the side extension by approximately 1.8m. It would be sited away from the shared boundary with 37 Coverley Road by approximately 2.9m. This extension would also have a hipped roof; set down approximately 1m from the ridgeline of the side extension ridge. To the rear there would also be a single storey element of the same depth as the two storey rear extension which would extend to the shared boundary with 37 Coverley Road. This would have a lean-to roof with an eaves height of approximately 3m, and the maximum height would be approximately 4m
- 10.5. Given the orientation at which the application site sits with the junction, it is noted that the two storey side extension would be clearly visible from the streetscene and would considerably close the space which is currently between the site and No. 9 Glebelands to the south side. Officers have given consideration to the other corner plots in the area which have similar orientations to the road and placement within their plots and note that many properties have already extended to the side. This includes 5 Glebelands, 1 and 2 Inott Furze, 46 Town Furze, 37 and 42 Coverley Road. Having regard to the context of the site, the fact that the extension would be stepped back and down from the host dwelling, and that it would have a hipped roof form to match the existing, that on balance the extension would appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling that would not be out of character with the local area. Although the gap between the site and No. 9 would be reduced, it would not be totally lost as there would still be a partial gap retained. Whilst this would be wider at the front and closer towards the rear elevation, due to the angled nature of the corner plot, the separation would be retained which on balance is considered to ensure that the overall character of the area would not be eroded.
- 10.6. The two storey rear element would be set down and set in from the side extension, and would not extend the full width of the property, being set away from the neighbour at 37 Coverley Road. Combined with its hipped roof form, officers consider that this element would appear as a subservient addition and

would respect the character of the property. Similarly, the single storey element would be modest in its size, appearing subservient to the host dwelling and would be considered to relate appropriately to the other extensions. Importantly when taking all the extensions as a whole, a small part of the original rear elevation would remain legible so that the dwelling, along with the front elevation) is not completely overwhelmed with extensions.

- 10.7. The extensions and works to the property would be finished in matching materials to the existing property. As such it is considered that the extensions would form an appropriate visual relationship with the dwelling and would not be out of character in the locality.
- 10.8. It is appreciated that the proposed extensions would considerably enlarge the property, nevertheless for the reasons set out above it is considered that they are in this instance acceptable and would not result in any visual harm.
- 10.9. As such, the development would be considered to comply with Policy DH1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

b. Impact upon neighbouring amenity

- 10.10. Policy H14 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 also states that planning permission will not be granted for any development that has an overbearing effect on existing homes. Appendix 3.7 of the Oxford Local Plan sets out guidelines for assessing the loss of sunlight and daylight using the 45/25 degree code.
- 10.11. Policy RE7 states that planning permission will only be granted for development that ensures that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected.
- 10.12. The site is located between 9 Glebelands and 37 and 37a Coverley Road

9 Glebelands

- 10.13. 9 Glebelands is a two storey detached property located to the south of the application site. This dwelling is relatively deep having a depth of approximately 11m. The north side elevation that faces towards the application site does not contain principal windows to habitable rooms. Due to the depth of this property and its siting within the plot and the orientation of the site, with the application dwelling to the northern side, when the 45 degree code of practice is applied to ground and first floor front and rear openings serving the neighbouring property, the proposal would not contravene this angle. As such it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the daylight afforded to the neighbouring property. Furthermore, currently there is a garage along the boundary with no. 9 which would be removed as part of the proposals and the proposed extension would be sited further from the boundary, being between approximately 1m-1.4m away at the closest points.

- 10.14. It is appreciated that as a result of the extensions the first floor of the property would be located closer to the shared boundary with No.9 (noting the garage as described above is at single storey level). Officers consider however that given the stepped configuration of the extensions, the different orientations of the properties, coupled with the fact that the proposal would not extend beyond the rear of the neighbouring property, as well as the separation distance away from the boundary at the closest points, that the proposal would not be overbearing when experienced from the neighbouring occupiers, and would not detrimentally impact upon outlook.
- 10.15. Two windows are proposed to be located on the side elevation of the property at ground floor and a further window at first floor which would face towards the neighbour. Given that these would be sited on the two storey side element and due to the angled nature of the plots, they would face out towards the streets of Glebelands rather than directly toward the neighbouring property itself. There are two windows on the north facing elevation of 9 Glebelands but neither of these serves a principal habitable room. Whilst it is appreciated that the openings to the rear would be located closer to the boundary with the neighbour in comparison to the existing situation, on balance Officers consider that the openings would not introduce any new views compared to the existing situation and would not be unusual in a residential setting such as this. It is considered that the proposal would not result in any detrimental privacy impacts or overlooking. However, a condition is suggested to remove permitted development rights for the insertion of any further windows or openings, in order to protect neighbouring privacy.

37 Coverley Road

- 10.16. 37 Coverley Road forms the other half of the semi detached pair and is a two storey property located to the north of the application site. This property has previously been extended with a part two storey part single storey side extension to form a new dwelling; 37a Coverley Road. As such 37 Coverley Road now is the middle of a short terrace of three dwellings. 37 Coverley Road has a single storey rear extension.
- 10.17. The 45 degree angle test has been applied to the ground floor and first floor rear openings and the proposal would not contravene any of these angles. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not detrimentally impact upon the daylight afforded to the neighbouring property.
- 10.18. The proposed single storey rear extension would adjoin the shared boundary with 37 Coverley Road. Given that it would be a similar depth to the single storey extension at 37 Coverley Road and because the first floor element would be set off the boundary by approximately 3m, it is considered that the proposal would not be overbearing when experienced from the neighbouring occupiers dwelling, and would not detrimentally impact upon outlook.
- 10.19. Windows in the two storey extension face towards the rear. Whilst they would be located further into the garden space, they would not introduce new views over the existing situation and as such would not introduce any new views over the existing situation. There are no openings proposed on the side elevation of

the extensions facing the neighbouring property. As such it is considered that the proposal would not result in any detrimental privacy impacts or overlooking. However, in order to ensure privacy, a condition is recommended to ensure no further windows or openings are proposed.

37a Coverley Road

- 10.20. 37a Coverley Road is a two storey end of terrace property located to the north of the application site and separated from the application property by 37 Coverley Road. The majority of windows on this property face towards Coverley Road.
- 10.21. The 45 degree angle test has been applied to the ground floor and first floor rear openings serving the neighbouring property and the proposal would not contravene this angle. As such it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact upon the daylight afforded to the neighbouring property.
- 10.22. It is appreciated that as a result of the extensions the application property would be located closer to the shared boundary. Officers consider however that given the stepped configuration of the extensions and because the two storey element would be located approximately 8m away from the shared boundary with the neighbour, that the proposal would not be overbearing when experienced from the neighbouring occupiers, and would not detrimentally impact upon outlook.
- 10.23. There are no openings proposed to the side of the extensions facing the neighbouring property. Whilst it is appreciated to the rear that the openings would be located closer to the boundary with the neighbour in comparison to the existing situation, nevertheless Officers consider that the openings would not introduce any new views compared to the existing situation.
- 10.24. All other properties are considered to be located a sufficient distance away so as not to be affected by the proposals.
- 10.25. As such, the development would be considered to comply with Policies H14 and RE7 of the Oxford Local Plan.

Drainage and impact upon SSSI

- 10.26. Policy RE4 states that within the surface and groundwater catchment area for the Lye Valley SSSI, development will only be permitted if it includes sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and where an assessment can demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the surface and groundwater flow to the Lye Valley SSSI. Policy G2 states that planning permission will not be granted for any development that would have an adverse impact on sites of national or international importance (SSSIs).
- 10.27. The site lies within the Lye Valley SSSI catchment for groundwater supply, modified surface water runoff (via sewers and watercourses), and aquifer recharge.
- 10.28. A revised drainage strategy including SuDS and a SuDS maintenance plan have been submitted during the process of the application.

- 10.29. Natural England raise no objection subject to appropriate SuDS mitigation being secured by condition.
- 10.30. The surface water proposal is for the roof runoff from the full roof area of the property to be piped to a soakaway in the front garden, for infiltration into the ground. On-site infiltration testing has been carried out, with an infiltration rate of 3.5xE-05 m/s. Calculations allow for the 1:100 year storm event plus 40% allowance for climate change. It has been established through on-site investigation that groundwater is not found within 1m of the invert of the soakaway. The soakaway location is shown on the submitted plan, with a dimension showing the minimum 5m distance required to any building.
- 10.31. Officers note that the geocellular soakaway crates are available in standard unit sizes and the applicant proposes non-standard dimensions, which are minimum dimensions required. The Applicant therefore will likely need to provide a soakaway with greater overall length and width dimensions in order to comply with these minimum sizes, which would offer further betterment.
- 10.32. The proposed scheme does not include a basement or any structure at a depth to interfere with groundwater flow, and therefore we consider that the development will not impact on groundwater flow. A water quality assessment is submitted to demonstrate that the groundwater quality would not be affected by the proposals.
- 10.33. The scheme does not propose any outfall into the sewer network or directly into a stream, and therefore there will be no increase in run-off peak discharge rates or water quality via this route. The proposed development would therefore not impact on the surface water runoff entering the Lye Valley via sewers and watercourses.
- 10.34. The scheme proposes that all surface water will infiltrate into the ground, and therefore it is considered that the recharge rates into the aquifer that feeds the Lye Valley would not be affected by the development.
- 10.35. As such Officers are satisfied that the proposals would not adversely impact on the hydrology of the Lye Valley SSSI, and that the requirements for the management of surface water can be met through the management plan. The SuDS and Management Plan can be secured by condition and a further condition in relation to the size of the geocellular soakaway crates.
- 10.36. Comments made in with regard to sewerage capacity are noted. The Applicant would likely need to get approval from Thames Water for any new bathrooms proposed as it may require new connections into the existing systems.
- 10.37. Subject to a conditions, the proposed development would comply with Policies RE4 and G2 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

c. Ecology

- 10.38. Policy G2 states that development that results in a net loss of sites and species of ecological value will not be permitted. Compensation and mitigation measures must offset any loss and achieve an overall net gain for biodiversity.

- 10.39. All species of bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). These laws make it an offence to deliberately kill, injure or capture a bat; to damage, destroy or obstruct access to a breeding or resting place; and to intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while in a structure or place of shelter or protection.
- 10.40. A preliminary ecological appraisal was submitted with the application in which the existing building was assessed to be of negligible suitability for roosting bats and no further surveys were recommended. No potential roosting features (PRFs) were identified externally or internally.
- 10.41. Officers are satisfied that a robust assessment was undertaken and the potential presence of protected habitats and species has been given due regard.
- 10.42. The Local Planning Authority, in exercising any of its functions, has a legal duty to have regard to the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, which identifies four main offences for development affecting European Protected Species (EPS):
1. Deliberate capture, injuring or killing of an EPS
 2. Deliberate disturbance of an EPS, including in particular any disturbance which is likely
 - a) to impair their ability –
 - i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or
 - ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.
 3. Deliberate taking or destroying the eggs of an EPS
 4. Damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place of an EPS.
- 10.43. Officers are satisfied that European Protected Species are unlikely to be harmed as a result of the proposals.
- 10.44. Subject to conditions to limit time on development before further surveys are required and to secure ecological enhancement measures and informatives reminding the applicant of their duty in relation to bats and wild birds, the proposal would be considered to accord with Policy G2 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), and the NPPF.

d. Other matters

10.45. Whilst neighbour objections are noted in relation to increased parking pressure and highway safety, the application is for an extension to a residential dwelling only. As such, the application would not materially change the parking demand or requirements and the proposed on site parking is considered to be sufficient.

11. CONCLUSION

11.1. On the basis of 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 it clear that proposals should be assessed in accordance with the development plan unless material consideration indicate otherwise

11.2. In the context of all proposals paragraph 11 of the NPPF requires that planning decision apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development that accord with an up-to-date development plan 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 reasons 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.

Compliance with development plan policies

11.3. 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.

11.4. In summary the proposed development is acceptable in regards of its design and would not cause any detrimental harm upon the character and appearance of the dwelling itself or the streetscene of Glebelands. The proposals would not cause any detrimental impacts upon the amenity of any neighbouring dwellings, and nor would the proposals cause any impacts in relation to drainage or ecology. As such the proposals are considered to comply with the policies of the Oxford Local Plan, and the NPPF.

11.5. It is recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to conditions.

12. CONDITIONS

Time Limit

- e. The development to which this permission relates must be begun no 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.

Approved Plans

2. The development referred to shall be constructed strictly in complete accordance with the specifications in the application and the submitted plans.

Reason: To avoid doubt as no objection is raised only in respect of the deemed consent application as submitted and to ensure an acceptable development as indicated on the submitted drawings in accordance with Policy S1 of the Oxford Local Plan.

Materials as specified

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

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

Remove PD for any further windows/openings

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, no additional windows, doors or openings shall be placed in the side elevation(s) of the extension hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining occupiers in accordance with policy H14 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

Time limit on development before further surveys are required

5. If the development hereby approved does not commence by August 2026, further ecological survey(s) shall be commissioned to establish if there have been any changes in the presence of roosting bats, and identify any likely new ecological impacts that might arise from any changes. The results of the survey(s) shall be submitted to the local planning authority

Where the survey results indicate that changes have occurred that will result in impacts not previously addressed in the approved scheme, a mitigation and compensation scheme will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Works will then be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme, under licence from Natural England.

Reason: To ensure bats are protected in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Ecological Enhancements

6. Prior to occupation of the development, details of ecological enhancement measures including at least one bat roosting device, one bee brick and one swift nesting device shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details must include the proposed specifications, locations, and arrangements for any required

maintenance. The approved devices shall be fully constructed under the oversight of a suitably qualified ecologist prior to occupation of the approved development. Any new fencing will include holes suitable for the safe passage of hedgehogs. The approved devices and fencing holes shall be maintained and retained in perpetuity unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in Oxford City in accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Drainage

7. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the proposed drainage strategy and plans listed below. The Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) measures shall be in place prior to first occupation as an House of Multiple Occupation and thereafter retained and maintained in accordance with the SuDS Maintenance Plan:
 - Wilsham Consulting letter, revision C, dated 23/10/25
 - 76/SK101/11, rev B -Surface Water Drainage Plan
 - 876, rev C, dated 23/10/25 - Soakaway calculations "front soakaway"
 - 876/SK100/11, rev C - Infiltration Crate Soakaway sketch
 - SuDS Quality Assessment sheet.
8. Prior to installation of the geocellular soakaway crates, details of larger standard sized geocellular soakaway crates that exceed the minimum geocellular soakaway crate measurements set out in the approved drainage strategy under condition 7 and which shall be at the same depth as set out in the approved drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be installed prior to first occupation as a House of Multiple Occupation.

Informatives

- 1 In accordance with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council tries to work positively and proactively with applicants towards achieving sustainable development that accords with the Development Plan and national planning policy objectives. This includes the offer of pre-application advice and, where reasonable and appropriate, the opportunity to submit amended proposals as well as time for constructive discussions during the course of the determination of an application. However, development that is not sustainable and that fails to accord with the requirements of the Development Plan and/or relevant national policy guidance will normally be refused. The Council expects applicants and their agents to adopt a similarly proactive approach in pursuit of sustainable development.

- 2 All species of bats and their roosts are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Please note that, among other activities, it is a criminal offence to deliberately kill, injure or capture a bat; to damage, destroy or obstruct access to a breeding or resting place; and to intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while in a structure or place of shelter or protection. Occasionally bats can be found during the course of development even when the site appears unlikely to support them. In the event that this occurs, work should stop immediately and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. A European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) may be required before works can resume.
- 3 All wild birds, their nests and young are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Occasionally nesting birds can be found during the course of development even when the site appears unlikely to support them. If any nesting birds are present then the buildings works should stop immediately and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

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/refuse] 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/refuse] planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community.