

## REPORT 3

**APPLICATION NO.** P06/E1094  
**APPLICATION TYPE** FULL  
**REGISTERED** 12 December 2006  
**PARISH** HENLEY  
**WARD MEMBER(S)** Ken Arlett and Gillian Zakss  
**APPLICANT** Mr & Mrs Harris  
**SITE** 38 Milton Close, Henley  
**PROPOSAL** Erection of single storey front extension and two storey rear and side extension and single storey rear garden room and pitched roof over existing flat roof garage.  
**AMENDMENTS** One set of amended plans – front extension reduced in size  
**GRID REFERENCE** 475677/182499  
**OFFICER** Paul Lucas

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee at the request of Mr Arlett, one of the Ward Councillors.

1.2 The application site is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix 1. The application site consists of a plot occupied by detached two storey 1960's property in a small estate off Deanfield Avenue within the built-up area of Henley. The immediate surroundings contain a mixture of detached and terraced houses of similar age and appearance. The properties are staggered, so that No.38 is set further forward than both No.39 (a similar detached house adjacent to the west) and No.37 (an end-of terrace house adjacent to the east). This means that the two storey rear building line of No's 37 and 39 project beyond the rear of No.38 by 3.2 metres and 0.8 metres, respectively. The rear garden of No.38 is longer than most of the other properties in Milton Close. The land slopes quite steeply down from west to east and from north to south. Some of the properties have been extended, most notably, No.20 has a two storey side extension and No.39 has a flat-roof front extension incorporating a balcony. A new dwelling was allowed on appeal between No's 32 & 33 in 2002 and has been recently constructed. No.38 itself has had the original horizontal cladding on the front elevation replaced by stone cladding and has a flat-roofed single storey extension and a terrace at the rear.

## THE PROPOSAL

2.0

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey front

2.1 extension and two storey rear and side extension and single storey rear garden room and pitched roof over existing flat roof garage. The front extension incorporating an open sided porch would be 2.1 metres deep by 4.4 metres wide, covering approximately two-thirds of the front elevation. It would have a ridged roof up to a height of 3.3 metres with a gable of similar shape to the main roof. The garage would also be brought forward by 2.1 metres and linked to the front extension by a hipped roof. This roof would be continued over the remainder of the existing flat-roof garage. The first floor side extension would measure 3 metres deep by 1.4 metres wide erected above the garage with a set back of 0.3 metres from the main front wall of the house and a pitched roof 1.5 metres below the main ridge.

2.2 The two storey rear extension would measure 4.5 metres deep by 7.9 metres wide, projecting out from the original eastern side wall of the house by 1.9 metres. It would be set in from both side boundaries by 1.2 metres. The single storey extension would be added to the rear of the proposed two storey rear extension. It would incorporate a 3.1 metre deep link and a 4.1 metre deep sunroom. The link would be 2.2 metres wide and the sunroom would be 4 metres wide. It would be 1.2 metres from the boundary with No.39 and 5 metres from the boundary with No.37 and would have a ridged roof of 3.1 metres high. The existing terrace would be extended further to the rear. Some alterations to openings on the existing house would be carried out, but these would not require planning permission, because permitted development rights were not removed when the houses were originally granted consent. The stone cladding would be removed and the existing single storey rear extension would be demolished. The proposal would lead to the reconfiguring of the internal layout, to facilitate a study, enlarged living room and garden room on the ground floor and the enlargement of two of the existing four bedrooms. The amended plans also show the addition of a trellis onto the boundary wall with No.37.

2.3

The applicant's supporting letter is **attached** as Appendix 2. The amended plans of the proposed development are **attached** as Appendix 3.

### 3.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Henley Town Council** – Original and amended proposals should be refused due to being too large, over intensive, unneighbourly and out of keeping.

3.2 **Henley Society** – The proposed extensions are still excessive in relation to the size of the existing house and garden and in relation to the neighbouring properties and streetscape.

**OCC Highways** – No objection.

3.3

**Neighbours** – One representation of objection to the original proposal, which was 3.4 sustained for the amended plans:

- Excessive development causing loss of sunlight and daylight to rear of No.39 and its garden;
- Loss of privacy to No.39;
- Extends beyond the lines of existing dwellings by 10.75 metres; and
- No increase in parking provision.

#### 4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 P80/S0723 – Planning permission was granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension in February 1981.

4.2 P82/S0124 – Planning permission was granted for the raising of a chimney stack in April 1982.

#### 5.0 POLICY AND GUIDANCE

5.1 Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies:

- G2 – Protection of the Environment
- G6 – Promoting Good Design
- H13 – Extensions to Dwellings
- T1 – Transport Requirements for New Developments

5.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance:

- South Oxfordshire Design Guide – Sections 4.3 and 4.6.

5.3 Government Guidance: PPS1.

#### 6.0 PLANNING ISSUES

6.1 The planning issues that are relevant to this application are whether:

- The development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area;
- The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers would be compromised;
- The development would result in an unacceptable deficiency of off-street parking spaces for the resultant dwelling; and
- The development would leave sufficient outdoor amenity space for future occupiers.

## 6.2 Character and Appearance

Criterion (ii) of Policy H13 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 requires that the scale and design of proposed extensions are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area. EX2 of Section 4.6 of the South Oxfordshire Design Guide recommends that extensions should complement the form and character of the original house. The proposed extensions would be substantial. However, only the front and side extensions would be noticeable in the street scene on Milton Close. The front extension would reflect the shape of the main roof and would be more in keeping with the appearance of original properties than the flat-roofed front extension at No.39. The pitched roof over the garage would constitute an improvement to its appearance. Although the ground floor of No.38 would project further forward than its neighbours, this was the case when the houses were originally built and this serves to reinforce the stagger. The first floor side extension would be relatively small in scale and would be both set back from the front wall of the house and set down from the main ridge, which would make it appear subordinate. There would be only limited views of the two storey rear extension from Deanfield Avenue and due to the distance of some 20 metres involved, it would not appear prominent. These properties are not of particular architectural merit and there is insufficient symmetry to resist the extensions to No.38 of the scale proposed. The character of the original house and the surroundings would not therefore be materially harmed. In the light of this assessment, the proposal would satisfy the above criterion.

## 6.3

### Living Conditions of Adjoining Dwellings

Criterion (iii) of Policy H13 of the adopted Local Plan requires that proposed extensions and alterations do not harm the residential amenity of occupants of nearby properties. EX5 of Section 3.6 of the South Oxfordshire Design Guide recommends that a proposed extension should not intrude upon a neighbour's privacy or significantly reduce the amount of daylight their house would receive. The front and side extensions and garage roof would be on the side of No.37. Although there would be some loss of light and outlook to the front kitchen window, the internal arrangement at No.37 is open plan and the living conditions in the front rooms of the property would not be materially affected. The proposed two storey rear extension would only project 1 metre beyond the rear of No.37. The single storey extension would be positioned some 5 metres from the boundary. This would enable a sufficient level of light and outlook to the rear rooms of No.37 to be preserved, demonstrated by the 45-degree line shown on the amended plans. The land at No.38 is higher than No.37 and the boundary wall/fencing steps down the garden, whereas the extended terrace would remain at the level of the house. In order to prevent overlooking of No.37 from this terrace, a trellis is proposed to be added to the boundary to ensure that its height remains above 1.8 metres on

## 6.4

No.38's side, thereby ensuring sufficient privacy for No.37. This can be covered in a planning condition. The occupants of No.37 have raised no objections to the proposal.

The two storey rear extension would project beyond the rear of No.39 by some 3.7 metres. Although the extension would be visible from the rear of No.39, it would be at a distance of some 6 metres from the centre of the nearest window, which would enable the extension to be within a 45-degree line of sight from that window. Consequently, whilst there would be some loss of light and outlook to the downstairs lounge and upstairs window, this impact would not be so significant so as to justify refusing planning permission. There would be some overshadowing of the garden, but as the extension would be to the east of the garden, this would only occur very early in the morning and mainly in the summer months, when there is more daylight generally. In the winter, the sun would rise further to the south-east. The single storey extension would be constructed much further down the garden, but as the ground level at No.38 is much lower than No.39, only the roof would be visible, with the ridge located at a distance of some 3 metres from the boundary. Given the existence of shrub planting along No.39's side of the boundary, this extension would not give rise to any significant loss of amenity to this property. A high level window would face No.38. As this would serve the master bedroom and there would be other sources of light, it is considered reasonable to impose an obscure glazing condition to ensure no overlooking of No.39 occurs. On the basis of this assessment the proposal would meet the requirements of the above criterion.

### Parking

6.6 Criterion (v) of Policy H13 of the adopted Local Plan requires that satisfactory parking areas are provided for the extended dwelling. The proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms from the current four. The Highway Authority has commented that the parking and access arrangements, which provide at least two off-street parking spaces would be sufficient to meet adopted standards. Consequently, the proposed development would not result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety, nor would it result in excessive vehicular movements in accordance with the above criterion.

### Outdoor Amenity Space Provision

Criterion (v) of Policy H13 of the adopted Local Plan requires that satisfactory amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling. The amount of garden area

would remain at some 125 square metres, which would be above the recommended minimum standard of 100 square metres for a dwelling of this size. The proposal would therefore comply with the above criterion.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

7.1 The application proposal would comply with the relevant Development Plan policies and it is considered that, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would be in keeping with the character of original dwelling and the surrounding area, would not materially harm the living conditions of adjoining residents and would not give rise to any highway safety issues.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

### **8.1 Grant Planning Permission**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Standard 3 Year Time Limit**
- 2. Matching Materials – Walls and Roofs**
- 3. Matching Materials – Windows and Doors**
- 4. Obscure glazing – first floor west-facing side window**
- 5. Trellis to be installed on boundary with No.37 before commencement**
- 6. Garage to be retained for parking of private vehicles only**
- 7. Permitted development rights removed first floor side windows and rooflights**

Author : Paul Lucas

Contact no : 01491 823434

Email : [Planning.east@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.east@southoxon.gov.uk)