

REPORT 4

APPLICATION NO.	P07/W0374
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL
REGISTERED	12.04.2007
PARISH	CROWMARSH GIFFORD
WARD MEMBER(S)	Mr Nicholas Odd
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs W Phelan
SITE	Ashview 71 The Street Crowmarsh Gifford
PROPOSAL	Two storey rear extension.
AMENDMENTS	
GRID REFERENCE	461696/189264
OFFICER	Ms N Bedggood

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application has been called in to the Committee by Councillor Odd.

1.2 The site is located at 71 The Street, Crowmarsh Gifford. The property forms part of a 5 house development that received planning permission in 2005. It is an irregular shaped plot of some 171 square metres in area. The site at present contains a 3 bedroom semi-detached two storey dwelling of some 69 square metres, facing on to a communal courtyard area, with private garden area to the rear. Several trees that form part of a group subject to a tree preservation order are located along the boundary of the site.

1.3 The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a two storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling. Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application together with the design and access statement are **attached** at Appendix 2.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 OCC (Highways)	No objection
OCC	No objection – standard advice note
Archaeologist	
Forestry	No objection subject to standard condition relating to tree protection measures
Parish Council	No strong views – the extension would reduce usable garden area

Neighbour Objectors (1) 1 objection from the neighbour to the rear has been received. The main reasons for their objections can be summarised as follows:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Design not in keeping with existing building or surrounding area.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 P04/E1142 – Five new houses and new access. Planning permission on 16 March 2005.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 Adopted SOLP Policies

G6 – Quality of design and local distinctiveness,

D1 – Principles of good design,

H13 – Extensions to dwellings

South Oxfordshire Design Guide EX1, EX2, EX3, EX6

PPS3 – Housing

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main issues in this case are;

1. Whether the scale and design of the proposal are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area.
2. Whether the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties is materially harmed
3. Whether adequate and satisfactory parking and amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling.

6.2 H13 criteria issues.

- i. Whether the scale and design of the proposal are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area.

The size, positioning and design details of the proposed extension are not considered to be in keeping with the character of the dwelling and site, or with the appearance of the surrounding area. There are a number of constraints on the site, including the irregular shape of the plot, the proximity of the group of trees subject of the TPO and the strong traditional design vernacular of the cluster of houses.

Officers consider that the extension would overwhelm the modest scale and character of the existing dwelling due to the two-storey nature of the proposal. In scale and massing, the extension dominates the existing building to its detriment. The proposed two storey extension projects centrally from the rear of the dwelling, thus the rear elevation will be bisected and due to the limited depth of the plot, will no longer be fully expressed or legible.

The existing building is characterised by small windows in masonry in a traditional arrangement. The design of the extension conflicts with this existing arrangement as it has a horizontal spread of windows at ground floor level, with timber boarding to the walls at first floor level. A visually permeable ground floor and 'solid' upper storey appearance with an apex window is not in keeping with the character of the building. It is visually contradictory to have the solid bearing on the void. The proposed use of timber boarding would also more generally be seen on an outbuilding rather than an extension.

The five houses located in the development are all of traditional materials and detailing and have been designed to relate to one another in terms of scale and materials. The extension is not in keeping with the prevailing style of the surrounding development and will appear at odds with the traditional character of the dwelling and surrounding buildings. The extension will be visually prominent from neighbouring properties to the north and west and also from the public footpath located to the north of the site.

ii. Whether the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties is materially harmed

The occupants of No. 2 Benson Lane are concerned that the proposal would overlook their property and affect their privacy. The proposed extension would be in excess of 30 metres from their dwelling, which is more than the 25 metres separation distance recommended in the Design Guide to maintain adequate levels of privacy. The windows on the west elevation of the extension are high level with a cill height of 1.5 metres above floor level and therefore limited overlooking can occur. One roof light is proposed on either side of the extension and these too are high level. The proposal will not be unneighbourly in terms of overlooking or affect the privacy of neighbouring properties in your officer's view.

Officers do have concerns over whether the proposal will overshadow the neighbouring plot to the north of the site. The gardens of numbers 71, 73 and 75 are already overshadowed by the existing tall trees located along the western boundaries of the plots. The proposed extension would increase the degree of overshadowing to the rear garden area of number 73, particularly in the area closest to the dwelling.

iii. Whether adequate and satisfactory parking and amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling;

OCC Highways has assessed the proposal and has no objection. The proposed parking levels meet the required standards for a dwelling of this size.

The proposal will extend the dwelling such that it does not meet the recommended standards for private amenity space set out in the Design Guide. It is recommended in guideline EX3 that semi-detached housing has plot coverage of 40% and that a 3 bedroom dwelling have a garden area of 100 square metres. Plot coverage at present equates to approximately 40%, and with the proposed extension will equate to approximately 46%. The garden area at present amounts to approximately 102 square meters and will be reduced to approximately 91 square metres if the extension were built. Officers do not consider that the reduction in garden area is a reason for refusal as the infringement of the standards is minor and there is communal garden area to the front of the dwelling which affords some amenity to the dwelling. However, the proposed extension will significantly impinge on the amount of *useable* garden area, overshadowing the remaining area of garden to the north of the extension. The garden is already overshadowed by the TPO trees and the extension would increase this degree of overshadowing, rendering the northern section of the garden in shadow for most of the day.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 Your officers do not consider that the design, scale and massing of the proposed extension is acceptable. The proposal will adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and will not be in keeping with the prevailing style of development in the surrounding area. The extension will affect the amount of useable garden area on the site and would overshadow adjacent properties.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 Planning Permission be REFUSED

1. That, having regard to the size, scale, design and materials, the proposal represents an inappropriate extension detracting from the character, appearance and detailing of the existing dwelling and would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area, contrary to provisions of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, particularly Policies G6, D1 and H13 and guidance contained in

the South Oxfordshire Design Guide.

2. That, having regard to the location of the extension on the site and its size and scale, the proposal represents an inappropriate extension that will overshadow the garden area of 71 and 73 The Street to the detriment of the amenity of the occupants of both properties. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy H13 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and guidance contained in the approved South Oxfordshire Design Guide.

Author	Miss N. Bedggood
Contact No.	01491 823275
Email Add.	planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk