

## REPORT 4

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P07/W0803
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL
<b>REGISTERED</b>	27.06.2007
<b>PARISH</b>	BRIGHTWELLCUMSOTWELL
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Mrs Celia Collett
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Paul Richards
<b>SITE</b>	Willowbank Church Lane Brightwell-cum-Sotwell
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Single storey porch to front elevation. Raising the roof to facilitate first floor accommodation and conservatory to rear
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	As amended by drawing no.03B received 22 August 2007.
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	458036/191145
<b>OFFICER</b>	Mrs S Crawford

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application has been referred to Planning Committee because a council employee is an immediate neighbour to the application site.

1.2 Willowbank is a detached bungalow constructed in painted brick under a corrugated concrete roof tile. The land slopes from north to south. The properties to either side have already undertaken similar alterations to provide accommodation at first floor. Church Lane is a narrow lane with no footway and there are banks to either side of the road. The site has no special designation.

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

### 2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application, as amended, seeks planning permission for a porch extension to the front elevation and the raising of the roof to provide first floor accommodation and a conservatory to the rear. The proposal involves raising the eaves and ridge height of the property by approximately 600mm, the provision of three dormer windows in the front elevation and three rooflights on the rear elevation. This would allow for two bedrooms (1 ensuite) and a study/office at first floor. There is an existing lounge wing on the rear of the building and the eaves and ridge of this wing would also be raised to the same height as the main body of the dwelling. Three rooflights are also proposed on the southern elevation of the rear wing.

2.2 Reduced copies of the amended plans are **attached** at Appendix 2.

### 3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Brightwell cum Sotwell Parish Council Refuse, overdevelopment across the width of the plot with no rear access.

In adequate maintenance strip on North elevation would create difficulties

Extension would shade neighbour and detract from amenity.

OCC (Archaeology) No objection.

Neighbour Objectors (4 plus additional objections to additional information) Loss of light to ground floor bedroom and oppressive form of development. Loss of amenity due to loss of light to garden. Concern regarding encroachment. Not in keeping. Use of property for business purposes. Concern about noise during construction.

Frontage out of keeping, too wide across full plot. Extension over lounge at rear is overbearing, rooflights in southern elevation will overlook. Independent access to study causes some concern.

Overdevelopment.

### 4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 P06/W1191 - Erection of a single storey porch including raising the roof and conservatory to rear. WITHDRAWN

### 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 Adopted SOLP Policies

G2 – Protection of District’s resources, G6 – Quality of design and local distinctiveness, EP6 – Surface water drainage requirements, D1 – Principles of good design, D8 – Conservation and efficient design, H13 – Extensions to dwellings

South Oxfordshire Design Guide

PPS1 – Delivering sustainable development

PPS3 – Housing

## 6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main issues in this case are:-

- Neighbour impact, and
- Design
- Parking and amenity

6.2 Policy H13 of SOLP allows for such development where the scale and design of the proposals are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and the surrounding area; would not be tantamount to the creation of a separate dwelling; are not unneighbourly and provide for satisfactory parking and amenity areas.

6.3 **Design.** The character of Church Lane is very varied and a number of properties that were originally bungalows have already gone up into the roof space in a similar manner. Whilst the proposal at Willowbank is slightly different to other properties that have been altered, it is not significantly different and the development itself would not detract from the character of the area. The Parish Council and neighbours have commented that the proposal would involve development across the full width of the site and would result in an overdevelopment of the site. In your officers view, the existing building already fills the complete width of the site and whilst the proposal aims to raise the height of the roof, the overall effect would not be significantly different. The effect of built form across the site is also reduced by the slope in the land and each property on Church Lane steps down towards the centre of the village.

The proposed dormer windows are of a size and scale that would accord with advice in the south Oxfordshire Design Guide.

6.4 **Neighbour impact.** Willowbank is surrounded on three sides by neighbours and each of these neighbours has objected to the proposals and the subsequent additional information.

The distance between Willowbank and **35 Kings Orchard** to the rear is some 27 metres from the back wall of the main body of the house and some 23.5 metres from the back wall of the rear wing. The proposal does involve the addition of three roof lights in the rear roof; these would meet the 25 metre minimum distance for a back to back relationship. In any event the rooflights would be provided with a minimum floor to cill height of 1.8 metres and would not involve unneighbourly overlooking. Conditions are recommended to remove permitted development rights for additional windows in the rear and side elevations of Willowbank.

**Cambourne** to the north of the site sits at a higher level than Willowbank. The neighbours are concerned that the increase in the height of the building would block light to a bedroom window in their side elevation that looks onto Willowbank. In an earlier application the impact on this bedroom window was deemed to be unneighbourly. Since the earlier application was withdrawn negotiations have resulted in some revisions to the proposal adjacent to Cambourne. An existing flat

roof area on the boundary would be retained (albeit with a lean-to roof and valley gutter on the boundary) but the main rise in height would occur at the point of the original side wall some 1.7 metres off the boundary. It is acknowledged that the existing building has an impact on this window but the changes in height proposed would not create a material difference to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

The residents of Cambourne are also concerned about the impact of the increase in height of the rear wing on the use of the garden and their conservatory, again the increase in height would not make a material difference in the view of your officer.

**Grangefields** to the south of the site is set at a lower level than Willowbank on a similar building line. The increase in height would be visible from the garden of Grangefield but the impact would not be dissimilar to other side to side relationships on Church Lane and would not be materially different from the existing impact. The residents of Grangefields have objected; one of the concerns relates to rooflights in the rear wing that would look onto their garden. These rooflights would again have a minimum floor to cill height of 1.8 metres and given the drop in levels it would be impossible to overlook the garden area of Grangefields.

**6.5 Parking and amenity.** The plot is an ample size to accommodate a larger building and would retain a garden area of some 200 square metres. Parking spaces for two cars is available on the frontage of the site and a further space available in the garage. Both the parking and the garden size would comply with the Council's standards.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

7.1 Your officer recommends that planning permission is granted because the design of the extension and alterations is not out of keeping with the varied character of the area and the resulting building would not be significantly different in terms of built form across the site. The impact on the neighbour to the north has been amended to address concerns about windows to that property and the rooflights to the rear would have a cill height of 1.8 metres above floor level to avoid overlooking.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**8.1 That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions**

**1. Commencement 3 years**

**2. Matching materials - walls and roof**

**3. That all roof lights shall have a minimum floor to cill height of no**

**less than 1.8 metres**

**4. No additional windows other than those shown on drawings**

**5. A detailed scheme for detail of valley gutter and parapet**

**Author** Sharon Crawford

**Contact No.** 01491 823739

**Email Add.** [planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk)