
APPLICATION NO.	P08/W1013
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL
REGISTERED	26.08.2008
PARISH	TIDDINGTON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Mr John Nowell-Smith
APPLICANT	Rectory Homes
SITE	Manor Farm Albury View Tiddington
PROPOSAL	Erection of four detached dwellings (amendment to P06/W0983) & As amended by drawing number 144/101A accompanying Agent's letter dated 5 September 2008, and 144/301A accompanying Agents letter dated 12th September 2008).
AMENDMENTS	
GRID REFERENCE	464981/204733
OFFICER	Mrs S Crawford

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The application has been referred to the Committee because the recommendation conflicts with the views of the Parish Council.
- 1.2 Manor Farm is part of the ribbon of frontage development on Albury View. It is a large, farmhouse set on sloping land to the south of the main village and has been in active use as a farmyard until recently. The farmhouse is a grade II listed building. Modern, utilitarian farm buildings surrounded the listed building to the north and west filling much of the site.
- 1.3 Following the granting of planning permission for redevelopment of the former farmyard with four detached houses the site was cleared. Construction commenced on the scheme for four houses following the discharge of all relevant conditions. During the course of construction investigations revealed that the slab levels on plots 1, 2 and 3 and some surrounding land levels were higher than those approved. A new application was requested to regularise the breach in planning control and to include alterations to some fenestration details.
- 1.4 An Ordnance Survey extract of the site is **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application, as amended, seeks full planning permission for amendments to the scheme approved by P06/W0983 for four houses. The amendments are:
1. Slab level increases of 200mm on plots 1, 2 and 3 (variation to condition 8) and a corresponding raise in surrounding land levels (gardens).
 2. Reducing ridge heights by 200mm on plots 1, 2 and 3 by reducing the roof pitch.
 3. Amendment to the location of the boundary wall that marks the side and rear boundary of 27 Albury View. One of the farm buildings projected into the rear garden of 27 and this dogleg has now been squared off. The rear boundary wall is approx 14 metres from the rear of 27 as opposed to the approved distance of approx 13 metres making the garden of 27 longer by approx 1 metres. The garden of 27 has increased in size and there has been a corresponding decrease in plot size of unit 4.

4. Changing the fenestration details on Plot 1 by removing rooflights from the south facing roof (as required by condition on the approved planning permission) and replacement with a small window at first floor level to light the staircase.
5. Changing the fenestration details on Plot 4 on north elevation. Increase in width of windows to Bed 1 and bed 3 and a reduction of glazing to the ground floor sun room. A relocation and reduction in size of the rooflight in the single storey wing.

For the avoidance of doubt, the position and slab levels of the house on plot 4 are as approved. The siting of all the houses is as approved.

- 2.2 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application and letters of clarification from the applicant are **attached** at Appendix 2.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Environmental Health

Comments regarding contamination issues and hours of construction.

Tiddington Parish Council

Refuse. Unneighbourly and in conflict with the original (approved) application.

Neighbour Objectors (2)

The dwelling on plot 4 is in the wrong position, it is 900mm closer to the road than it should be. The original plans and topographical survey were wrong. There has been an increase in the height of land levels as well as slab levels. The windows on plot 4 are different and increase overlooking. (Neighbour comments in detail **attached at** Appendix3)
Whilst the overall height of the building will not change, the rise in slab levels means that the windows within walls are higher and have greater potential for overlooking given the sloping nature of the site and relationship with neighbouring properties.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 P06/W0983 - Demolition of farm buildings and replacement with four dwellings - Approved

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 Adopted SOLP Policies

G2 – Protection of District's resources, G4 – Development in the countryside, G6 – Quality of design and local distinctiveness, C1 – Landscape character, CON5 – setting of listed buildings, EP6 - Surface water drainage requirements, EP7 – Ground water resources, EP8 – Contaminated land, D1 – Principles of good design, D2 – Parking for vehicles and cycles, D3 – Provision of private amenity areas, D4 – Privacy for new dwellings, D8 – Conservation and efficient design, D9 – Renewable energy, D10 – Management of waste, H4 – New housing within larger villages, H5 – residential development in smaller villages, H6 – Locations where new housing will not be permitted, H7 – Mix of units, H8 - density, H9 – affordable housing
South Oxfordshire Design Guide

PPS1 – Delivering sustainable development
PPS3 – Housing
PPS7 – Sustainable Development In Rural Areas
PPG13 – Transport
PPS22 – Renewable Energy

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in this case are;

- the differences between the approved scheme and that now proposed
- any additional neighbour impact
- any design or setting of listed building issues.

6.2 **Differences.** The differences between the approved scheme and that now proposed are detailed in paragraph 2.1

- 1 and 2) Whilst the slab levels of plots 1, 2 and 3 have been raised by 200mm, there has been a corresponding drop of 200mm in the ridge height, which has been achieved by reducing the roof pitch. In your officer's view there is no material increase in the bulk of the buildings over that of the approved scheme. Neighbours have commented that the increase in slab levels means that there is a corresponding increase in the height of windows and this increases the potential for overlooking to neighbouring properties.
- 3) The changes to the side and rear boundary to 27 Albury view have resulted in an increase in the size of the garden. There has been a corresponding reduction in the size of plot 4 but the amenity levels are still acceptable
- 4) There has been a reduction in numbers of windows in the south elevation looking towards 27. The new first floor window lights a stairwell and will not result in overlooking.
- 5) The fenestration changes to the north elevation of the dwelling on plot 4 are not material. The 2 bedroom windows have been increased from a 3 unit window to four units and from 1 unit to 2. There has been a reduction in the amount of glazing on the sun room and a reduction in the size of a rooflight. Whilst the neighbour has objected to the increased overlooking, the overall impact is not significantly different to the approved scheme.

Investigations by the applicant and the Enforcement Officer have concluded that the siting of the buildings is accurate. The position of the boundary wall to 27 has changed with 27 benefiting slightly in that the garden area has increased at the side and rear.

6.3 **Neighbour impact.** The neighbouring house most affected is at 27 Albury View. The previous use of the site caused some problems in terms of noise, smell, slurry and traffic and the rear garden of 27 was surrounded by large and unattractive utilitarian farm buildings. The removal of the use and the bulk of buildings has been a considerable improvement in amenity for this property. On the original application the form, scale and positioning of the new buildings were considered to have much less impact than the farm buildings. In addition the removal of the dog leg on the side boundary to the garden of 27 and the relocation of the rear boundary wall has resulted in an increase in the size of the garden area for 27.

6.4 **Design and setting issues.** The only change to the dwellings is a reduction in the pitch of the roofs which been used to reduce the ridge height. The roof material on the approved scheme is shown as being slate and this can still be used at the lower pitch. In design terms and impact on the setting of the listed building the changes are minimal.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 It is acknowledged that some changes of levels have occurred and these can be problematic on sloping sites. However, there is no overall increase in the bulk of the buildings and no materially greater overlooking on plots 1, 2 and 3 from the increase in the slab levels or garden levels. The previous use of the site as a farm yard and the size of the former buildings is a material factor and the differences from the approved scheme are not materially harmful in terms of the impact on neighbours.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 **Planning Permission is granted subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Parking & Manoeuvring Areas to be provided prior to occupation.**
2. **Withdrawal of P.D. Classes A, B, C, D and E**

Author Sharon Crawford
Contact No. 01491 823739
Email Add. planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk