

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P11/E0272
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	Full
<b>REGISTERED</b>	17 March 2011
<b>PARISH</b>	Binfield Heath
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Malcolm Leonard and Robert Simister
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr & Mrs Saood
<b>SITE</b>	Land adjacent to Applecroft, Gravel Road, Binfield Heath
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of detached two-storey four-bedroom dwelling.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None.
<b>OFFICER</b>	Paul Lucas

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee as a result of a conflict between the Officers' recommendation and the views of Binfield Heath Parish Council.
- 1.2 The application site is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix 1. The site is 330 square metres in area and was formerly part of the garden of Applecroft, a detached two storey early 1900's dwelling located on the corner of Gravel Road and Dunsden Way at the southern end of the village of Binfield Heath. The application site is on the north side of Gravel Road, with Applecroft and its remaining plot located to the east and a two storey detached mid 1900's dwelling, Rosedene, to the west. The side boundary of Longways, a property fronting onto Dunsden Way, forms the rear boundary of the site. There are a number of dwellings located along the north side of Gravel Road, to the west of the site. These are predominantly two storey and are a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, with relatively small gaps between them. Open countryside lies opposite on the south side of Gravel Road. There is a hawthorn and hazel hedge along the front boundary. The site has been recently cleared of foliage and a gap has been formed in the front boundary hedge. There are no special designations that apply to this site.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two storey four-bedroom dwelling incorporating an integral garage. The two storey depth of the dwelling would be staggered to measure 10.3 metres on the eastern side and 8 metres on the western side. There would also be a single storey lean-to, which would project a further 2.3 metres to the rear of the part of the dwelling closest to Rosedene. The width would be 10.1 metres and the main roof would have side gables with a ridge height of 8.2 metres. The roof over the integral garage element on the eastern side elevation would have a lower ridge with a catslide roof and front and rear dormer windows.
- 2.2 The gap to the boundary with Rosedene would be about 1 metre and there would be a gap of 1.1 metres from the boundary fence with Applecroft. The rear wall of the proposed dwelling would be broadly in line with the north elevation of Applecroft. The main front wall would be roughly in line with Rosedene and the rear wall would project about 2 metres beyond Rosedene's rear wall. The removed section of frontage hedge would enable vehicular access to the garage and a parking and turning area in front. The amended plans of the proposed development can be found as **Appendix 2**. Other documents in support of the application can be viewed on the Council's website.

**3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 3.1 **Binfield Heath Parish Council** – The application should be refused: Permission was originally given for a smaller 3 bed house, with the rear building line in line with Rosedene next door. This application shows extended rear building line cutting light to Rosedene house and garden. Very unneighbourly for both Rosedene and Applecroft itself. Overlarge development of small site.
- 3.2 **OCC Highways** – Previous comments apply – no objections to proposed access and parking arrangements. Conditions requiring formation and retention of vision splays, access, parking and turning areas. Visibility improvements at junction between Gravel Road and Dunsden Lane referred to in the submitted Design and Access Statement no longer required for this proposal.
- 3.3 **Forestry Officer** – Previous comments apply – removal of hedge regrettable and there would be limited space for significant landscaping, however no objections subject to replacement hedge.
- 3.4 **Health and Housing – (Contamination)** – No objection subject to the imposition of a standard condition requiring submission of a Contaminated Land Statement Questionnaire.
- 3.5 **Neighbours** – One representation of objection, summarised as follows:
- Larger footprint than has been previously approved.
  - Greater than 30% of the total plot.

**4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 P07/E1262 – A planning application for a dwelling was withdrawn following officers' indication that it was unacceptable on grounds of impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Rosedene and highway safety.
- 4.2 P08/E0427 – Planning permission was refused for a dwelling by the Planning Committee in September 2008 due to an overbearing impact and loss of light to the rear of Rosedene.
- 4.3 P09/E0686 – Planning permission was granted for the erection of a three bedroom dwelling on the site in August 2009.
- 4.4 P10/E0125 – Planning permission was refused for the erection of a larger two storey three/four bedroom dwelling in April 2010 than due to its excessive size, bulk and massing.
- 4.5 P10/E0501 – Planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey three/four bedroom dwelling in June 2010, which was of similar proportions to the 2009 permission. The key differences between this most recent planning permission and the current proposal are:
1. The addition of a single storey lean-to at the rear;
  2. The enlargement of the dormer windows (although still 2-pane);
  3. The projection of the front canopy by a further 1 metre; and
  4. Alterations to glazing.

The approved plans for P10/E0501 are included as **Appendix 3**.

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 Adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies:  
G2 – Protection of the Environment  
G6 – Promoting Good Design

- C4 – Landscape Setting of Settlements
- C6 – Biodiversity Conservation
- C9 – Landscape Features
- EP8 – Contaminated Land
- D1 – Good Design and Local Distinctiveness
- D2 – Vehicle and Bicycle Parking
- D3 – Plot Coverage and Garden Areas
- D4 – Privacy and Daylight
- D8 – Energy, Water and Materials Efficient Design
- D10 – Waste Management
- H4 – Towns and Larger Villages outside the Green Belt
- H5 – Larger Villages Within the Green Belt and Smaller Villages Elsewhere
- T1 – Transport Requirements for New Developments
- T2 – Transport Requirements for New Developments

5.2 Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008 – Sections 3, 4 and 5.  
South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment – Character Area 10.

5.3 Government Guidance:  
PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS3 – Housing  
PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas  
PPG13 – Transport

## 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The proposed dwelling would be located within the built-up area of the village of Binfield Heath, which is a settlement where infill residential development of up to 4 dwellings is acceptable in principle. Consequently, through Policy H5, the proposal falls to be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4. The planning issues that are relevant to this application are whether the development would:

- result in the loss of an open space or view of public, environmental or ecological value;
- have a size and appearance in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- compromise the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers;
- result in an unacceptable deficiency of off-street parking spaces or other conditions prejudicial to highway safety; and
- incorporate sufficient sustainability and waste management measures.

### Loss of Open Space

6.2 Criterion (i) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view spoilt. The site has historically formed part of a residential plot. It is surrounded by residential properties and there is no evidence that it has any particular ecological value and is only visible in public views from Gravel Road. This criterion would therefore be satisfied.

### Character and Appearance

6.3 Criteria (ii) and (iii) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 explain that the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development should be in keeping with its surroundings and the character of the area should not be adversely affected. The proposed dwelling

would take up just under a third of the plot (92 square metres of 310 square metres), which would be in accordance with the recommended plot ratio of 30% for detached dwellings. It would be set in from both side boundaries by 1 metre and there are similar gaps further along the road. There is some variation in terms of design and appearance of the dwellings on Gravel Road, with many of these, including Applecroft, being positioned further forward than the proposed dwelling. The scale of the dwelling would be greater than Rosedene in terms of overall depth and height, but it would be similar in terms of width and it would be smaller than Applecroft. The depth of the proposed house would be difficult to read from the street scene and would be acceptable given the overall depth of the plot. The Forestry Officer has previously commented that the loss of the hedge would be regrettable and that there would be limited space for significant landscaping, however, this situation was considered acceptable in connection with two previous planning permissions and it should be noted that no other trees or shrubs that make a significant contribution to the street scene would be removed. The form and design of the dwelling would generally reflect that of the most recent planning permission and appropriate materials could be secured through a planning condition. The additional rear single storey and front canopy elements and changes to the dormers and windows would not significantly alter the impact of the dwelling. In the light of this assessment, the proposed development would comply with the above criteria.

#### Living Conditions

- 6.4 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. Whilst the main front wall of the proposed house would be approximately level with the front wall of Rosedene, the proposed main two-storey rear wall would staggered so that the closest part would be level with the rear of Rosedene and the section projecting 2.3 metres beyond the rear wall of this adjoining property would be 5 metres from the boundary. This would be the same layout as approved under planning permission P10/E0510 and has been previously found to be an acceptable arrangement. However, the current application proposes to 'infill' the stagger with a single storey lean-to. This would project 2.3 metres beyond the rear wall of Rosedene at a distance of 1 metre from the boundary between the two properties. There is also a gap of approximately 1 metre between Rosedene and the boundary. The closest patio doors on the ground floor of Rosedene serve a dining area. Taking into account the distance that would exist between the two dwellings and that the lean-to would only be visible in oblique views from the patio doors, there would be unlikely to be a significant impact on the outlook from this room as a result of this additional single storey element. In terms of daylight, the north-west corner of the lean-to would lie outside a 45-degree line taken from the centre line of the patio doors. It should also be noted that the internal ground floor layout of Rosedene comprises an open plan dining and lounge area and the dining area also receives some daylight and direct sunlight from the large south-west facing front windows. Consequently, any loss of light to the dining area would be unlikely to be so significant to justify a refusal of planning permission. Turning to the issue of sunlight, the proposed house would mostly lie to the south-east of Rosedene and consequently there is likely to be some overshadowing of the rear garden, but this would be restricted to the morning and would only affect a small part of the garden. There would also be no first floor windows facing Rosedene, so no loss of privacy would occur.
- 6.5 In terms of the relationship with Applecroft, the distance of this adjoining dwelling to the proposed boundary would vary from 2 metres to 8 metres. The only facing windows at Applecroft are a secondary dining room window on the ground floor with two stairwell windows above. Given that the proposed dwelling would lie to the north-west, there would be no significant loss of light or outlook on the west-facing rooms or garden of

Applecroft and there would be no first floor windows proposed in the eastern elevation facing Applecroft. The rear windows of the proposed dwelling would be 10 metres from the boundary with Longlands and would face onto the blank side wall of this property, preventing any loss of light, outlook or privacy. The proposed dwelling would have a rear garden of approximately 100 square metres, complying with the recommended minimum standard for a dwelling of this size, as set out in Section 3 of the SODG. On the basis of this assessment, the proposed development would meet the above criterion.

#### Highways and Parking

- 6.6 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 also requires that there are no overriding highway objections. The Highway Liaison Officer raised no objections to the access, parking and turning arrangements on P10/E0501, which remain unchanged for this application. Planning conditions can be imposed to ensure that the vision splays and parking spaces are maintained. The proposed development would therefore satisfy the above criterion.

#### Sustainability Measures

- 6.7 Policy D8 of the adopted SOLP 2011 requires proposals to incorporate sustainability measures in terms of energy, water and materials efficient design. Section 3 of the SODG 2008 recommends that single dwellings reach at least Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The application is accompanied by a pre-assessment report, which indicates that Level 3 would be achieved. The implementation of the measures outlined can be secured through a planning condition. Refuse, recycling and composting storage and collection facilities have been indicated in a similar position to the previous approval and can also be secured via a planning condition in accordance with Policy D10.

#### 7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The application proposal would comply with the relevant Development Plan Policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance and it is considered that, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would not materially harm the living conditions of nearby residents or the character and appearance of the area or result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

#### 8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

##### 8.1 **Grant Planning Permission**

1. **Standard 3 Year Time Limit**
2. **Approved Plans Condition**
3. **Details of slab levels and ridge heights prior to commencement**
4. **Schedule of materials prior to commencement**
5. **Removal of Permitted Development Rights relating to extensions, dormers, porch and outbuildings**
6. **Sustainability measures to be implemented prior to occupation**
7. **Refuse, recycling and composting facilities implemented prior to occupation**
8. **Provision of access (including culverting of ditch) and vision splays prior to occupation and thereafter maintained**
9. **Provision of parking and turning areas prior to occupation and retention of garage accommodation for parking of vehicles and cycles**

- 10. Details of hard and soft landscaping including replacement hedge planting and boundary treatment prior to commencement**
- 11. Submission of Contaminated Land Statement Questionnaire required prior to commencement**

Author: Paul Lucas  
Contact No: 01491 823434  
Email: [Planning.east@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.east@southoxon.gov.uk)