
APPLICATION NO.	P11/E1161
APPLICATION TYPE	Planning application
REGISTERED	13 July 2011
PARISH	Aston Rowant
WARD MEMBER	Mrs D Brown
APPLICANT	Mr and Mrs Brine
SITE	3 Plowden Park, Aston Rowant
PROPOSAL	Single storey extensions and front porch
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	473148/199238
OFFICER	Mrs H Moore

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is referred to Planning Committee at the discretion of the Development Manager.
- 1.2 The site lies within the main confines of Aston Rowant in an area of housing constructed in the 1960's. The property is a detached house with an attached flat roofed garage, constructed in red brick with a tiled roof. There is a mature oak tree in the front garden protected by a tree preservation order.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to add single storey additions to the property. The additions comprise a 2.6m extension to the front of the garage and the addition of a pitched roof over that and the whole of the existing flat roofed section at the side of the house. An additional flat roofed section, some 4.9m in length, is proposed to the side/rear of the property, and a new porch is proposed on the front of the property. The extensions would provide an extended kitchen and family room, a utility room, and retention of a garage. The extensions are proposed in materials to match the existing house.
- 2.2 The proposal is an amended scheme following the refusal of planning application P11/E0536 which proposed ground and first floor extensions.
- 2.3 A Design and Access statement accompanies the application. The agent advises that, in his view, the revised proposal addresses the design and neighbourly issues specified in the reasons for refusal set out for application P11/E0536. He advises that the extensions will be screened from the neighbouring property by an existing garden wall and by the wall of the neighbour's house. In his view, the proposed tiled roof, sloping away from the boundary, would result in minimal impact to the neighbouring property and would have a minimal effect upon the existing visual gap between the properties. He confirms that the applicants are not proposing any changes to the existing driveway arrangements and that works to the protected tree have always been with the approval of SODC's Forestry Officer. In the agent's view, the proposed extensions comply with the Council's policies and guidance.
- 2.4 Plans **attached** to the report at Appendix 1 show the location of the site and details of the proposals. Other documentation associated with the application can be viewed on the council's website, www.southoxon.gov.uk

3.0 **CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Aston Rowant Parish Council – No objection raised.

Forestry Officer – No objection raised, subject to the imposition of a tree protection condition.

Neighbour responses –

1 letter of no objection received.

3 letters of objection received. The objections raised include the following matters –

- There has been a total lack of consultation from the architect on any of the submitted proposals.
- It is difficult to acquire a copy of the plans from the Parish Council.
- The proposals contravene the principles set out in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG), in particular sections 6.2.2 and 6.3.2, and Policies H13, D1, D4, G2 and G6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.
- Plowden Park is a development of spaciouly positioned Neo-Georgian houses, which have symmetry and regular spaces between them. It is a fine example of what was created in the 1960's. The proposals would seriously damage the homogenous character of the road.
- The proposed front extension and rear extensions contravene the 3m limit for extensions set out in the SODG.
- The existing and proposed side extensions will increase from 10.5m length to a massive 18m, and will be fully visible above the existing 1.8m wall. It will detract from the echelon layout of the houses.
- The proposed pitched roof will be nearly as high as the eaves of the house, will cover 75% of the length of the side extension, and the original structure would no longer be the dominant element. The pitched roof will infill the spacious gap between the properties, restricting views of the countryside beyond and restricting surveillance of the roadway. It will cut light from ground and first floor windows and will contravene the 45 degree line taken from my windows. It will create an undesirable precedent for others in the row to provide pitched roofs. The proposed roof light in the rear extension is unnecessary.
- A flat roof, of modern construction specification, would be a much more satisfactory solution than a pitched roof and would blend with the existing street scene.
- The proposed extension will severely compromise the existing off-street parking capacity and will lead to future overspill parking by visitors.
- The property is registered as a trading address.
- The proposed extension will compromise the 9m diameter root protection area of the oak tree in the front garden which is protected by a Tree Protection Order. Construction vehicles and storage of equipment are likely to adversely affect the health of the tree.
- The proposed porch and associated fenestration changes will be out of keeping with the discrete porticos in Plowden Park.
- The agent claims that his revised design has been formulated under direction from the Local Planning Authority. This excludes the opinions of those directly affected.
- The revised proposals do not overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous application.
- It will be difficult to match the materials for the extensions with those used on

the existing building.

- A similar application at number 10 Plowden Park was rejected, and any forward extension in Plowden Park should be rejected.
- Residents will not be aware of planning applications now that site notices are not displayed.

3.2 Copies of all correspondence and submitted information can be viewed on the Council's web site www.southoxon.gov.uk

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P11/E0536 – Single and two storey extensions and front porch. Refusal of planning permission.

P11/E0064 – Single and two storey extensions and front porch. Application withdrawn.

P63/M0673 – Site and layout for 14 detached dwellings and garages with roads, installation of sewage disposal plant. Planning permission granted.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP) Policies G2, G6, C9, H13, D1, D2, D3, D4, T1

South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG) 2008

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The principal issues to be considered are –

- Whether the scale and design of the proposal is in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area.
- Whether the amenity of occupants of nearby properties is materially harmed.
- Whether adequate and satisfactory parking and amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling.
- Whether the proposals would prejudice the health of the mature oak tree
- Other issues

Scale and Design

6.2 Policy H13 of the SOLP requires that the scale and design of extensions are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area.

6.3 Design advice in relation to domestic development is contained in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG). The following paragraphs are of particular relevance –

6.2.3 Retain proportions

Keep the form and scale of the extension proportionate to the house and plot.

The original building should remain the dominant element of the property whether you have one extension or several. The effect of any extension should not overwhelm the house from any given view point.

6.3.2 Side extensions.

- You should normally set side extensions back from the front of the house. This will keep the proportions of the existing building and reduce the visual impact of the join between the existing and new materials. This is particularly important on symmetrical properties or identical semi detached properties. As

a guide, the set back should be at least 0.5metres. You will need to justify anything different in a Design and Access Statement.

- Extensions should relate to the scale and proportions of the original building and should be generally narrower than the original in width of frontage and depth from front to back.
- In general you should set the ridgeline of the roof of a two storey extension lower than the ridge of the original house. However, this does depend on the existing building height, roof pitch and current building regulations. As a guide, the set down should be at least 0.5metres. You would need to justify anything different in a Design and Access statement.
- We would normally refuse permission for extensions that would close an important gap within the street scene or lead to a terracing effect.

6.3.4 Front extensions

- Front extensions can damage the appearance of a dwelling and have a harmful impact on the street scene.
- Front extensions will often be resisted, where they are allowed, any proposed front extension should be limited in size.

6.4 The existing dwelling at 3 Plowden Park is a substantial property of Neo Georgian style, and is one in a row of similar houses. The houses are generally set well back from the road/access track and the overall appearance is one of substantial houses spaciouly laid out. The gap above the flat roofed double garages between the houses add to the spacious feel to the area and the long front gardens, mature trees and views through to open land beyond give a rural feel to the development. In this particular case, number 3 Plowden Park is set back some 20 m from the access road, and there is a gap at first floor between this and the adjacent property of some 7 metres. The previous planning application proposed a first floor extension in the gap between the houses, and planning permission was refused on the basis that the closure of the gap would detract from the spacious setting of the dwellings and the character of the area. The current proposal is to add a pitched roof over the existing flat roof and proposed front extension. The ridge of the pitched roof is some 3.7m below the ridge of the main house and is of hipped design to minimize its bulk and massing. In these circumstances, officers consider that the proposed pitched roof would not fill in the visual gap between the properties and that the spacious setting of the properties would be maintained. Other properties in Plowden Park have added pitched roofs over the garages, and officers consider that these single storey pitched roofs have not detracted from the spacious character of the area.

6.5 The proposals include a front extension some 2.6m in length. Whilst in some instances a front extension could detract from the appearance of a property, in this case, the existing garage already projects in front of the main wall of the house. The addition of a further modest front extension and the addition of a pitched roof would not, in the opinion of officers detract from the overall appearance of the dwelling in the street scene. Similarly, the proposed rear/side single storey extension would not detract from the overall appearance of the dwelling. Although the overall length of the side extension to the dwelling exceeds the depth of the existing house, the width of the extension is narrower than the main house, and the proposed extension would appear as a subservient addition to the main house. The original house will remain as the dominant element of the property, and the appearance of the proposed extensions would not overwhelm the house from any point of view. The proposed porch is modest in size, satisfactory in design and would appear as a subservient addition to the house.

- 6.6 Whilst one objector has referred to a refusal of planning permission at 10 Plowden Park, this was a refusal of planning permission for a first floor extension in 1988. Planning permission was subsequently granted for a single storey front extension in 1989.
- 6.7 In conclusion, officers consider that the scale and design of the proposed extensions to 3 Plowden Park are acceptable and that the proposed pitched roof would retain a sufficient gap between this house and number 2 Plowden Park such that the spacious setting of the houses and the character of the area is maintained.

Amenity of occupants of nearby properties.

- 6.8 Policy H13 of the SOLP requires that proposed extensions do not materially harm the amenity of occupants of nearby properties. Further advice in relation to development close to neighbours is contained in the SODG. The following paragraph is of particular relevance –

6.2.2

Be considerate to your neighbours.

Think about your neighbours when designing your extension. Consider size, how close it will be to them, overlooking and privacy.

- make sure an extension does not intrude upon a neighbour's privacy
- consider the size, position and form of the extension in relation to adjoining properties and the path of the sun so that overshadowing and loss of daylight are minimal,
- any extension should not lead to an oppressive or overbearing impact, which would be harmful to the amenity of occupiers of nearby dwellings,
- new windows should avoid overlooking neighbouring properties,
- a single storey extension should generally not extend more than 3 metres out from the original building where it adjoins or is closely positioned to neighbouring buildings.

- 6.9 In relation to overlooking, the windows in the proposed rear extension look over the rear garden of the applicant's property and the side window looks towards the neighbour's fence at 4 Plowden Park. The window and door in the side facing number 2 Plowden Park look towards the boundary wall between the properties. In these circumstances officers consider that the proposed extensions would not result in any significant overlooking of adjoining properties.
- 6.10 In terms of overshadowing, the extensions lie to the west of the adjoining property, number 2 Plowden Park. The pitched roof over the existing and proposed single storey section of the property is hipped at the front and is pitched away from the neighbour's house. As this section of the house lies adjacent to the existing boundary fencing/walls and adjacent to the side wall of number 2, the proposal is unlikely to result in any significant overshadowing. In addition, number 2 would retain a full southerly aspect to its rear windows, rear garden and sitting out areas. In these circumstances officers consider that any loss of light to the front garden area of number 2 would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of that property.
- 6.11 With regard to whether the extensions would be overbearing, the two storey section of 3 Plowden Park is sited some 6 metres in front of the neighbouring property, number 2. The property is, therefore, already significant in views from the front windows and has an impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property. On the previous application, a first floor extension was proposed and was considered to constitute unneighbourly development. The proposals have now been reduced to single storey

only with a pitched roof that slopes away from the neighbouring property. In these circumstances, officers consider that the additions to the property would not have any further significant impact on the amenity of the adjoining property.

- 6.12 With regard to the impact of the rear extension, although it does protrude more than 3m from the original building, the extension lies adjacent to the side wall of the adjoining property. Whilst the whole of the single storey development would result in a long narrow passage between the two properties, as there is already a fence/wall along the boundary, officers consider that the single storey extensions would not result in significant harm to the adjoining property.
- 6.13 In conclusion, officers consider that the proposed extensions would not significantly detract from the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

Parking and amenity areas.

- 6.14 The property would retain a parking space within the garage and two parking spaces on the driveway. Accordingly, the on site parking provision would comply with the Council's guidelines. Whilst concern has been raised by the neighbour that the extension could be used as office accommodation which would result in the need for additional on-site parking, the extension is not proposed for commercial purposes. Any material change of use of the property to office accommodation would require the further grant of planning permission.
- 6.15 The property sits in large gardens which would be retained and comply with the Council's guidelines for the provision of private amenity areas.

Impact on the tree protected by a Tree Protection Order.

- 6.16 The submitted plans show the position of the mature oak tree in the front garden in relation to the proposed development. The Forestry Officer has considered the proposals and has advised that no elements of the proposed development are within the oak's root protection area. Accordingly, he raises no objection to the development subject to the imposition of a planning condition requiring the tree to be protected during construction works.

Other Issues

- 6.17 The principal objector to the application has raised other issues relating to the processing of planning applications.
- 6.18 With regard to consultation with neighbours by the applicant before a planning application is submitted, this is a recommended course of action set out in the SODG, and is not mandatory.
- 6.19 The objector expresses concern that the Parish Council does not consult neighbours, and has preferential access to plans. However, Parish Council processes are a matter for the Parish. In addition, plans are available to be viewed on the Council's web site, and copies can also be viewed at the District Council's Offices.
- 6.20 Whilst the objector has complained that the public are no longer aware of planning proposals because the Council no longer displays site notices, this measure has been introduced for cost reasons, and the Council continues to notify those directly affected by development such as adjoining occupiers.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan Policies and it is considered that, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of nearby residents.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. **Commencement detailed 3 years.**
2. **Compliance with submitted plans.**
3. **Matching materials walls and roof.**
4. **Submission, approval and implementation of a tree protection scheme.**

Author: Mrs H Moore
Contact No: 01491 823732
Email Add: planning.east@southandvale.gov.uk