
APPLICATION NO.	P12/S0670/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	22.5.2012
PARISH	SHIPLAKE
WARD MEMBERS	Mr Malcolm Leonard & Mr Robert Simister
APPLICANT	Hamilton Properties Ltd
SITE	Quickwood, Plough Lane, Shiplake Cross
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing house and erection of two 2-storey 5-bedroom dwellings and one detached garage (Arboricultural Information received 19th June 2012).
AMENDMENTS	One - additional arboricultural information.
OFFICER	Paul Lucas

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee as a result of a conflict between officers' recommendation and the views of Shiplake Parish Council.

1.2 The application site is identified at **Appendix 1** and comprises a detached two storey four-bedroom mid-twentieth century dwelling, constructed from wooden cladding, render and concrete tiles. It also has a large detached garage/annexe building with dormer windows located in the north-eastern corner of the site at right angles to the dwelling. The house is set well back from road on the northern side of Plough Lane with the main garden area lying between the house and the road. The land rises slightly from the road towards the house. The site is accessed to a gravel hardstanding in front of the garage to the rear off a shared gravel driveway. This driveway also serves three other dwellings, two of which Russet and Pippin are located fairly close to the western side of the site. These two dwellings were granted planning permission in 2000 and are constructed from red brick and clay tiles. The other dwelling sharing the access is Easby Orchard, which lies about 35 metres to the north of the site boundary. The closest dwelling, Russet has main windows facing north and south, some secondary windows facing east of which the upper floors are obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. Two mature trees are located along the western boundary of the site with the shared driveway. Other trees and shrubs are located around the site boundaries. The site to east is presently under development with two dwellings, a replacement dwelling at the front of the site and a new-build dwelling at the rear of the site.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing house, the erection of a replacement two storey five-bedroom dwelling (Plot 1) on a similar part of the site continuing to be served by the existing driveway and garaging arrangements. The application also proposes the erection of a second two-storey five-bedroom dwelling (Plot 2) located towards the front of the site. Plot 1 would have a T-shaped plan with a two/storey link into the garage/annexe, positioned slightly further north and with a greater two-storey width than the existing dwelling. The gaps to the western and eastern boundaries would be 4 and 3 metres, respectively. The ridge would be about 7.7 metres high and it would have a 21 metres east-west axis and an 11.5 metres north-south axis incorporating gables, hipped and catslide roof elements.

2.2 The main windows would be orientated to face north and south, including a south-facing enclosed balcony. It would be constructed of facing bricks, cedar boarding detailing, handmade clay tiles and timber windows and doors. Plot 2 would also have a T-shaped plan. It would be located about 23 metres to the south of Plot 1 and 13 metres to the north of the front boundary with Plough Lane. The gaps to the western and eastern boundaries would be 4.5 and 1.5 metres, respectively. The ridge would be about 8.1 metres high and it would have a 13.5 metres east-west axis and a 14 metres north-south axis incorporating gables, hipped and catslide roof elements. The main windows would also be orientated to face north and south. The facing materials would be similar to those of Plot 1. Plot 2 would be accessed from a new opening onto the private driveway leading to a hardstanding and detached double garage located on its northern side. The main gardens for both plots would be located to the south of the proposed dwellings. Tree protection information was requested and submitted, detailing protection methodology for the important trees on the site.

2.3 The current plans of the proposed development can be found at **Appendix 2**. Other documents associated with the application can be viewed on the Council's [website](#).

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Shiplake Parish Council** – The application should be refused due to scale and bulk resulting in loss of light to Russet from Plot 1 and overlooking and loss of amenity of Russet from Plot 2. The additional access onto a narrow part of the shared driveway would result in problems of traffic generation and safety and unsuitable for construction vehicles. Overdevelopment of this site and its surroundings in the context of adjacent development.

Forestry Officer – No objection to the proposals on the basis of the submitted arboricultural method statement, no objection subject to a standard tree protection condition.

Highways Liaison Officer – The proposals involve the intensification of the use of an existing access by the net addition of a dwelling. This is not likely to lead to a severe impact, in highways terms and is therefore under the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) not a matter, upon which, an objection would be likely to be sustainable at appeal from this point of view. This is because the visibility at the access is adequate for the context and there is no other source of likely adverse highways impact. No objection, subject to a standard parking and turning condition.

Waste Management Officer - No objection

Neighbours – Four representations of objection, summarised as follows:

- Overlooking and loss of light to Russet from Plot 1 and Plot 2
- Traffic generation and highway safety risk from extra vehicles using drive adding to localised congestion due to existing drives, nearby junction, pub car park, bus stops and local schools
- Overdevelopment of site in context of adjacent development, cramped and detracting from the character of the area
- Noise nuisance to Russet, Pippin & Rose Cottage from additional vehicles using the gravel driveway
- New dwelling should share access with adjacent development instead
- Problems associated with construction vehicles using the driveway
- Threat to two mature trees positioned on the site boundary with the driveway
- Loss of privacy to Pippin

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 Last application received for this site: [P02/S0386](#) - Approved (24/07/2002)
Demolish existing garage and sheds and replace with new garage with room over.

- 4.2 Recent site history for the adjacent site to the east: [P11/E1013](#) - Approved (23/08/2011) Demolition of existing 2-storey dwelling and erection of two 2-storey 5-bedroom dwellings incorporating access alterations and garaging.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;
- C4 - Landscape setting of settlements
 - C8 - Adverse affect on protected species
 - C9 - Loss of landscape features
 - D1 - Principles of good design
 - D10 - Waste Management
 - D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
 - D3 - Outdoor amenity area
 - D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
 - D8 - Conservation and efficient use of energy
 - EP2 - Adverse affect by noise or vibration
 - EP6 - Sustainable drainage
 - EP8 - Contaminated land
 - G2 - Protect district from adverse development
 - G6 - Appropriateness of development to its site & surroundings
 - H13 - Extension to dwelling
 - H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt
 - H5 - Housing sites in larger villages in the Green Belt
 - T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
 - T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008 – Sections 3, 4 & 5

National Planning Policy Framework

The policies within the SOLP 2011 of relevance to this application are considered to be in general conformity with the provisions of the NPPF and therefore this application can be determined against these relevant policies.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The proposed dwelling would be located within the built-up area of the village of Lower Shiplake, 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;
- be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- compromise the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and the development would provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers;
- provide an adequate level of off-street parking spaces for the existing and proposed dwelling or other conditions prejudicial to highway safety; and
- incorporate sufficient sustainability and waste management measures.

6.2 Loss of Open Space

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 is an established private residential plot. It has no public access and due to mature planting in and around the site there are limited views from public land. The site has no particular ecological value.

6.3 Visual Impact

Criteria (ii) and (iii) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 seek to ensure that the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings and the character of the area is not adversely affected. The appearance of Quickwood is typical of the mid twentieth era and consequently there is no objection to its replacement. Although Plot 1 would have a greater two storey mass and increased ridge height, it would not be unduly prominent in the locality due to the distance of approximately 45 metres from Plough Lane, about 3 metres further back than the existing dwelling. The dwelling would have a narrow footprint, but this would enable it to have a more traditional appearance than Quickwood does presently. The surrounding boundary trees and shrubs would be retained and this would also help to soften the appearance of the dwelling in the locality. Plot 2 would be more noticeable in the locality due to its forward position in relation to both Quickwood and also of the neighbouring dwellings, Russet and Pippin. However, there are other two dwellings in the immediate locality that are positioned closer to the street, notably the adjacent plot (formerly the location of Shiplake Grange) to the east and No's 38 & 39 Plowden Way to the west. In this context, the introduction of a second dwelling in this location would not appear out of keeping with the locality, bearing in mind that the front gable would be 13.5 metres from the roadside boundary. Plot 2 would have a slightly higher ridge height than Plot 1, but this is similar to the ridge heights of the adjoining Shiplake Grange development and the ridge heights of Russet and Pippin. The footprint of Plot 2 would be more compact than Plot 1, but would also enable traditional materials to be used and would maintain a reasonable gap to either of the side boundaries. The established foliage around the front boundary of the site and the two mature trees along the driveway would be retained to the Forestry Officer's satisfaction. There is also a significant amount of planting on the western side of the Shiplake Grange site and mature trees and hedges in the front gardens of Russet and Pippin, which would also serve to provide natural screening of the additional dwelling in public views in either direction along Plough Lane. The garage would be located to the rear of this plot, along with the additional hard surfacing and would have a simple form, similar to those granted planning permission on the adjoining development. In light of this assessment, the proposed development would add to the variety of development in the surrounding area and would comply with the above criteria.

6.4 Neighbour Impact

Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. Criterion (v) explains that if the proposal constitutes backland development, it should not create problems of privacy or access. Plot 1 would occupy a similar position to Quickwood. Although the overall footprint would be moved further away from the western boundary, the first floor side wall would be closer to Russet. However, it would be about 10 metres from the side wall of Russet. The two first floor windows in this side wall of Russet are secondary windows and obscure glazed. Of the four ground floor windows, only one serves a habitable room, a kitchen. The side elevation of Plot 1 would lie to the north-east of this window and would be at a more oblique line of sight from this window than the existing first floor side wall of Quickwood. The existing single storey side wall, which is much closer would be removed and sunlight currently received from the south-easterly direction would not be interrupted by the replacement dwelling. Plot 1 would project further to the rear of Russet than Quickwood, but it would remain outside a 45-degree line of sight from the main windows on the north elevation of Russet. There would be a bedroom window in the west-facing first floor side wall of Plot 1, which would face across the front elevation of Russet. However, as this is a secondary window to 'bedroom 1', an obscure glazing/ fixed shut condition could be imposed to prevent loss of privacy.

- 6.5 Views from the proposed first floor front balcony would be primarily over its own garden, views directly towards Russet would be prevented by the balcony being recessed behind the side wall and views towards the neighbouring garden would be over a distance of about 20 metres at an angle greater than 45-degrees. The relationship of Plot 1 to Easby Orchard to the rear would be similar to the existing situation, however, as the rear projecting wing would be about 7.5 metres closer to the boundary, the first floor windows on this element serving a bathroom and stairwell should also be obscure glazed to prevent any overlooking of the adjoining garden from a distance of 10 metres. None of the other rear-facing windows would serve habitable rooms. The relationship to the recently constructed dwelling at the rear of the Shiplake Grange site would be similar to the existing situation with Quickwood and the retention of the boundary foliage on that side. The impact on Pippin would not be significant, due to the greater level of separation compared with Russet.
- 6.6 In respect of Plot 2, the closest hipped end elevation, spanning a depth of 6 metres, would be about 9 metres from the side boundary of the garden of Russet on the opposite side of the driveway. The main depth of Plot 2 would be further away at a distance between 16 and 19 metres. This level of separation would be sufficient to prevent loss of light or outlook to the adjoining garden. Plot 2 would appear within a 45-degree line of sight from the south-facing windows of Russet, serving a living room, conservatory at ground floor and one of the bedrooms at first floor. However, there would be a distance of between 15-20 metres between these windows and the closest part of Plot 2 and the mature trees to be retained along the driveway would lie in between. Given these distances, any loss of morning sunlight would be likely to be limited and not sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission. The distance to the aforementioned kitchen side window would be over 25 metres and at an oblique angle, so this would also be an acceptable relationship. There is a corner window serving 'bedroom 5', which would enable some views towards Russet, but the closest window to window distance would be 25 metres, which would accord with the recommended standard. The other first floor side windows would serve bathrooms and could be obscure glazed. All other main windows would face north and south. Consequently, there would be no significant overlooking and loss of privacy to Russet from Plot 2. The impact on Pippin would also be acceptable due to the additional level of separation involved. The 20 metre gap between Plot 2 and the dwelling under construction at the front of Shiplake Grange would lead to an adequate relationship having regard to the amount of intervening foliage and the obscure glazing of first floor windows.
- 6.7 In terms of the relationship between the south elevation of Plot 1 and the north elevation of Plot 2, there are several first floor windows to habitable rooms facing towards each other. However, only 'bedroom 5' of Plot 2, at about 23 metres, is under the 25 metre recommended distance from the windows at the rear of the proposed dwelling to the north. This is acceptable in this particular instance, given that the dwellings would not be angled directly towards each other and that this window is a corner window and so has a dual aspect. The garden areas for both dwellings would be in compliance with recommended standards. Concerns about noise nuisance from additional vehicular use of the driveway by one additional domestic property using a smaller section of the drive than the existing dwellings would not be sufficient reason to warrant refusal of planning permission, having regard to environmental protection officers' experience that this would not generate a statutory nuisance. On the basis of this assessment, the proposed development would on balance meet the above criteria and guidance.

6.8 Access and Parking

Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 also requires that there are no overriding highway objections. Criterion (v) explains that if the proposal constitutes backland development, it should not create problems of privacy or access. Although the proposals involve the intensification of the use of an existing access by the net addition of a dwelling, the Highway Liaison Officer considers that this would not be likely to lead to a severe impact and consequently an objection on highway safety grounds would be unlikely to be sustainable at appeal. This is because the visibility at the access would remain adequate for the context and there is no other source of likely adverse highways impact, subject to the imposition of a standard parking and turning condition. The HLO is also satisfied that a construction management plan would not be necessary for construction vehicles. The proposed development would therefore satisfy the above criterion.

6.9 Sustainability Measures and Waste Management

Policy D8 of the 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 sustainability template submitted with the application sets out a few measures with a view to achieving Level 3. A planning condition is recommended requiring a more comprehensive list of measures to be submitted and implemented prior to occupation. An appropriate location for refuse, recycling and composting collection could also be secured within the site via a planning condition in accordance with Policy D10. Both of these aspects could be secured through planning conditions.

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 **Planning Permission**

1. **Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission**
2. **planning condition listing the approved drawings**
3. **Levels (details required)**
4. **Sample materials required (all)**
5. **Obscure glazed and fixed shut west-facing bedroom window and north-facing bathroom and stairwell windows to Plot 1 and all side-facing windows to Plot 2**
6. **Withdrawal of Permitted Development Rights**
7. **Sustainable Method of Construction - Dwelling**
8. **Refuse & Recycling Storage (Details required)**
9. **Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained**
10. **Cycle Parking Facilities (Details required)**
11. **Landscaping (access/hard standings/fencing/walls)**
12. **Tree Protection (General)**
13. **Contamination (investigation)**

Author: Paul Lucas
Contact No: 01491 823434
Email: Planning.east@southandvale.gov.uk