

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P16/S2257/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	1.7.2016
<b>PARISH</b>	CHOLSEY
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Pat Dawe Jane Murphy
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr L Peacock
<b>SITE</b>	46 Crescent Way, Cholsey OX10 9NG
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	New three bed dwelling attached to existing and single storey extension to rear aspect.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	As amended by revised plans received on 14 August 2016.
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	458684/186127
<b>OFFICER</b>	Gabriella Brown

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been referred to the Planning Committee because the officer recommendation conflicts with that of the Parish Council.
- 1.2 The application site is shown on the OS extract **attached** at Appendix 1 and it measures some 0.026 hectares. No. 46 Crescent is a two storey semi-detached dwelling and it is located within the built-up limits of Cholsey on the corner of Crescent Way and Kentwood Close. The exterior of the property is finished in facing brickwork and the pitched, hipped roof is clad in concrete tiles. There is vehicular access to the rear of the property from Kentwood Close and there is a detached garage/outbuilding within the rear garden.
- 1.3 The property lies within an area of archaeological constraint.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission to erect a new three bedroom dwelling to the side of No.46 Crescent Way and to erect a single storey extension to the rear of the existing property. The plot is to be divided to create an amenity area for both dwellings with off-road parking at the rear of the site accessed from Kentwood Close.
- 2.2 The proposed scheme has been amended during the course of the application to show a reduction in the width of the two storey section of the proposed dwelling, a small reduction in its depth at ground floor level in order to achieve a larger rear garden and a reduction in the number of bedrooms at the new property from four to three. The amended scheme also shows all of the parking provision for the two properties at the rear of the site as the area to the front of No.46 does not comply with SODC's parking standards in terms of its size.
- 2.3 The plans of the proposed development are **attached** at Appendix 2. Full details of the application and the consultation responses can be viewed on the Council's website at [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk)

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 3.1 Original Plans
- 3.2 **Cholsey Parish Council** – Object. The planned dwelling is over-development and is un-neighbourly. In addition, there are existing issues with parking in this location which would be made worse by this development.

- 3.3 **County Archaeological Services** - The proposals outlined would not appear to have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme.
- 3.4 **OCC (Highways)** – Refuse. The proposed access taken from Crescent Way does not provide pedestrian visibility splays in accordance with standard; given the proximity to the neighbouring boundary this is unlikely to be achievable. The parking space fronting Crescent Way does not take into account vehicle ‘shyness’ an extra 0.5m is required to the length of the parking space so as to prevent vehicle overhang over the footway. Pedestrian access to the front door of the existing dwelling will be affected and does not accord with standards set out within the document ‘Inclusive Mobility’.
- 3.5 **Neighbour Representations (1)** - Object. The proposal is overdevelopment, there are access issues and concerns over parking. The new dwelling would come up to the path, changing the street scene and the building line. The application mentions 4 parking spaces. There are currently up to 6 vehicles parked at the property and I have concerns that the on-street parking would continue which causes problems for access of delivery vehicles.
- 3.6 Amended Plans
- 3.7 **Cholsey Parish Council** – Object. Council consider that the planned dwelling is over-development and is unneighbourly, in addition there are existing issues with parking in this location which would be made worse by this development.
- 3.8 **OCC (Highways)** – Approve. Revised plans have been submitted which show the removal of the parking space to the front of the proposal. In addition it is noted the existing garage accommodation will be removed in order to provide the parking allocation for the proposal along with the existing. No change is proposed to the existing access arrangements. The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network.
- 3.9 **Neighbour Representations (2)**  
- Object. The amendment has done little to ease my concerns so I write to continue to object about this development on the grounds it is over development of the site, not in keeping with the street scene, issues with access and parking concerns. I urge councillors and officers to visit this site to view the parking situation and size of the plot.  
  
- No objection to the proposed extension to the rear of No.46.
- 4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**
- 4.1 [P12/S3177/HH](#) - Approved (18/03/2013)  
Proposed ground front and rear extension and first floor side extension. As clarified by agent e-mail dated 28 February 2013.
- 5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**
- 5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy policies;
- CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction  
CSQ3 - Design  
CSR1 - Housing in villages  
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy
- 5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;
- D1 - Principles of good design  
D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles

- D3 - Outdoor amenity area
- D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
- G2 - Protect district from adverse development
- H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt
- T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
- T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

### 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

## 6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main considerations in the determination of the application are:

- The principle of the proposed development
- Whether it would be detrimental to an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value
- Whether the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are acceptable
- Whether the character of the area would be adversely affected
- Whether there are any overriding amenity, environmental or highway objections
- Whether the proposal constitutes backland development
- Parking and amenity provision
- Sustainability
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Other considerations

6.2 **The principle of the proposed development.** Cholsey is categorised at Appendix 4 of the SOCS as a larger village. Policy CSR1 of the SOCS permits infill development within the built up limits of the larger villages and infill is defined in the supporting text to the policy as “the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage or on other sites within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings”.

6.3 46 Crescent Way is located within the built-up limits of the settlement and it is surrounded on all four sides by other dwellings. Your officers therefore consider that the site does constitute an infill plot and that the principle of the proposed residential development is acceptable.

6.4 The development must also comply with the criteria of saved Policy H4 of the SOLP which are explored below:

6.5 **Whether it would be detrimental to an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value.** The plot currently comprises part of the private garden belonging to No.46 Crescent Way and it contains a large garage/outbuilding at the rear of the site. The plot is contained by a high close boarded fence and it is surrounded on all sides by residential development. No locally important views are gained across the site and there is no record of any protected species on the site itself or in the surrounding area. Your officers do not therefore consider that the erection of a new dwelling on the plot would result in the loss of an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value.

- 6.6 **Whether the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are acceptable.** The existing property, a two storey dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair and it is part of a 1950's residential development. There is a mixture of property types on Crescent Way including two storey semi-detached and terraced properties and single storey bungalows. Some of the neighbouring properties have been altered and extended (largely at single storey level) and in 2013 planning permission was granted for a two storey extension to the side of the application property. The extension has not been built but it was just 0.3 metres narrower than the two storey element of the proposed dwelling.
- 6.7 The plans show that the new dwelling would be set back from the façade of No.46 by just under 0.5 metres and the new roof would be set down from the existing ridgeline by some 0.15 metres. The single storey element is set back from the façade of No.46 by over 2.5 metres and it is of a simple lean-to form. The width of the new dwelling has been reduced during the course of the application and its general appearance is of a subservient two storey side extension. The simple elevations of the host property have been carried through in to the proposed dwelling as has the arrangement and style of openings. Meanwhile, the exterior of the new dwelling is to be finished in brick and tile to match No.46 and the surrounding properties.
- 6.8 **Whether the character of the area would be adversely affected.** Although the development would turn the existing pair of semis' in to a terrace, this is not at odds with the type of properties within the immediate area as there are other terraced dwellings immediately adjacent to and opposite the application site. In addition, the proposed dwelling would be accessed from Kentwood Close such that in views from Crescent Way, it would appear as a traditional extension to the side of No.46. Your officers therefore consider that the development would have a similar impact on the character of the property and the street scene as the two storey side extension approved in 2013.
- 6.9 The two storey element of the new dwelling would be set back from the side (northern) boundary of the site by more than 2 metres and the single storey element by 1 metre with only the open sided porch projecting right up to the edge of the pavement.
- 6.10 Having regard to the earlier permission for a two storey extension and to the fact that there are other terraced properties on the road your officers do not consider that the proposed development would have a materially harmful impact on the character of the streetscene or the wider area. Furthermore, the proposal would provide an additional unit of accommodation in a sustainable location.
- 6.11 In order to protect the visual amenity of the area in the future and given the fact that the plot is being subdivided, I consider that it would be appropriate to remove Class A and E permitted development rights (extensions and outbuildings) for the proposed and host dwelling.
- 6.12 **Whether there are any overriding amenity, environmental or highway objections. Amenity considerations**  
Policies D4 and H4 of the SOLP seek to resist development that would be harmful to the amenities of occupants of nearby properties or that would not provide a sufficient level of amenity for occupiers of the new dwelling.
- 6.13 The proposed two storey extension would be located at a distance of over 19 metres from the rear boundary of the site which also forms the side boundary of No.1 Kentwood Close. The neighbouring property is itself set away from the shared boundary by approximately 1 metre. As such, the overall distance between the side of 1

Kentwood Close and the rear of the new dwelling would be some 20 metres. Having regard to this considerable distance as well as to the fact that this relationship is not dissimilar to the one that already exists between the two dwellings your officers do not consider that the development would have an overbearing or oppressive impact on the amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring property or detract from their privacy.

- 6.14 The proposed dwelling would be located on the opposite side of the road to No.44 Crescent Way and no habitable upper floor windows are proposed within the side elevation of the new dwelling. Due to the degree of separation that would exist between the two properties and to the fact that the development would not introduce any direct overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling or its private amenity area your officers do not consider that the development would detract from the residential amenity of the occupants of 44 Crescent Way.
- 6.15 As part of the proposals a single storey extension is to be erected to the rear of No.44. This would serve to mitigate any impact on the host property by the new dwelling. The proposed extension would project beyond the rear of No.48 Crescent Way by some 3.6 metres. No.48 hasn't itself been extended to the rear and in such circumstances, only a 3 metre deep extension would normally be permitted on the shared boundary with the adjoining property. However, the occupants of No.48 have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed extension such that it is reasonable to assume that the applicant has a permitted development fall-back position for an identical, if not deeper extension, in the same location as that proposed.
- 6.16 The host property would retain a good sized garden area and only oblique views of the garden would be possible from the first floor windows of the new dwelling which is a common and accepted relationship in a built-up residential area such as this.
- 6.17 **Environmental considerations**  
As the proposal involves the loss of a small proportion of a suburban garden and does not result in the demolition of any structures that would be suitable for roosting bats there are no objections on environmental grounds.
- 6.18 **Highway considerations**  
The highway liaison officer has considered the merits of the proposed development and given that no changes are proposed to existing access arrangements and that the Council's parking standard can be met he is satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the highway network or on pedestrian safety.
- 6.19 **Whether the proposal constitutes backland development.** The proposed dwelling would have a road frontage and the proposal does not constitute backland development.
- 6.20 **Parking and amenity provision**  
As a result of the proposed development there would be the existing two bedroom dwelling on the site as well as the new three bedroom property. The Council's maximum parking requirement for these dwellings would be four spaces. The submitted plans show that the existing garage is to be demolished and that four spaces are to be provided at the rear of the site. As such, there would be a total of four spaces on the site which is located within close proximity of the village centre and the railway station.
- 6.21 The garden area for the existing dwelling would measure just over 55 sq metres which exceeds the Council's amenity requirement for a two bedroom property of 50 sq metres and the proposed dwelling would have a garden area measuring 97.57 sq metres which

is just 2.43 sq metres below the Council's requirement of 100 sq metres. There are also allotment gardens and playing fields within walking distance of the site.

6.22 **Sustainability.** Policy CSQ2 of the SOCS seeks to ensure that all new development demonstrates high standards in the conservation and efficient use of energy, water and materials. It requires that any new building must be designed to achieve at least level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The policy is no longer up to date as a result of the government's withdrawal of the Code in March 2015. The Development Plan Policies have yet to be updated to take account of the new technical standards and so the property will need to meet with current building regulations in terms of energy performance and water efficiency and this will be controlled under the building regulations application.

6.23 **Community Infrastructure Levy.** The Council adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy in April 2016. In Cholsey the CIL rate for residential development is £150 per sq. m. Monies will be levied on gross internal floorspace (in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended). The applicant has provided the required CIL forms which demonstrate that the floor area of the new property is 97 sq m such that the levy for the development will be £14,550.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

Your officers recommend that planning permission is granted on the basis that the principle of infill development is acceptable within the built-up limits of Cholsey and the design and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the established character of the area. The Highway Officer is satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety and the relationship of the dwelling with neighbouring properties is acceptable. The relevant parking and amenity standards can be met and the proposal is otherwise in accordance with Development Plan Policies.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 **To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 : Commencement three yearss - full planning permission.
- 2 : Approved plans.
- 3 : Matching materials (walls and roof).
- 4 : Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.
- 5 : Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class E) - no outbuildings etc.
- 6 : Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.

**Author:** Gabriella Brown  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)