

APPLICATION NO.	P17/S0908/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	13.3.2017
PARISH	DIDCOT
WARD MEMBER(S)	Mocky Khan Anthony Dearlove Anthony Nash
APPLICANT	Mrs J Gibbons
SITE	48 Abbott Road, Didcot, OX11 8HU
PROPOSAL	Provision of 1 no new dwelling in addition to existing (As amended by drawings accompanying e-mail from agent received 19 July 2017 deleting the previously proposed detached dwelling)
OFFICER	Paul Bowers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is referred to planning committee because the views of the Didcot Town Council differ from the officer’s recommendation.

1.2 48 Abbott Road is one half of a semi-detached two storey dwelling on a corner plot at the junction of Abbott Road and Abbott Close. Vehicular access is to the rear off Abbott Close and a detached single garage is located in the rear garden.

1.3 A plan identifying the site can be found at **Appendix 1** to this report.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application in its amended form has been reduced from the creation of a detached dwelling in the garden of number 48 Abbott Road and an attached two storey, 3 bedroom dwelling to a single attached dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling. Access is proposed at the rear alongside parking for the existing dwelling and involves the widening of the access and dropped kerb.

2.2 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application can be found at **Appendix 2** to this report. All the plans and representations can be viewed on the council’s website www.southoxon.gov.uk under the planning application reference number.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Didcot Town Council** – Recommend the application for refusal of planning permission on original and amended schemes. Their reasons for refusal in relation to the current amended scheme;

- Impact on the street scene.

Neighbour Representations –

5 x objections to the original plans showing 2 dwellings.

- Loss of light to 1 and 27 Abbott Close and 68 Abbott Close.
- Reduction in property values.
- Current provision for new housing in Didcot meets the need.
- Additional traffic movements.
- Detached dwelling would be overbearing and oppressive and cause overlooking.

- Insufficient parking provision and garden space.
- Development will cause drainage problems locally.
- Overdevelopment at odds with other properties.

3 x objections to the amended plans altering the detached dwelling to become a 2 bedroom unit.

- Harmful effects from construction work.
- Increased parking on the highway.
- At odds with the surrounding area in terms of size of plots.
- Adequate housing already being provided in Didcot.

3 x objections to the third and final amendment deleting the detached dwelling and amending the scheme to a single end of terrace dwelling.

- Parking on the plans would reduce space for visitors to other properties to park on the road.
- Concern over visibility for existing cars.
- No need for additional housing.
- No need for a dwelling given the housing already being provided in Didcot.
- Overdevelopment.

Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objection to the final amended scheme for a single dwelling with conditions.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) Policies

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSDID3 - New housing at Didcot

CSQ3 - Design

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 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

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The issues to consider in relation to this proposal are;

- **The principle of development.**
- **Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4.**
- **Plot coverage and garden size.**
- **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**
- **Impact on highway safety.**

- **Community Infrastructure Levy.**

6.2 The principle of development.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

6.3 In the case of this application, the most relevant parts of the Development Plan are the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) which was adopted in December 2012 and the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP).

6.4 Development which is not in accordance with an up-to-date development plan should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.5 Policy CSDID3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) permits infill development within Didcot.

Infill development is defined in the Appendix 1 of SOCS 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'*.

6.6 The site is located within the town on a corner plot within an established residential estate. The site has a frontage on to the street and is surrounded on all sides by existing dwellings. This is within the meaning of infill development. Although Policy CSDID3 is out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged, this development complies with its criteria. It also represents a sustainable form of development due to its position within one of the four main towns in the district and has good access to existing services.

Therefore there is a clear presumption in favour of granting planning permission in this instance unless as stated above, there are significant and demonstrable impacts that outweigh the benefits of this development.

6.7 Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4 of SOLP.

If a proposed housing development is acceptable in principle then the detail of the proposal must be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4 which deals with new housing.

Provision (i) of Policy H4 *states 'an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important view spoilt.'*

The site is part of a residential garden. It does not comprise an important public open space.

The site has no ecological value and the development will not spoil or harm any important views beyond the site.

6.8 Provision (ii) *states 'the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings.'* whilst Provision (iii) *states that the 'character of the area is not adversely affected.'*

The dwelling is in effect an extension of the existing 48 Abbott Road and continues the ridge line of the roof and alignment of the front and rear walls. It replicates the design and positioning of the openings and appears in the context of the street scene a natural progression of the existing building. It also mirrors the development on the opposite side of the junction to the east at 68 Abbott Road. In my view the form and character of the building is entirely in keeping with the established character of the area, which includes rows of terrace properties.

The plot size of the development will be smaller than the existing number 48 and the other half of the pair of semis at number 46 Abbott Road. However, when considering the location plan it can be seen that in the wider context of the area the plot sizes and shapes differ considerably. Plot size is dealt with in greater detail below but in terms of the impact the plot size will have on the wider character of the area I conclude that it will not cause significant or appreciable harm

Provision iv) of Policy H4 states that there should be no overriding amenity or environmental or highway objections.

In terms of amenity this refers to both the amenity space being provided for the occupants of the existing and new property and also the amenity of occupants of nearby properties. These issues are also covered by other policies within SOLP such as Policy D3 and T1 and they are considered separately as they are fundamental issues to this proposal.

6.9 Plot coverage and garden size.

Policy D3 of SOCS seeks to ensure that new dwellings should provide adequate private outdoor space. The amount of land to be used for garden or amenity space will be determined by the size of the dwelling and the character of surrounding development.

6.10 The South Oxfordshire Design Guide sets out the minimum amount of private amenity space for 3 bedroom units and above at 100 square metres. The inability to provide these minimum standards would be an indicator that a proposal amounts to an overdevelopment.

6.11 The new dwelling provides for 115 square metres of private amenity space. The existing dwelling retains an area of 125 square metres. Therefore both properties would exceed the council's minimum standards. I therefore conclude that what is proposed will not amount to an overdevelopment of the plot.

6.12 Neighbour impact.

The dwelling extends the form of the existing 48 Abbott Road to the east. In terms of the impact to that property the only potential impact would be from first floor windows overlooking from the east where they don't at the moment because the property is on a corner plot. However this level and degree of overlooking is the same as is possible from the existing 46 Abbott Road. In my view the new dwelling will not harm the amenities of the occupants of the existing dwelling. The new dwelling is further away from number 46 Abbott Road and as a consequence in terms of overlooking it would have even less of an impact than the existing windows of number 48.

The property to the north in Abbott Close is side on to the application site. Whilst the new dwelling has an outlook toward that property there will be no greater level of overlooking of that property than what is already experienced from the existing floor

windows at numbers 46 and 48. The new dwelling is to the south but the main outlook of number 1 Abbott Close is to east-west. In my view the elongation of the existing built form would not cause any material loss of sunlight or overshadowing due to the distances involved.

Properties to the west on Abbott Road will be side on to the form of the existing building at number 48 coming closer to them but with the road in between. In my view this would cause no material impact.

To the south on the opposite side of the road the new dwelling would also in my view be no harmful in terms of the bulk of the building and the windows than the existing dwelling. It should also be noted that it would create a typical across-street type relationship common in nearly every street scene.

Overall I conclude that the development does not give rise to an unacceptable unneighbourly impact,

6.13 Impact on highway safety.

With respect to highway safety matters the advice from Central Government set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is as follows:

Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe.

The term severe is locally interpreted as situations, which have a high impact, likely to result in loss of life, or a higher possibility of occurrence with a lower impact.

- 6.14 The site affords for sufficient parking provision for each of the dwellings i.e. 2 off street spaces. The Highway Officer is happy with the proposed parking arrangements. The amended plans included the alignment of the boundary of the site to allow for visibility looking south. This was at the request of the Highway Officer and he satisfied that this is now adequate.

There is local concern that the increased size of the access and dropped kerb reduces the amount of on street parking for visitors. However what is being proposed will not itself result in increased pressure to park on the highway because adequate levels of parking are provided for on site.

- 6.15 Overall the proposed development does not give rise to severe harm and in highway safety terms it is acceptable.

6.16 Community Infrastructure Levy.

The council's CIL charging schedule has been adopted. CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area, and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development.

In this case CIL is liable as the proposal involves the creation of a new dwelling.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposal will create a new dwelling in a sustainable location and accords with paragraph 14 of the NPPF which sets out the presumption favour of sustainable development.

There will be a limited impact to the overall character of the area and limited harm to neighbour amenity. Any perceived harm from the development is not significant and does not outweigh the benefit of the development. The site affords for adequate levels of parking and garden space.

In conjunction with the attached conditions the proposal accords with development plan policies.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Commencement three years - full planning permission.**
2. **Approved plans.**
3. **Matching materials (walls and roof).**
4. **Existing vehicular access improved.**
5. **Vision splay details to be submitted and approved.**
6. **Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.**

Author: Paul Bowers
E-mail : paul.bowers@southandvale.gov.uk
Contact No: 01235 422600