

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P17/S2070/O</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE
<b>REGISTERED</b>	2.6.2017
<b>PARISH</b>	CHOLSEY
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Jane Murphy Pat Dawe
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Morgans
<b>SITE</b>	9 Station Road Cholsey, OX10 9PT
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Two detached, four bedroom dwellings
<b>OFFICER</b>	Katherine Pearce

---

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application is referred to Planning Committee for a decision as the views of Cholsey Parish Council differ from the officer's recommendation.
- 1.2 The site is located in the built-up area of Cholsey. It is a triangular shaped plot measuring approximately 800sqm in area. On the plot is a bungalow with a single storey detached garage located to the north east of the bungalow. The bungalow is set back approximately 6.4m from the front boundary. The site is accessed off Station Road.
- 1.3 The site is located in a residential area. To the north of the site is No. 7 Station Road. This is an end of terrace, two storey property with a two storey and single storey extension so that it is built up to its boundary.
- 1.4 Between No. 7 and the site is an access drive leading to No. 7a Station Road. This is a detached bungalow located to the east of the site.
- 1.5 To the south of the site is No. 11 Station Road. This is a two storey, semi-detached house.
- 1.6 The site is located in an area of archaeological constraint.
- 1.7 The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal is an outline application with all matters reserved accept access and scale, for two detached, four bedroom dwellings. The dwellings will be two storey with a cross gable on the front elevation and a larger cross gable on the rear elevation. They will each have a footprint of around 85 sqm. The dwellings will each be approximately 9m wide including the chimney and approximately 7.6m in height.
- 2.2 The dwellings will be set back around 6.4m from the pavement. Access for the site will be off Station Road. Space for parking will be available in front of the dwellings and along the sides of the dwellings.
- 2.3 The block plan, elevations, street scene and floor plans can be found are **attached** at Appendix 2 to this report. All the plans and representations can be viewed on the Council's website [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk) under the planning application reference number.

The attached plans are the amended plans on which the recommendation is based. The original plans showed two detached dwellings, four bedroom dwellings with attached car ports. The amended plans have reduced the height and width of the dwellings, removed the car ports and set the dwellings slightly further back from the pavement.

### **3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **3.1 Cholsey Parish Council – Object, in summary:**

- Over development of the site – can't provide large enough gardens or provide adequate off street parking
- Out of character with the streetscene
- Unneighbourly
- Loss of a bungalow is detrimental to the community
- Application not in line with the Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan and applicant has not consulted the committee
- Plans do not show bungalow at 7a

Objections maintained in response to amended plans.

**Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council)** - No objection. The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network.

**County Archaeological Services** – Site located in an area of archaeological potential. Recommend a watching brief is maintained during construction.

**Waste Management Officer (District Council)** – Standard comments

**Countryside Officer** - Unlikely to be any significant ecological impacts

#### **Neighbour Objections (5) – In summary:**

- Plans do not show extensions on No. 7, which come up to the site border
- Loss of light to Nos 7 and 11
- Bungalow is attractive and of solid structure so why should it be destroyed
- Properties on Station Road are of traditional style of pre-war housing and 1960s bungalows in good plots. Also, listed buildings nearby on The Forty. The proposals would be out of keeping with this.
- Submitted information and plans does not show bungalow at No. 7a
- Unneighbourly and overbearing causing loss of privacy at Nos 7 and 11.
- Overdevelopment with very small gardens for size of houses
- Though design is reserved, concerned about the height and overall style being out of keeping with the street scene
- Large amount of glazing would cause overlooking into surrounding properties and vice versa.
- There is little space between the two dwellings.

Comments on amended plans:

- Still object because the proposals are:
  - Unneighbourly
  - Out of keeping, excessive in scale and design (particularly height)
  - Results in loss of light to windows in the facing elevation of No. 11 and to No.7 (also overbearing and oppressive)
  - Shoe-horned into the site
  - Forward of the common building line.

#### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 [P79/W0419](#) - Approved (26/09/1979)  
EXTENSION TO GARAGE

[P77/W0225](#) - Approved (14/06/1977)  
BATHROOM EXTENSION.

[P74/W0197](#) - Refused (13/09/1974)  
ERECTION OF BOUNDARY WALL.

[P68/R3891](#) - Approved (06/06/1968)  
PROPOSED ADDITION OF LOUNGE AND ERECTION OF GARAGE

#### **5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- 5.2 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) Policies:  
CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development  
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy  
CSR1 - Housing in villages  
CSQ3 - Design
- 5.3 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies:  
H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt  
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  
CON12 & 13 – Sites of archaeological interest  
T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users  
T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users
- 5.4 South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)
- 5.5 Emerging Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan  
Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF.

Cholsey Parish Council are working towards the adoption of a neighbourhood plan and are at the pre-submission stage of development, hence the plan currently carries limited weight.

#### **6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The main planning considerations of the proposed development are:
- Principle of Development
  - Design and Impact on the Character of the Area
  - Neighbour Amenities
  - Access and Highways
  - Other matters
  - Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of Development

- 6.2 The site is located within the built up limits of Cholsey and there is an existing residential use of the site. On this basis, the principle of residential development is acceptable and in accordance with Policy CSR1. I am aware that Policy CSR1 carries less weight because the Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply. However, Policy CSR1 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development achieve the same end in this instance. The principle of development is therefore acceptable subject to other planning considerations being satisfactorily met.
- 6.3 Policy H4 allows for residential development in built up areas of villages if the following criteria are met:
- (i) an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view spoilt;
  - (ii) the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings;
  - (iii) the character of the area is not adversely affected;
  - (iv) there are no overriding amenity, environmental or highway objections; and
  - (v) if the proposal constitutes backland development, it would not create problems of privacy and access and would not extend the built limits of the settlement.
- 6.4 In relation to criterion (i), as the site is currently occupied by a house, an important open space or public view will not be lost.
- 6.5 Criteria (ii) – (iv) will be assessed in subsequent paragraphs.
- 6.6 In relation to criterion (v), the proposal will not constitute backland development.
- 6.7 The Council does not have a policy which precludes the demolition of existing dwellings outside of a conservation area or the loss of bungalows. This, therefore cannot be used as a reason for refusal.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

- 6.8 The proposed application is outline with all matters except access and scale reserved. This means that it is not for the Council to determine the detail of the proposed development at this stage, only the scale and height of the proposed buildings.
- 6.9 Station Road is characterised by dwellings of different styles, types, sizes and scale. In the immediate vicinity of the site are detached bungalows, terraced and semi-detached dwellings. There are detached dwellings along Station Road, on the other side of the road including two storey dwellings. The fact that the buildings are detached and two storey therefore does not make them out of character with the area.
- 6.10 The Street View plan shows how the dwellings will appear in the street scene. The dwellings will be larger in scale than the dwellings either side. However, I do not consider this means that they will be harmful. As stated above, the street is characterised by properties of differing types and scales. I therefore do not consider they will be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.11 The proposed dwellings will be approximately 4.9m to the eaves line, which is comparable to the eaves line of No. 7 (approximately 4.9m) and the eaves of No. 11 (approximately 5m). The dwellings will be approximately 7.6m in height, which is similar in height to No. 7 (approximately 7.3m) and just over half a metre higher than No. 11 (approximately 7m). The new dwellings will have gabled roofs whereas No. 7 and

No.11 have hipped roofs. Whilst a hipped roof on the new dwellings would have been more in keeping with the character of the area, there are examples of gabled roofs along the street. I therefore do not consider the form of the roof to be out of character.

- 6.12 Even though No. 7 Station Road has an extension taking it up to the boundary, there is still approximately 11m between it and its closest new dwelling as the access drive to No. 7a provides a separation between the two properties. There will be approximately 7m between No. 11 Station Road and the new dwelling to the north when viewed from the street. These distances mean that the new dwellings will not have an overbearing impact on the adjacent properties when viewed from the street (their impact on amenity will be assessed at paragraph 6.16 - 6.20 of the report).
- 6.13 The proposed dwellings will be set back from the pavement by around 6.4m, which is the same as the set-back of the current bungalow.
- 6.14 The Cholsey Conservation Area is located to the north west of the site on the opposite side of Station Road. Though the site is in the vicinity of the Conservation Area and a cluster of listed buildings, it is surrounded by C20 development and is seen in this context. I therefore do not consider the proposed development will cause significant harm to the setting of the Conservation Area or any listed buildings.
- 6.15 Overall I consider the scale of the proposals is in keeping with the character of the area and are in accordance with Policy CSQ3 of the SOCS and D1 and the SOLP. It also accords with Section 7 of the Design Guide, which states that:

*The building forms used along a street should create rhythm and interest. Subtle variations in the height and width of buildings can add visual interest to the street making it more attractive and interesting.*

*The scale of new development should be appropriate and sensitive to its context. Heights of buildings should be informed by the contextual analysis. Variety of building height along the street frontage can also help the [sic] to achieve this."*

#### Neighbour Amenity

- 6.16 No.7 is located approximately 11m to the north of the site. It has a two storey and a single storey extension that were not shown on the original plans but have been plotted on the amended block plan. There are no visible windows on the side elevation of either extension as there is a fence alongside the dwelling. Even if this fence were not there, the dwellings are off set from each other so windows in the side elevation would not directly face each other. Further to this, the plans do not show any windows in the side elevation of the proposed dwellings. I therefore consider that there will be no issue of overlooking between the two properties. Given the distance between them I do not consider the dwellings will have an overbearing impact on No. 7. The dwellings are located to the south west of No. 7 and set slightly forward. Therefore I do not consider that there will be a loss of light to the dwelling or the rear garden.
- 6.17 No 7a is located approximately 13.6m to the east of the proposed north dwelling. No. 7a is a single storey dwelling so the first floor windows of the proposed dwellings will look onto the roof of No. 7a. There is a small strip in front of No.7a that will potentially be overlooked but this is an access to the property rather than a private amenity space.
- 6.18 The rear elevations on proposed plans show a pair of French doors onto a Juliet balcony and a large, triple glazed doorway onto a Juliet balcony. I consider that such large areas of glazing on these rear elevations would not be appropriate in a built-up area such as this surrounded by dwellings and gardens, as it will increase the

opportunity to see into the new dwellings. However, as this is an outline application and detail is a reserved matter, this can be dealt with at a later stage. More standard sized windows would be more appropriate on the rear elevations of the dwellings.

- 6.19 No.11 is located to the south of the site. There are four windows on the ground floor, side elevation facing the site; one is hall window, one is a landing window, one is a kitchen window and one is an obscure-glazed bathroom window. The part of the house with the kitchen window is approximately 5.8m from the proposed dwellings. I visited No. 11 to view the application site from this window. The location of the kitchen in the middle of the dwelling and in a north facing elevation means that it currently does not receive much light. However, I do not consider that the proposed dwellings would make this situation significantly worse.

- 6.20 Overall I conclude that the proposals are in accordance with Policy D4 of SOLP.

Access and Highways

- 6.21 The dwellings would be accessed off Station Road. Oxfordshire County Council's Highways Officer has no objection subject to conditions being attached to any permission. These are included in the recommended list of conditions. The Highways Officer concludes that *"The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network."*
- 6.22 The proposals provide a sufficient level of parking in accordance with the Oxfordshire County Council standards.
- 6.23 I conclude that the proposals are in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

- 6.24 Though the gardens appear to be small because of their triangular shape, they provide in excess of the garden size recommended in the Design Guide. The proposals are therefore in accordance with Policy D3 of the SOLP.
- 6.25 The site is located in an area of archaeological constraint so a watching brief is recommended. As the site has already been developed, this measure is considered sufficient and the proposals are therefore in accordance with Policies CON 12 & 13.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 6.26 CIL is usually calculated on the basis of the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. However, as this is an outline application it would not be liable for CIL until the submission of the Reserved Matters.

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposed development accords with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, Policy CSR1 of the Core Strategy and the criteria set out in Policy H4 of the Local Plan. Officers recommend that planning permission is granted because the details of the proposal are acceptable, and in accordance with national policy, the Development Plan and the South Oxfordshire Design Guide.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

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

- 1. Outline time limit – commencement.**
- 2. Submission of reserved matters.**
- 3. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.**
- 4. New vehicular access.**
- 5. Close existing access.**
- 6. Vision splay dimensions.**
- 7. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.**
- 8. Archaeological watching brief.**
- 9. Written scheme of investigation.**

**Author:** Katherine Pearce

**E-mail :** [Katherine.pearce@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:Katherine.pearce@southandvale.gov.uk)

**Contact No:** 01235 422600

This page is intentionally left blank