

APPLICATION NO.	P17/S2532/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	20.7.2017
PARISH	GORING
WARD MEMBER(S)	Kevin Bulmer
APPLICANT	Mr Gary Stevenson
SITE	18 Cleeve Down, Goring, RG8 0HB
PROPOSAL	Erection of 2 x 2 bed dwellings, with provision for access and parking. As amended by drawings accompanying e-mail from agent received 21 August 2017 moving the dwellings further south and reducing the bedroom sizes to 2 bed units and amplified by response to Highway comments)
OFFICER	Paul Bowers

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The application is referred to the Planning Committee as the views of Goring on Thames Parish Council conflict with the officer's recommendation.

1.2 18 Cleeve Down is one half of a pair of two storey semi-detached properties on the southern side of the road running through this 1950's residential estate.

1.3 Planning permission was granted in 2015 under application reference P15/S3526/FUL and then varied by subsequent planning permissions for the erection of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings to the rear of the adjoining property number 17 Cleeve Down. The most recent planning permission for the dwellings remains extant and can still be implemented.

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

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 This application seeks full planning permission from the council to erect a pair of semi-detached dwellings accessed across the land to the rear of number 17 Cleeve Down serving the approved dwellings.

The application has been amended, increasing the distance between the dwellings and those to the north fronting on to Cleeve Down and reducing the number of bedrooms such that the proposal is now for 2 x 2 bedroom units.

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 **Goring Parish Council** – Recommend refusal of planning permission.

- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Negative impact on the AONB.
- Concern about the access and highway safety.

Neighbour Responses – 2 x letters of objection.

- Concern over the number of bedrooms being proposed.
- Inadequate parking provision and likely parking on the highway.

Highways Liaison Officer - No objection subject to conditions.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P17/S0360/FUL](#) - Approved (14/03/2017)

Erection of two semi-detached properties to rear of No 17 Cleeve Down (re-submission of application P16/S3538/FUL to include rear facing dormer windows).

[P16/S3538/FUL](#) - Approved (11/01/2017)

Erection of two semi-detached properties to rear of no17 Cleeve Down (Variation to approval P15/S3526/FUL)

[P16/S0750/DIS](#) - Approved (17/03/2016)

Discharge of condition 3 - External Materials from application P15/S3526/FUL.

[P15/S3526/FUL](#) - Approved (20/01/2016)

Erection of two semi-detached dwellings to rear of 17 Cleeve Down. (As amplified by Tree Survey and Ecological Appraisal dated 13 November 2015 and amended by drawings accompanying e-mail from agent received 23 November 2015)

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

CSEN1 - Landscape protection

CSQ3 - Design

CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

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)

Emerging Goring on Thames 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.

Goring on Thames Parish Council are working towards the adoption of a neighbourhood plan and being at the plan preparation stage of development it carries very limited weight.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- **The principle of development and the AONB.**
- **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 and the AONB.**

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 Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPG)

6.4 The Development Plan –

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). Goring on Thames is defined at Appendix 5 of SOCS as a 'larger village'. Policy CSR1 is the most relevant housing policy within the Core Strategy. It permits infill development within villages. Infill development is defined as the filling of an existing gap on an otherwise built up frontage or on other sites within the settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings.

6.5 The Neighbourhood Plan –

Goring on Thames is currently progressing a Neighbourhood Plan. As it is currently at the plan preparation stage it can only be given very limited weight in the determination of this planning application.

6.6 The NPPF -

The council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. This means the housing policies within the development plan are out of date and the application has to be assessed in the context of the Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: –

- any adverse impacts of doing so would **significantly and demonstrably**

outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or –

- **specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.**

6.7 Footnote 4 (formerly Footnote 9) of Page 4 of the NPPF introduces the specific policies in the NPPF that indicate development should be restricted. Amongst these are policies relating to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which are considered under paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. Para. 115 states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONB's as they have the highest status of protection.

6.8 Impact on the AONB -

In considering the impact to the AONB I have had regard to the scale, design and appearance of the buildings, their position in close proximity to adjoining and permitted dwellings and the level of screening to the south.

6.9 I conclude that any harm to the wider landscape of this part of AONB would be very limited and the scenic beauty of the area would be preserved. As such paragraph 115 does not outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in terms of paragraph 14, and it is therefore engaged.

6.10 *Economic Dimension –*

The proposal will provide additional housing where there is an identified requirement to increase housing targets and boost housing supply. As the development provides 2 units it will make a small contribution to the overall supply of housing. The associated construction jobs and local investment during its build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy will be of economic benefit to the local area.

The proposal will also help meet the requirements under Policy CSS1 for smaller villages by facilitating growth which supports the provision and retention of local services.

6.11 *Social Dimension –*

Goring is a sustainable location and includes a train station, pubs, a Tesco Express and several other shops restaurants and public houses.

The site is within the settlement and located where there are realistic transport alternatives to the car with pedestrian links from the site to bus services and access to the rail network via the Goring station.

The development will provide housing and increase housing choice and availability in a sustainable location where there is an identified requirement to increase housing targets and boost housing supply.

6.12 *Environmental –*

The development results in the loss of garden area but does not result in the loss of identified protected species. Whilst there won't be any specific environmental benefits from the development the other two strands of sustainable development carry greater weight in my view.

6.13 *Conclusion in respect of the principle of development –*

In your officer's view the site comprises previously developed land and the location of

the site, the proximity to existing services within the village and availability and access to public transport to the wider county and region in conjunction with the social, environmental and economic benefits I conclude that this proposal constitutes a sustainable form of development. Therefore unless there are significant and demonstrable adverse impacts from the development the presumption is in favour of granting permission for the development and the principle of housing on this site is acceptable.

The remaining sections of this report consider the proposal in detail in terms of whether there are adverse impacts generated from the development that would outweigh the benefits that it would bring.

6.14 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.

6.15 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.

6.16 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 in not adversely affected.***

The design, scale and appearance of the pair of semis reflects the two already approved on the adjoining site. The wider area is characterised by semi-detached properties. Although backland development is not a feature of the area this principle has already been established with the previous approval for the two adjoining properties. Equally they will align with the more modern properties to the east. In my view the siting and appearance of these building is in keeping with the area and any visual harm will be limited.

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

In terms of the amenity, I have considered the amenity spaces afforded for the new dwellings and the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties. These matters are dealt with under sections 6.4 and 6. of this report.

Provision (v) relates to backland development and seeks ensure that it would not *create problems of privacy and access and would not extend the built up limits of the settlement.* I have considered the impact on neighbours at paragraph 6.23.

6.18 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.

The South Oxfordshire Design Guide sets out the minimum amount of private amenity for 3 bedroom units and above at 100 square metres and for 2 bedroom units is 50 square metres.

6.19 The layout of the development ensures that the units exceed this minimum amount. Both properties would have the required garden and parking provision demonstrating that the proposal would not amount to an over development of the site.

6.20 Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

Impact on residential amenity is normally considered in terms of whether a development results in material harm by way of overlooking, loss of sunlight or being so large and close that it is considered oppressive and overbearing.

6.21 The South Oxfordshire Design Guide sets out a minimum distance between properties which have a back to back relationship of 25 metres. Whilst this proposes a front to rear relationship with the existing 18 Cleeve Down this distance is still considered relevant. As originally submitted the distance was below 25 metres. The plans were adjusted moving the dwellings back slightly in the plot so that a distance of 25 metres is provided in line with the advice. The distance is the same as that approved on the adjoining site and the same if not greater than the distances between the properties further to the east and those that front on to Cleeve Down. The level of overlooking between properties is therefore within acceptable limits and does not present an unneighbourly situation.

The alignment with properties to the east mitigates any impact that may have been created by the height and mass.

Overall I conclude that the development is not unneighbourly.

6.22 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.

6.23 The dwellings will be served by the same access as the approved dwellings. This application has been considered in terms of the cumulative impact of the proposed and approved dwellings. The parking layout has been amended at the request of the Highway Officer and he is now satisfied with the proposal, subject to conditions that require the parking and manoeuvring areas shown on the plans to be retained and the vision splays at the junction are protected.

6.24 Overall, I conclude that the development does not present “severe harm” as referred to

in the NPPF.

6.25 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 new dwellings.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 The development proposes two dwellings adjacent to a site for two other dwellings the council has previously approved but are as yet unbuilt. In terms of design and appearance the new dwellings are comparable to the surrounding development. They would not result in any significant harm to neighbours' amenities or detract from the character or scenic beauty of this part of the AONB. The proposal would create two new dwellings in a suitable location with adequate levels of amenity and parking and, in conjunction with the recommended conditions, the proposal accords with relevant 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. Schedule of materials.**
- 4. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.**
- 5. Vision splay protection.**
- 6. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.**

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

This page is intentionally left blank