

APPLICATION NO.	P17/S3359/O
APPLICATION TYPE	Outline
REGISTERED	22.9.2017
PARISH	Tiddington
WARD MEMBER(S)	John Walsh
APPLICANT	Mr M Nixey
SITE	Hartgrove, Oxford Road, Tiddington, OX9 2LH
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing bungalow and replacement with two double storey dwellings.(As amplified by indicative parking plan accompanying e-mail from agent received 25 October 2017)
OFFICER	Paul Bowers

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application is referred to planning committee because the views of the Tiddington with Albury Parish Council differ from the officer’s recommendation.
- 1.2 The application site comprises a single detached bungalow access via the slip road which serves existing properties on the north side of Oxford Road. The building is not listed and not located within a designated area.
- 1.3 A plan identifying the site can be found at **Appendix 1** to this report.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application seeks outline planning permission to replace the existing single storey detached bungalow with 2 x two storey dwellings.

All matters such as layout, access, appearance, landscaping and scale have been reserved for later consideration in a reserved matters application(s).

The plans accompanying the application are indicative to demonstrate how two dwellings **could** be achieved on the site.

The application has been amended and amplified such that the plans show how parking and access could be undertaken.

- 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 **Tiddington Parish Council** – Recommend the application for refusal of planning permission for the following reasons;

- the plot is too small to accommodate 2 detached dwellings.
- the boundaries of the two proposed dwellings will be too close to the adjacent dwellings.
- inadequate access form the slip road.

Neighbour Responses – 4 objections from separate properties to the original submisison and additional information covering the following main concerns;

- Reduction in the spacing between properties resulting in the loss of privacy and light to the property called Ambleside.
- Inconsistent separation between properties which would be out of keeping.
- The development will appear cramped.
- Inadequate parking provision.
- Concern about the height of the dwellings and loss of privacy to the property Denby.
- No parking provision for visitors.

SGN Plant Protection Team - No objection but advise drawing the applicant's attention to the location of nearby gas pipework.

OCC Highways Liaison Officer - No objection following the provision of additional information and subject to 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

CSQ3 - Design

CSR1 - Housing in villages

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)

Tiddington with Albury 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 within the NPPF.

As the Neighbourhood Plan is at the plan preparation stage it can not be given weight in the determination of the application at this stage.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues to consider in relation to this development are as follows;

- **The principle of development.**
- **Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4.**
- **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**

- **Plot size and coverage.**
- **Highway issues.**
- **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).**

6.2 The site is located within the built up confines of Tiddington and contains a single detached bungalow. Tiddington is one of the smaller villages in the district. Infill development is permitted through Policy CSR1 of the Core Strategy. The demolition of the existing dwelling will create a gap in an otherwise built up frontage. In my view this would therefore constitute infill development and is acceptable in principle.

6.3 **Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4.**

If a proposed housing development is acceptable in principle and accords with Policy CSR1 of SOCS then the detail of the proposal must be assessed against the criteria of saved Policy H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP).

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.

6.4 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.’***

In terms of design, exact height, materials and position these are all currently unknown and reserved for later consideration. What is fixed in terms of what is being applied for in the development description is that the development is for two dwellings and they will be two storey.

There has been local objection on the basis that the gaps to the boundaries shown on the plans are less than the properties along Oxford Road and therefore the development would be out of keeping. However it is important to stress that the layout has not been fixed and the plan is purely illustrative. In practice the applicant could submit a plan showing a pair of semi-detached properties with a larger gap to the boundary at the reserved matters stage. As layout is yet to be agreed your officers do not consider that it can be concluded at this stage that 2 two storey dwellings would be cramped or harmful to appearance of the area.

Taking into account the properties on either side are two storey and there is a considerable mixture of designs in the areas I do not consider that 2 two storey dwellings would be out of keeping or cause any harm to the wider character of the area.

6.5 ***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.

- 6.6 Provision v) relates to back land development and seeks to ensure that it would not ***create problems of privacy and access and would not extend the built up limits of the settlement.*** The development is not backland and would not extend the built up limits of Tiddington. The impact of the amenities of neighbours is assessed below.

6.7 **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**

The impact on nearby properties is normally assessed with regard to whether a development results in overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing or being so large and close that it is considered oppressive.

At this outline stage it is not possible to determine the exact impact a dwelling will have on adjoining properties. Two 2 storey dwellings sitting alongside two properties on either side which are also two storey will not necessarily result in a harmful impact. This is a typical relationship on most streets and acceptable in principle. At a later stage when the exact position, height and location of windows an assessment of the detailed impact of the development and how it affects neighbours will be made.

6.8 **Plot size and coverage.**

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 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. However this is not the case here. The indicative plans show that each dwelling could achieve 100 square metres of amenity space in line with the Design Guide. Overall I am satisfied that two dwellings could be built in this location without resulting in an overdevelopment of the site.

6.9 **Highway issues.**

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.

- 6.10 The Highway Authority originally provided a holding objection as they wanted to see parking arrangements and visibility splays. Whilst the layout and access are not fixed as part of this application the applicant's agent has demonstrated that adequate parking, visibility and access could be achieved on this site for a development of two dwellings without causing severe harm to the safety of the users of the public highway.

6.11 Community Infrastructure Levy

This development is CIL liable as it result in the creation of new dwellings. CIL is payable on commencement and a CIL liability notice wold be sent out to the applicant at the point that the reserved matters applications were approved.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 The site is located within the built up limits of one of the smaller villages in the district where infill development is acceptable. Although all matters have been reserved for subsequent approval the principle of two dwellings is considered acceptable as it has been successfully demonstrated that 2 two storey dwellings would not be out of keeping with the area given the variety in the street scene. Furthermore the indicative plans show that the development could provide adequate levels of parking and amenity space. In conjunction with the attached conditions the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policies.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

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

1. **Approved plans.**
2. **Commencement - outline planning permission.**
3. **Submission of reserved matters – general.**
4. **New vehicular access.**
5. **Vision splay dimensions.**
6. **Turning area and car parking.**
7. **No surface water drainage to highway.**

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

This page is intentionally left blank