

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P17/S4117/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	20.11.2017
<b>PARISH</b>	Sydenham
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Lynn Lloyd Ian White
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr H Elsayed
<b>SITE</b>	18 Holliers Close Sydenham, OX39 4NG
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Proposed front and rear extensions to dwelling and subdivision of extended dwelling into two separate 1 bedroom dwellings. (Amended Design Statement and Planning Statement received 8 January 2017 to reflect amended description).
<b>OFFICER</b>	Davina Sarac

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is referred to planning committee because the views of Sydenham Parish Council differ from the officer's recommendation.

1.2 18 Holliers Close comprises a link detached bungalow located at the head of a cul-de-sac within the built up confines of Sydenham. It has a large garden to the front where it is proposed to extend. Holliers Close, within the vicinity of the site is characterised by landscaped front gardens of varying sizes, some of which are enclosed by hedging, as is the case with the application site whilst others are open to the highway.

1.3 A plan identifying the site is **attached** as Appendix 1 to this report.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for single storey front and rear extensions to the dwelling and the subdivision of the extended dwelling into two separate dwellings. The dwellings would be 1 bedroom and would have one off street car parking space as shown on the submitted block plan. The extensions are proposed to be constructed in matching materials.

2.2 Copies of the plans accompanying the application are **attached** at Appendix 2 to this report. All other documentation associated with the application can be viewed on the council's website [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk) under the planning application reference number.

**3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**  
**Comments on original plans**

3.1 **Sydenham Parish Council** – Object on 3 grounds:-

- Over-development of the site.
- Parking is already an issue in the close. Only one space per property is proposed the likelihood is that there will be 2 vehicles per property.
- The application shows windows on both the north and south elevation meaning there could be overlooking issues.

- 3.2 **Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council)** – Holding objection until a plan is submitted to show that the parking spaces have a minimum of 6.0m so as to allow for access and egress.
- 3.3 **Neighbour representations** – Two letters received with the following comments:-
- Lack of parking spaces – two is not enough.
  - Parking is already an issue in the close.
  - Overdevelopment of the plot, harm to character of area.
  - No objection to rear extensions.
  - Holliers Close already has multiple vehicles parked on road.

**Comments on amended block plan submitted 2 January 2018:-**

- 3.4 **Sydenham Parish Council** – The Parish’s view remains unchanged. Object for the 3 reasons as stated above.

**Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council)** – No objection subject to a parking and manoeuvring area condition.

**4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 [P16/S3914/FUL](#) - Refused (25/01/2017) - Appeal dismissed (19/10/2017)  
Proposed dwelling with enabling works to existing dwelling.
- 4.2 [P16/S0358/HH](#) - Approved (07/07/2016)  
Proposed single storey, front, side extension with associated internal and external works (Re-submission of Approval P15/S2662/HH) (Amended plans received 31 March 2016 showing removal of car port from the scheme).
- 4.3 [P15/S2662/HH](#) - Approved (15/10/2015)  
Erection of single storey front, side and rear extensions and external alterations.

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**  
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- 5.2 **South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS 2027) policies**  
CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development  
CSQ3 - Design  
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy  
CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction  
CON11 - Protection of archaeological remains
- 5.3 **South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) saved policies**  
C8 - Adverse affect on protected species  
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  
H13 - Extension to dwelling  
T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users  
T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users  
H11 - Sub-division of dwellings in built up area  
C9 - Loss of landscape features

5.4 **South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)**

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in this application are whether the development:

1. would adversely affect the character of the building or the surrounding residential area; and
2. is appropriate in terms of the size of the property and the proposed internal layout, access, private amenity space and car parking provision
3. would harm the amenity of the occupants of nearby properties
4. would result in environmental or highway objections.

6.2 **Impact upon character of the building or the surrounding residential area**

The size of the front extension is 7.2 metres in length and this is the exact same size as the front extension previously approved under planning application reference number P16/S0358/HH. This proposal will further increase the size of the dwelling by proposing to add a rear extension. The rear extension would be 3.0 metres in length and would spread across the entire width of the rear elevation (11.5 metres). It would have a dual gable end elevation with a roof height that is lower than the existing ridge line.

6.3 The recent application reference number P16/S3914/FUL was refused for a detached separate dwelling on the front of site. The subsequent appeal was dismissed because the Inspector concluded that *“the development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with the development plan. The provision of a dwelling in this location would not outweigh this harm.”*

6.4 Officers consider in this case that due to extensions and subdivision of the dwelling the proposal would be considerably less harmful than the refused separate detached dwelling, proposed under reference P16/S3914/FUL, as the proposal would still retain the appearance of one single extended dwelling. The appearance of the proposal would not be materially different from that approved under P16/S0358/HH from the front and, thus, officers believe that the extensions are of a size, scale and design that would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would comply with criterion (ii) of policy H13 and criterion (iii) of policy H11 of the SOLP in this regard.

6.5 **Size and scale of property, amenity and car parking provision**

The size of the resultant dwellings would be 72 sqm of internal floor space and this is well above the Government’s national space standards as amended on 19 May 2016 of 39 sqm\* for a 1 bedroom 1 person dwelling and if two people are living there in the one bedroom dwelling the standard size is 50 sqm\*. The rooms are sizeable and considered to provide good internal amenity space.

(\*Table 1 of Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard, March 2015 [www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk)).

6.6 Section 7.8 (Plots and Buildings) of the SODG 2016 recommends that an adequate amount of outdoor amenity space should be provided for each residential unit. For a 1 bedroom dwelling it recommends a minimum of 35 sqm. The proposed garden areas complies with this standard.

6.7 Appendix 5 of the SOLP states the Council’s car parking standards for developments. For 1 bedroom dwellings, the requirement is 1 car parking space. The proposal meets the current parking standards for two, one-bedroom dwellings with a single space allocated to each unit. No change is proposed to the existing access arrangements. Holliers Close is a no through road and given the modest number of dwellings that it

serves, it is likely that it is not heavily trafficked. Even if a vehicle associated with the proposal were to park in the highway, officers do not consider that this would result in harm to highway safety. There has been no objection from the Local Highway Authority and therefore, it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network. The proposal is considered to comply with criterion (ii) of Policy H11, policies D2, D3 and T2 of the SOLP.

**6.8 Impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties**

The Parish Council has raised concerns that the size facing windows of the proposal would result in overlooking. These windows serve bathrooms in the proposed dwellings and therefore for privacy of the occupiers a condition will be imposed that they are fitted with obscure glazing and fixed shut except for a top high level openable section.

6.9 It is considered that the extensions to the front and rear would not result in a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of the nearby neighbouring properties. The proposal would comply with criterion (i) of policy H11 and criterion (iii) of H13 and D4 of the SOLP.

**6.10 Environmental or highway issues**

The County's Archaeologist was consulted on previous applications and commented that the previous applications did not appear to have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. As such there would be no conflict with policy CON11 of SOLP.

6.11 The existing roof structure is in good condition and comprises of interlocking concrete tiles with no obvious accesses to the roof void. Bats are unlikely to be using the existing roof structure to be impacted by this proposal for roosting. The Council's Ecologist has previously stated they have no objection to development of the site, subject to a bat informative being attached to the decision notice if granted planning permission. As such there would be no conflict with Policy C8 of the SOLP.

6.12 Given the characteristics of the carriageway, vehicular traffic and speeds are likely to be low and as stated above in Paragraph 6.7 the Local Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal in terms of highway safety issues. As such there would be no conflict with the aims of policy T1 or criterion (iv) of policy H11 of the SOLP.

**6.13 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The council's CIL charging schedule has been adopted and applied to relevant proposals since 1 April 2016. 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. This application is liable for CIL

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

7.1 The application proposal would comply with the relevant Development Plan Policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance and it is considered that, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It would be acceptable in terms of the living conditions of nearby residents, and would not result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within three years.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Materials of external development to match existing.
4. Turning area and car parking to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
5. Obscure glazing to bathroom windows on side elevations.

**Author:** Davina Sarac

**Phone:** 01235 422600

**Email:** [Planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:Planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank