

APPLICATION NO.	P18/S4154/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	12.12.2018
PARISH	WATERPERRY
WARD MEMBER(S)	John Walsh
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Atkinson
SITE	1 Waterperry, OX33 1LD
PROPOSAL	Two storey side extension to create open plan kitchen/dining at ground floor and replacement bedroom 4 with ensuite bathroom at first floor
OFFICER	Kim Gould

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application has been referred to Planning Committee because the local member, John Walsh, has called the application to committee if the recommendation is for the refusal of planning permission.
- 1.2 1 Waterperry is a detached, two-storey dwelling which is located outside the built-up limits of Waterperry in a line of properties on the western side of the road leading to Waterperry. The property has been previously extended by the addition of a two-storey rear extension in the late 1990s.
- 1.3 The site lies outside the conservation area but within the Oxford green belt.
- 1.4 The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This application seeks to add a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling off the north-west boundary wall. It would measure some 4.4 metres x 6.5 metres.
- 2.2 The additional accommodation would provide a kitchen/dining area at ground floor with an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor.
- 2.3 The proposed extension would be constructed using similar materials to that on the existing dwelling.
- 2.4 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application are **attached** at Appendix 2. Full copies of the plans and consultation responses are available for inspection on the Council's website at www.southoxon.gov.uk

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Waterperry Parish Council – Approve**

- The Parish Council felt that the property is within the existing established limits of development of the village, since it is in an early C20th house (circa 1910) on the built-up side of the road into the village. A small row of 6 semi-detached council houses were built adjacent to the property post war, completing development to that end of the village road.
- The proposed extension does not materially alter the style of the original house and therefore it is still in keeping with the character of the nearby properties in the village.

- There was full agreement that the Parish Council would prefer to see the house extended to continue its use as a single dwelling, rather than see the plot divided for infill development.
- The extension to the front of the property would balance the existing previous rear extension, making more sense of the internal accommodation and making it more suitable for modern family living.
- There is lots of space for on-site parking for several cars, so this would not cause road issues.
- Although the proposed extension is large, the house is set back from the road within a large garden and even with the extension, would still sit to one side of its plot, with a large area of garden between it and the neighbouring property on Green Ground. It would not be overwhelming in the street view.

Neighbour Approve (1)

- I have no objection to the proposed extension to my neighbour's house which is planned to be in keeping with the existing building and I suspect will enhance the property. I wish them well.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 [P18/S2521/PEO](#) – Response (06/09/2018)
SITE MEETING & FOLLOW UP LETTER

Side extension to existing house incorporating new kitchen to ground floor, new bedroom and en-suite bathroom to first floor. The proposal also includes the creation of a new downstairs WC and hallway.

[P18/S1463/PEO](#) - Response (21/05/2018)
ADVICE LETTER ONLY

Two storey side extension to existing house.

[P02/N0817](#) - Approved (16/01/2003)
Extension to hallway and porch.

[P95/N0313](#) - Approved (13/07/1995)
Rear two storey extension. (As amended by drawings accompanying Applicant's letter dated 2 October 1995).

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) Policies

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
CSEN2 - Green Belt protection
CSQ3 - Design
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies;

D1 - Principles of good design
G2 - Protect district from adverse development
GB4 - Openness of Green Belt maintained
H13 - Extension to dwelling
T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

5.3 Neighbourhood Plan policies; Not applicable.

5.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

5.5 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- **Whether the principle of the extension is acceptable in the green belt**
- **Are there any very special circumstances**
- **Policy H13 criteria**
- **Impact on the openness and visual amenity of the green belt**
- **CIL**
- **Other issues**

6.2 **Principle of development**

The site lies within the Oxford green belt. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. There is a general presumption against inappropriate development. Inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (paragraph 143 of the NPF). Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other circumstances.

Policy CSEN2 of the SOCS seeks to protect the special character and landscape setting of Oxford.

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF identifies a strictly defined list of development which is not inappropriate. Included within this list is the extensions or alterations to an existing building providing the extensions do not result in disproportionate additions over the volume of the original dwelling.

In determining whether a proposal is disproportionate, the volume of any previous extensions together with the volume of the proposed extension have to be added together to give a percentage increase over the volume of the original building. In this case the extensions would represent an increase of some 136% over the volume of the original. As such, the extensions would result in disproportionate additions over the original dwelling.

For this reason, it is my opinion that the extension is inappropriate development and the principle of this extension is not acceptable.

Notwithstanding the objection in principle to the proposal, the proposed extension is considered against the criteria set out in policy H13 of the SOLP.

6.3 **Are there any very special circumstances?**

As previously stated, Government advice within the NPPF requires a consideration of whether any very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm from inappropriate development. No such circumstances exist in this instance, in my opinion, and therefore the proposed extension is inappropriate development and should be resisted.

6.4 **Policy H13**

Policy H13 of the SOLP allows extensions to existing dwellings provided that the following criteria are met:

In the green belt, outside the limits of the larger and smaller village, the extension would be no greater than 40% of the volume of the original dwelling;

This site lies outside the built up limits of the Waterperry because there is an open and undeveloped gap between the main body of the village on this side of the road and this line of houses. The property has been extended previously. The existing extension and proposed extension would amount to an increase of some 136% of the original dwelling.

The scale and design of the proposal is in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the site and with the appearance of the surrounding area;

The South Oxfordshire Design Guide advises that extensions to dwellings should be subservient to the existing property. This proposal would not be subservient. It would, in my opinion, overwhelm the attractive character of the existing, previously extended dwelling which would be contrary to Design Guide advice.

The amenity of occupants of nearby properties is not materially harmed;

The proposed extension would be to the north of the existing dwelling. As such, those neighbours most affected by this proposal would be at 1 Green Ground, Waterperry. Given the generous gaps to the northern boundary and lack of any proposed first floor windows in this elevation, it is my opinion that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of occupants of nearby properties.

The proposal would not be tantamount to the creation of a separate dwelling;

The proposed development would be an extension to the existing property and would not be tantamount to the creation of a separate dwelling.

Adequate and satisfactory parking and amenity areas are provided for the extended dwelling;

As an additional bedroom would be created by this development, 3 off street parking spaces would be required to satisfy the council's parking requirements. There is ample room on site to provide 3 off street parking spaces.

6.5 **Impact on the openness and visual amenity of the green belt**

Given the disproportionate size of the extension in relation to the original dwelling, the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the openness and visual amenity of the green belt contrary to Government advice within the NPPF and policies CSEN2 of the SOCS and GB4 of the SOLP.

6.6 **Community Infrastructure Levy**

This Proposal is CIL liable but as the proposed additional floor area is less than 100sq metres, CIL will not be payable on this scheme.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 Your officers recommend that planning permission is refused because the proposed extension, together with the previous extensions to this dwelling, would result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling amounting to a volume increase of some 136% over the volume of the original dwelling. This would be contrary to Government advice in the NPPF, policy CSEN2 of the Core Strategy and policy H13 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan. As such, the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the green belt which is by definition harmful to its

openness. No very special circumstances exist to overcome this harm in your officers' opinion.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **That planning permission is refused for the following reason:**

That, having regard to the volume of the proposed extension and that of previous extensions, the development will result in disproportionate additions over the original dwelling. As such, this would be inappropriate development which is harmful to the green belt. No very special circumstances exist to outweigh this harm. This would be contrary to Government advice in paragraph 145 of the NPPF, policy CSEN2 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies GB4 and H13 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

Author: Kim Gould

Contact No: 01235 422600

e-mail: planning@southoxon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank