
APPLICATION NO.	P13/S2604/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	19.8.2013
PARISH	SHIPLAKE
WARD MEMBERS	Mr Malcolm Leonard & Mr Robert Simister
APPLICANT	Hamilton Properties Ltd
SITE	The Pippins & Hurstbourne, Northfield Avenue, Lower Shiplake
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing two dwellings. Erection of two new detached dwellings (amended plan received 27th August 2013).
AMENDMENTS	One – front garden increased in size.
OFFICER	Paul Lucas

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee as a result of a conflict between officers' recommendation and the views of Shiplake and Harpsden Parish Councils.

1.2 The application site is shown on the OS extract identified as **Appendix 1**. The application site consists of a plot occupied by two dwellings on the western side of Northfield Avenue, a residential street within the built up area of Lower Shiplake. Pippins is a three-bedroom chalet-bungalow. Hurstbourne is a single storey self-contained one-bedroom dwelling that was added to the north-west elevation of Pippins in the early 1970s. The dwellings share the rear garden area. There are mature trees and hedges around the site boundaries. There is a vehicular access at the south-eastern corner of the site onto Northfield Avenue leading to a driveway and garage along the southern boundary of the site. There is a parking space on the verge in front of Hurstbourne which is used by the occupiers of this property. There are two storey dwellings on either side, Foxwood to the south-east and Greenmantle to the north-west. The site backs onto the side boundary of Withens, another two storey dwelling fronting onto Bolney Trevor Drive. In general, the surrounding area is residential in character, comprising mostly detached dwellings with variations in appearance.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwellings and the erection of two replacement two-storey dwellings on the site. The dwellings would be set back further into the site than the existing dwellings and would have separate vehicular access to a parking area in the front gardens. Plot 1 is on the southern side and has a catslide roof facing towards the boundary with Foxwood. Plot 2 is on the northern side and has a double-pitch roof, with the rear ridge being the lower of the two.

2.2 The plans of the proposed development can be found at **Appendix 2**. Other documents in support of the application can be viewed on the Council's [website](#).

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Shiplake Parish Council – The application should be refused due to:

- Overdevelopment of site from one building into two detached houses
- Overbearing impact from additional height, depth and proximity to neighbours
- Additional access resulting in traffic movement and parking problems opposite Manor Wood Gate

3.2 Harpsden Parish Council – The application should be refused due to overdevelopment – the site can bear one large house, but two would spoil the character of the area.

3.3 Countryside Access - No objection

3.4 Forestry Officer (South Oxfordshire District Council) - No objection subject to tree and hedge protection and landscaping conditions

3.5 Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objection subject to access, vision splays, parking and turning and surface water drainage conditions

3.6 Countryside Officer (South Oxfordshire & Vale of White Horse) - No objection

3.7 Neighbours – Two representations of objection/concern and two of support, summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy to Withens from first floor rear windows
- Overdevelopment – two dwellings would represent overcrowding, not enough open space and would not conform with existing dwellings
- Imposing and overbearing impact of Plot 2 on Greenmantle, compromising sunlight and daylight to its southern aspect
- Overlooking of Greenmantle from side windows of Plot 2
- Conflict of new access to Plot 2 with Manor Wood Gate
- Loss of trees and bushes
- One house would be better in terms of character and neighbour impact
- No objection to impact on Foxwood on basis of Plot 1 having catslide roof and no first floor windows facing Foxwood, other than a bathroom
- The two proposed houses look attractive and are in keeping with the variety of homes already in the area.
- Currently the turning into Manor Wood Gate is often compromised by a car legally parked on the verge alongside Hurstbourne. If the proposed building goes ahead this issue will be alleviated as the new residents' vehicles will be parked inside the plot.
- The distance and the intervening mature hedges and trees mean there will be little impact on 2 Manor Wood Gate.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 [P71/H0768](#) - Approved (25/11/1971)

Addition of bedroom, kitchen, bathroom and living room to form self-contained unit. New pedestrian access.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy policies

- CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CSB1 - Conservation and improvement of biodiversity
- CSEN1 - Landscape protection

- CSH2 - Housing density
- CSM1 - Transport
- CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction
- CSQ3 - Design
- CSR1 - Housing in villages
- CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

- 5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;
- C6 - Maintain & enhance biodiversity
 - C9 - Loss of landscape features
 - D1 - Principles of good design
 - D10 - Waste Management
 - D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
 - D3 - Outdoor amenity area
 - D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
 - EP2 - Adverse affect by noise or vibration
 - EP6 - Sustainable drainage
 - EP8 - Contaminated land
 - G2 - Protect district from adverse development
 - H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt
 - R8 - Protection of existing public right of way
 - T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
 - T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008 – Sections 3, 4 & 5

- 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework
The policies within the Core Strategy and the SOLP 2011 of relevance to this application are considered to be in general conformity with the provisions of the NPPF and therefore this application can be determined against these relevant policies.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The proposed development would be located within the built-up area of the village of Lower Shiplake, which is a settlement where residential development is considered to be acceptable in principle under Core Strategy Policy CSR1. Consequently the proposal falls to be assessed primarily against the criteria of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011. The planning issues that are relevant to the planning application are whether the development would:

- result in the loss of an open space or view of public, environmental or ecological value;
- be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, bearing in mind its location within the Chilterns AONB;
- safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and would provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers;
- demonstrate an acceptable provision of off-street parking spaces for the resultant dwelling or other conditions prejudicial to highway safety; and
- provide adequate sustainability and waste management measures.

Loss of Open Space

6.2 Criterion (i) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view spoilt. There is no public access and the site has been in residential use since the 1950s. It is surrounded by residential properties and there is no evidence that it has any particular ecological value. It is only visible in public views from along Northfield Avenue against

the backdrop of other buildings. This criterion would therefore be satisfied.

Visual Impact

- 6.3 Criteria (ii) and (iii) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 explain that the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development should be in keeping with its surroundings and the character of the area should not be adversely affected. Policies CSQ3 of the SOCS and D1 of the SOLP 2011 amplify this requirement. The site width is about 32 metres. Although many plots in the street of comparable width to the site only contain one dwelling, the combined plot widths of Beggars Roost and Sandpipers, to the north-west and Hawkhursts, Harberton, Cloveley and Iona to the south-east have similar widths to the application site. Consequently, officers consider that the form and layout of the proposed dwellings would add to the varied appearance of dwellings in the street. The ridge height of the dwellings, at around 7.8 metres would be typical of two storey properties. Whilst this would be a significant increase in height of 1 metre above Pippins and 3 metres above Hurstbourne, in officers' view the fact that the dwellings would be set back into the site by 2 metres (Plot 1) and 9 metres (Plot 2) would off-set this height increase. The proposed frontage parking is usually discouraged, but as there are several other dwellings in the vicinity with similar parking arrangements, this is an acceptable situation, given the retention of frontage screening and provision of front garden areas. The Council's Forestry Officer has confirmed that there would be sufficient scope for tree and hedge protection measures to secure the retention of important tree screening on the boundaries and this could be supplemented through a landscaping condition. As such, the proposal would comply with the above criteria.

Neighbour Impact

- 6.4 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. Policy D4 requires that all new dwellings should be designed and laid out so as to secure a reasonable degree of privacy for the occupiers. Development will not be permitted if it would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight. Advice on privacy standards is also included in the SODG 2008. In Section 3.2.6 it advocates that a distance of 25 metres between facing habitable rooms is desirable. The main side wall of Greenmantle is located about 10.6 metres from the northern side boundary with its garage in between. On the ground floor, there is a secondary window to a dining room on the southern side elevation, with the main window serving this room facing westwards towards the rear garden. At first floor level there is a window, which is the only source of light to a bedroom. The proposed Plot 2 would be positioned 2 metres directly to the south of this window, whereas Hurstbourne, with its lower roof lies further to the south-east. However, the distance involved in excess of 12 metres would mean that a notional 25-degree line of sight from the horizontal taken from the neighbouring window would comfortably clear the roof of Plot 2. As such, there would be no significant loss of light or outlook. The southern aspect of Greenmantle is dominated by the tall Cypress hedge on the boundary and Plot 2 would not result in any additional shading.
- 6.5 The first floor windows in the northern elevation of Plot 2 serve an en-suite and a bathroom, therefore an obscure glazing condition could be imposed to prevent overlooking and any loss of privacy. The rear of the proposed dwellings would be about 20 metres from the boundary. There is only one first floor window in the side elevation of Withens, serving a bathroom. The boundary comprises some significant foliage and consequently, this adjoining occupier would be unlikely to experience any discernible loss of light or privacy. Plot 1 would project further to the rear of Foxwood than Pippins, however the roof would be a catslide design and would only contain a bathroom window at first floor level. As Plot 1 would lie to the north-west of Foxwood and there is some mature planting on the boundary, the relationship between these two dwellings would also be acceptable, with the set back from the front affording a more open aspect

to the side windows of Foxwood. The private gardens would be in excess of the recommended minimum standard of 100 square metres, as set out in Section 3.2.8 of the SODG 2008. As such, the proposal would accord with the above policies and guidance.

Access and Parking

- 6.6 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 also requires that there are no overriding highway objections. Although concerns have been raised about the formation of the second access, the Highway Liaison Officer has not objected to the proposal, subject to the imposition of several standard highway conditions. The proposed access and parking arrangements would be acceptable to serve the proposed dwellings. The proposed development would therefore satisfy the above criterion.

Sustainability and Waste Management Measures

- 6.7 Policy CSQ2 of the SOCS and Section 4 of the SODG 2008 require single dwellings to achieve Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. This could be achieved through the imposition of a planning condition requiring details to be provided prior to occupation. With regard to waste management, the plans indicate that sufficient space would be available on site for waste bin storage, which would allow for both boxes and wheeled bins to be presented for collection at the highway junction with the driveway as is the case for nearby dwellings. Therefore the requirements of the above policies would be satisfied.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposed development would be acceptable in principle, would safeguard the character and appearance the surrounding area, would safeguard important trees, would not detract from the living conditions of adjoining residents or be prejudicial to highway safety and would be in accordance with Development Plan Policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **Planning Permission**

1. **Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission**
2. **Approved plans**
3. **Levels (details required)**
4. **Schedule of materials required (all)**
5. **Obscure glazing**
6. **Withdrawal of P.D. (extensions, roof extensions, outbuildings)**
7. **Code Level 4**
8. **New vehicular access**
9. **Vision splay protection**
10. **Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained**
11. **No Surface Water Drainage to Highway**
12. **Landscaping (incl access road and hard standings)**
13. **Tree Protection (Detailed)**
14. **Protect hedges during development operations**

Author: Paul Lucas
Contact No: 01491 823434
Email: Planning.east@southandvale.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank