

APPLICATION NO.	P14/S3089/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	26.9.2014
PARISH	SONNING COMMON
WARD MEMBERS	Paul Harrison Alan Rooke
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Jonathan Drakeford-Lewis
SITE	Land adjoining 102 Wood Lane, Sonning Common, RG4 9SL
PROPOSAL	Erection of a new four-bed dwelling.
AMENDMENTS	One – Removing garage
GRID REFERENCE	470477/179974
OFFICER	Emma Bowerman

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee as the Officer's recommendation differs from the views of Sonning Common Parish Council.
- 1.2 The application site (which is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix A) is part of the side / front garden of 102 Wood Lane. There is a detached timber ancillary building on the site and a number of trees on the boundary to the road. There is an existing gated access to the site onto Reades Lane but there is no formal crossover to the highway to access this gate. The site does not fall within any areas of special designation.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a two storey dwelling with four bedrooms. The proposed dwelling would be sited on land between 102 Wood Lane and the neighbouring telephone exchange. The materials proposed are painted render to the walls and plain clay tiles to the roof. Access would be formalised through the existing gated access point onto Reades Lane.
- 2.2 Amended plans were received during the application process to remove a detached garage from the scheme. The garage was originally proposed at the front of the site and officers considered that it would have been prominent in the streetscene.
- 2.3 A copy of the proposed plans is **attached** as Appendix B. The application is accompanied by a design and access statement, which can be viewed online at www.southoxon.gov.uk.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Sonning Common Parish Council - Considers the application should be refused as the building would be too far forward, overdevelopment and mass too great with surrounding properties.
- 3.2 Highways Liaison Officer - No objection subject to conditions requiring no surface water to highway and gates to be set back from the road.
- 3.3 Forestry Officer - No objection subject to conditions regarding tree protection and landscaping. Commented that the oak which is proposed for removal has a significant landscape value but is in poor condition and should not be seen as a constraint to the development.

3.4 Neighbour Representations - One received raising concern that the dwelling is set too far forward and should be in line with the other Reades Lane properties and 102 Wood Lane, and that the gates should be set back a minimum of 5m from the back of the footway. One received with no objection.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

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

5.2 **NPPF Planning Practice Guidance**

5.3 **South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) 2027**

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction

CSQ3 - Design

CSR1 - Housing in villages

CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

5.4 **South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) 2011 saved policies**

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

D6 - Community safety

EP1 - Adverse affect on people and environment

EP6 - Sustainable drainage

EP7 - Impact on ground water resources

EP8 - Contaminated land

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

5.5 **South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG) 2008**

Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues to be considered are:

1. The principle of the development
2. The impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area
3. The impact on neighbouring properties
4. The impact on parking provision / highway safety

Principle:

6.2 The site is located within the built up limits of Sonning Common, which is classed as a larger village under policy CSR1 of the SOCS. Policy CSR1 allows for infill development within larger villages and as such, I consider that the principle of the development is acceptable. .

Agenda Item 9
South Oxfordshire District Council – Planning Committee – 17 December 2014

- 6.3 The proposal therefore falls to be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4 of the SOLP. Policy H4 supports new housing in villages, subject to a number of environmental and amenity considerations, which are addressed below.

Character and appearance:

- 6.4 Criterion (i) of policy H4 of the SOLP requires that an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view spoilt. The site is part of an enclosed garden and is not open to the public. The site has no particular environmental or ecological value and there are no important views across the site. On this basis, the proposal would be in accordance with the above criterion.
- 6.5 Criterion (ii) of policy H4 of the SOLP requires that the design, materials, height and scale of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings. The proposed dwelling would be based on a simple rectangular plan with gables to the front and rear. This design approach would generally follow the guidance in the Design Guide. There are a variety of materials in the local area. The proposed dwelling would be finished with painted render and would have clay tiles to the roof and I consider that these would be suitable to the character of the area.
- 6.6 At 8.8m high, the proposed dwelling would be the same height as No.8 Reades Lane. In terms of its scale, the proposal would be a sizeable four bedroom house but has been designed in a manner that does not create a building with a bulky appearance. The individual elements of the building would be in proportion and the hipped roof reduces the overall built form. There are a number of larger family houses in the area and I consider that the scale of the development would be acceptable, in accordance with Criterion (ii) of policy H4.
- 6.7 Criterion (iii) of policy H4 requires the development to not adversely affect the character of the area. The proposed dwelling and existing property at No.102 Wood Lane would have substantial front gardens and both rear gardens would exceed the council's standards for amenity space. The proposed dwelling would be positioned a sufficient distance from the side boundaries to not appear cramped in the plot. There would be sufficient space to accommodate a suitable parking and turning area. In light of this assessment, I do not consider that the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site.
- 6.8 The Parish Council and a neighbour have raised concern regarding the position of the proposed dwelling forward of the properties on Reades Lane and the existing dwelling at 102 Wood Lane. Although the proposed dwelling would be positioned further forward than the neighbouring dwellings, the forward projecting gable would be some 11m back from the edge of the site, with the main body of the dwelling some 13m back and in line with the neighbouring telephone exchange. A landscaping scheme could help to soften the development from the road and is particularly important to replace the tree on the frontage that would be removed. I have recommended that a landscaping scheme is submitted as one of the conditions of the consent. Given these factors, I do not consider that the development would be prominent or intrusive in the streetscene and would comply with criterion (iii) of policy H4 and the other policies which seek to secure high quality design and protect the character of the area, including policies G2 and D1 of the SOLP, and policy CSQ3 of the SOCS.

Neighbours:

- 6.9 Criterion (iv) of policy H4 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. Given the position of the dwelling in relation to the neighbouring properties, I consider that the development would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties, in accordance with policies H4 and D4 of the SOLP.

- 6.10 I note that the first floor rear windows in the existing dwelling would, to some extent, overlook the garden of the proposed dwelling. The proposed dwelling would have its terrace at the point furthest from No.102 and the view towards the terrace from No.102 would be oblique. I do not consider that the level of overlooking would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of future occupiers of the site.

Parking provision / highway safety:

- 6.11 Criterion (iv) of policy H4 also requires there to be no overriding highway objections. Policies D1, D2, T1 and T2 of the SOLP also require an appropriate parking layout and that there would be no adverse impact on highway safety. The existing gated access point would be formalised to provide vehicular access to the site and sufficient parking and turning space would be provided. The County highways officer has raised no objection to the application, subject to a condition requiring the gates to be set back 5m from the back of the footpath. Subject to this condition I consider that the development would not be prejudicial to highway safety in compliance with the relevant policies.

Other material considerations:

- 6.12 In accordance with policy CSQ2 of the SOCS, I have recommended a condition requiring the new dwelling to meet Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. There would be sufficient space to incorporate appropriate storage for waste and recycling on site, in accordance with policy D10 of the SOLP. As the site forms part of a garden and there is no history of any potential previous contamination, I do not consider that a contaminated land assessment is required through a further condition.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 This proposal represents an appropriate infill development within a settlement where the principle of additional residential development is acceptable. The proposed dwelling would be of an appropriate design and would be of a scale suitable to the size of the plot. The position of the dwelling would not result in a development that is prominent or intrusive. Furthermore, the development would not be unneighbourly and would not result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety. As such, there is no reason to withhold planning permission.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **That planning permission is granted for the development contained in planning application P14/S3089/FUL subject to the following conditions-**

- 1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission**
- 2. Development to be as shown on approved plans**
- 3. Sample materials to be approved**
- 4. Dwelling to meet Code Level 4 of Code for Sustainable Homes**
- 5. Parking to be provided as on plan and retained**
- 6. Tree protection to be submitted and approved**
- 7. Landscaping scheme to be submitted and approved**
- 8. Gates to be set back 5m from highway**
- 9. No surface water drainage to highway**

Author: Emma Bowerman
Contact No: 01491 823761
Email: planning@southandvale.gov.uk