

APPLICATION NO.	P15/S0024/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	30.1.2015
PARISH	ROTHERFIELD PEPPARD
WARD MEMBER(S)	Paul Harrison and Alan Rooke
APPLICANT	D + N Construction Ltd
SITE	Broadlands House, 6 Stoke Row Road, Peppard Common
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing dwelling, sheds and garage to Vine Lodge. Erection of 2 x four bedroom dwellings with garages, new access on to Peppard Hill (B481), landscaping works to boundary to protect existing access visibility splays, 2 x bin stores and hard and soft landscaping (existing access to Stoke Row Road blocked up as shown on amended site plan received 2nd March 2015).
AMENDMENTS	One – see above
OFFICER	Paul Lucas

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application is reported to the Planning Committee as the Officers' recommendation differs from the views of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council.

1.2 The application site, shown on the OS extract at **Appendix 1**, is a residential plot occupied by a single dwelling with an area of 0.24 hectares. The dwelling fronts onto and is accessed from Stoke Row Road to the west, but is also bordered by Peppard Hill to the east. The site is adjoined by Vine Lodge, a large detached house to the south and by Apple Trees (a semi-detached house) and Coopers Cottage (a detached house) to the north. The site is within the built-up limits of Rotherfield Peppard and does not fall within any areas of special designation. There are three trees located towards the eastern end of the site that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 14S11).

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing dwelling and construct two detached two-storey 4-bedroom dwellings with basements. Plot 1 would have an attached two-bay garage and Plot 2 would have a detached two-bay carport. A new shared vehicular access would be formed from Peppard Hill to serve the two dwellings. The site would include a parcel of land that originally belonged to Vine Lodge. A parcel of land at the north-eastern end of the site would be transferred to Apple Tree Cottage. It was originally intended to retain the existing access onto Stoke Row Road, however, following objections, an amended plan has been submitted to show that this would be blocked up.

2.2 The current 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 **Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council** – The application should be refused for the following reason:

Although the Council welcomed the revised plans with the access onto Stoke Row Road closed, the concerns regarding the safety of the B481 in this area remain and therefore again recommend the refusal of this application. The Council are also concerned that the unequal apportioning of the two plots will result in a third or even fourth property being built on the site contrary to the pre application advice. Appendix A of the Design and Access statement.

Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objection subject to conditions

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

Forestry Officer (South Oxfordshire District Council) - No objection subject to condition

Neighbours – Six representations of objection/concern, summarised as follows:

- Retention of existing access would pre-empt 3rd dwelling [access to be closed]
- Orientation of Plot 1 would lead to overlooking of Coopers Cottage rear-facing windows and garden, resulting in loss of privacy to the occupiers and to future occupiers of Plot 1
- Trees have been removed from site
- When seen in combination with the planning permission at Vine Lodge and the implemented development at Mulberry House, proposal would lead to suburbanisation of the semi-rural area
- Proposed replacement planting could overshadow Coopers Cottage garden
- Why is the garden to Plot 2 much larger than Plot 1?
- Conditions to control landscaping, orientation of dwellings, obscure glazing in western elevation of Plot 1, no further extensions and no further dwellings should be imposed if planning permission is granted
- Rear boundaries with Stoke Row Road should be planted
- Intensification of access onto highway near the busy junction to the south in combination with other recent planning permissions and development
- Wildlife habitats should be conserved

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 None directly relevant on the application site. The following planning permission was recently granted at Vine Lodge:

[P14/S3795/FUL](#) - Approved (23/02/2015)

Demolition of existing dwelling and garage. Erection of two detached two-storey 5-bedroom dwellings with garages. Closure of existing access and creation of new access. (as amended by drawings from Agent received 05/02/15 amending layout of plot 2).

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

- 5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy policies

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSEN1 - Landscape protection

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;

- C9 - Loss of landscape features
- 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
- D10 - Waste Management
- EP2 - Adverse affect by noise or vibration
- EP3 - Adverse affect by external lighting
- EP6 - Sustainable drainage
- 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 2008 – Sections 3 & 5

- 5.3 Paragraph 32 – “...Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance
The policies within the SOCS and 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 planning issues that are relevant to the planning application are whether the development would:

- Be acceptable in principle;
- 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 site and the surrounding area, including the preservation of important trees;
- Safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers;
- Provide safe and convenient access and off-street parking provision for the resultant dwelling; and
- Give rise to any other material planning considerations

Principle:

- 6.2 The site is located within the built up limits of Peppard Common, which is classed as a smaller village under policy CSR1 of the SOCS. Policy CSR1 allows for infill development within smaller villages of sites up to 0.2 hectares. Although the site is slightly larger than this, the proposal would involve the replacement of the existing dwelling and could reasonably be described as a “redevelopment proposal” for which there is no site limit under Policy CSR1. The site is otherwise closely surrounded by other buildings and would comply with the definition of acceptable infill development as set out under Policy CSR1. The proposal therefore falls to be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011. Policy H4 supports new housing in villages, subject to a number of environmental and amenity considerations, which are addressed below.

Loss of Open Space

- 6.3 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. The site has formed part of a plot containing a dwelling for many decades. It is surrounded by residential plots or roads with built up frontages and the Council's Countryside Office is satisfied that there is no evidence that the site has any particular ecological value. The site is visible in public views from both Stoke Row Road and Peppard Hill, where it would be seen in the context of established and recent residential development. This criterion would therefore be satisfied.

Visual Impact

- 6.4 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. The proposed dwellings would be sizable family dwellings, with four bedrooms. The proposed dwellings would be set in from the site boundaries and in my opinion, would not appear cramped. There would be sufficient space around the buildings so that the site would not appear overdeveloped. There are a number of larger dwellings in the local area, particularly the three recently constructed dwellings in the grounds of Mulberry House, on the opposite side of Peppard Hill and the two dwellings granted planning permission to be built in place of Vine Lodge, which are larger with five bedrooms and include second floor dormer windows. The proposed dwellings would be in keeping with these neighbours both in relation to their plot sizes and visual appearance, which would both accord with guidance in Sections 3 and 5 of the SODG 2008. The carport serving Plot 2 would be positioned quite close to the street frontage, however, it would be in line with the footprint of Apple Trees to the north and would be reasonably well screened by the protected trees to the north and by replacement planting in due course. There is also a forward-located garage in the Mulberry House development. Consequently, the proposal would not be harmful to the character of the local area, which has a variety of houses of different sizes and designs. The materials on the plans (natural stone and clay tiles for Plot 1 and timber boarding and natural slates) would be appropriate given the variety in the appearance of dwellings in the locality and suitable quality materials could be secured via a condition. The Council's Forestry Officer has raised no objections, subject to a condition requiring a detailed tree protection condition and a landscaping scheme to assimilate the development into the site and provide additional screening. In the light of the above assessment, the proposal would comply with the above criteria.

Neighbour Impact

- 6.5 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. The main concern raised is the impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of Coopers Cottage. Officers acknowledge that Plot 1 would be angled more towards the rear of Coopers Cottage than the existing dwelling. However, the distance from the proposed first floor windows to the boundary with the adjoining garden would be about 25 metres at an angle. This would be in compliance with the recommended minimum window to window distance of 25 metres, as set out in Section 3 of the SODG 2008. As a consequence, officers are satisfied that significant overlooking and mutual loss of privacy would not occur. Although the rear building line of Plot 1 would project beyond the rear of Apple Trees, the closest part would be the attached garage, which would be about 4 metres from the nearest wall of Apple Trees. The two storey element of Plot 1 would be over 9 metres away. Officers consider that this would be a sufficient level of separation to prevent any significant loss of light and outlook to the adjoining residents. There would be no first floor north-facing windows, so privacy would not be an issue. It is also noted that the occupiers of Apple Trees have not objected to the application.

- 6.6 The relationship between the two plots and the closest approved dwelling at Vine Lodge would be acceptable as their building lines are broadly in line with one another. An obscure glazing condition is necessary in order to prevent first floor windows proposed in Plot 1 from overlooking Plot 2. The amount of garden area at the rear of both of the proposed dwellings would comply with the recommended minimum standard of 100m² for dwellings of this size as set out in Section 3 of the SODG 2008. On the basis of this assessment, the proposal would be in accordance with the above criterion.

Access and Parking

- 6.7 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 also requires that there are no overriding highway objections. The OCC Highway Liaison Officer (HLO) is satisfied that the proposed access and parking arrangements would be acceptable to serve the proposed dwelling, subject to standard planning conditions relating to the provision and retention of the new access and vision splays, closure of the existing access, garaging, parking and turning area provision, prevention of surface water discharge onto the highway and ensuring that any gates would be sufficiently set back from the highway. Although there is concern about the cumulative impact of this proposal alongside other recently approved developments in the vicinity, each application must be considered on its individual merits and those other developments were also found to have acceptable access and parking arrangements. Although the scale of development is such that the HLO does not recommend a construction traffic management plan condition, the applicant is encouraged to ensure that construction activity at the site embraces the principles of the Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) by following the Code of Considerate Practice, and is CCS registered. In this regard it is expected that contractors vehicles should pass slowly and with caution down Reading Road, endeavour to keep all construction related vehicle parking within the curtilage of the site and refrain from obstructing either Reading Road or adjoining private driveways. This matter can be dealt with through an informative on any planning permission. The proposal would therefore satisfy the above criterion.

Other Material Planning Considerations

- 6.8 Matters relating to Code for Sustainable Homes and waste management could be dealt with through planning conditions.

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 not materially harm the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of nearby residents or result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

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

- 1 : Commencement three years - full planning permission.**
- 2 : Development to accord with the approved plans.**
- 3 : Schedule of materials required.**
- 4 : Obscure glazing (south-facing first floor windows to plot 1).**
- 5 : Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings.**
- 6 : Code Level 4 of the code for sustainable homes to be attained.**
- 7 : New vehicular access to be provided.**
- 8 : Close existing access.**
- 9 : Vision splay details to be agreed.**
- 10 : Garage, parking and manoeuvring areas retained.**

11 : No surface water drainage to highway.

12 : Gates/carriageway details.

13 : Landscaping scheme (trees, boundaries, hardstandings) to be agreed.

14 : Tree protection (detailed) to be agreed.

Author: Paul Lucas

Email: Planning@southandvale.gov.uk

Telephone: 01235 540546