

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P15/S1375/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	28.4.2015
<b>PARISH</b>	BINFIELD HEATH
<b>WARD MEMBERS</b>	Paul Harrison Martin Akehurst
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr and Mrs Cottam
<b>SITE</b>	The Briars, 18 Heathfield Avenue, Binfield Heath, RG9 4ED
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Demolition of existing property and construction of a new four bedroom house
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None
<b>OFFICER</b>	Emma Bowerman

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee as the Officers' recommendation differs from the views of Binfield Heath Parish Council.

1.2 The application site (which is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix A) contains a detached brick and clay tile dwelling constricted prior to planning records. A detached garage is positioned to the side / rear of the property. The plot is at the end of Heathfield Avenue and is triangular in shape. Heathfield Avenue is a single lane, un-adopted road and is also a public footpath. There is another public footpath running to the east of the site, linking Heathfield Avenue to Kiln Lane. The site does not fall within any areas of special designation.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission to replace the existing 3 bedroom dwelling with a larger 4 bedroom property. The proposed dwelling would be positioned in a similar position to the existing and would be of brick construction with a slate roof. Solar panels would also be provided on the south (front) facing roof slope.

2.2 A new access and two car parking spaces would be provided at the front of the proposed dwelling. The existing access to the side would be closed off and the existing garage would also be demolished.

2.3 A copy of the proposed plans is **attached** as Appendix B. The application is accompanied by a design and access assessment, which can be viewed online at [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk).

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Binfield Heath Parish Council – Considers the application should be refused on the grounds that:

- 1) There seems to be a disproportional amount of business space for a residential house which causes concern in terms of future potential traffic to the completed site and business use issues and
- 2) The new building proposed does not fit with the character of established houses in the road or the neighbourhood.

3.2 Countryside Officer – No objection subject to an informative bringing to the applicants attention the potential for the building to be used by bats.

3.3 Countryside Access Officer - No objection subject to an informative advising the applicant that the footpaths should not be obstructed and that any damage to the surface would be the responsibility of the applicants to put right.

3.4 Neighbour representations –

1 in objection raising the following issues:

- That a modern house is out of keeping with other types of houses in the road
- Issues with construction traffic as the road is narrow, private and maintained by residents

4 in support / no objection with the following comments:

- Building is appropriate and would enhance the street
- Development would enhance the far end of Heathfield Avenue where the houses are younger

1 with no strong views commenting that the new build would be preferable to an extension to the existing dwelling as this would be less disruptive and be more complementary to this part of the Avenue.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P13/S3768/FUL – Withdrawn prior to determination (12/03/2014)  
Erection of a dwelling adjacent to The Briars

This proposal was for a new dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling in the corner of the plot. This application had an officer recommendation of approval but was withdrawn prior to the application being determined by the planning committee.

4.2 P14/S3509/HH - Approved (22/12/2014)

Two storey rear and part side extension with garden home office, internal revisions and upgrading existing building fabric.

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**

C8 - Adverse affect on protected species

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

D6 - Community safety

D10 - Waste Management

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
- 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

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

Sections 3, 4 and 5

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 Binfield Heath, which is classed as a smaller village under policy CSR1 of the SOCS. Policy CSR1 allows for infill development within smaller villages and as such, I consider that the principle of replacing the existing dwelling is acceptable. 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:

6.3 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 contains a private dwelling 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, I consider that the proposal would be in accordance with the above criterion.

6.4 Criterion (ii) of Policy H4 of the SOLP requires that the design, scale, height, and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings. The proposed dwelling would be a pitched roof building of a traditional form. Large areas of glazing would create a modern appearance and I have no objection to this design approach. In my opinion the proposed dwelling would be appropriately proportioned and of an acceptable scale in relation to the plot. At 8m high, the dwelling would not be excessive in height. The materials proposed (brick and slate) are characteristic to the local area and there are examples on other properties in Heathfield Avenue. As such the proposal accords with criterion (ii) of policy H4.

6.5 Criterion (iii) of policy H4 requires the development to not adversely affect the character of the area. Heathfield Avenue is characterised by brick built, eaves fronted dwellings, which are positioned close to the Avenue. With the exception of the gable feature at the front, the proposed dwelling would fit in with this character. The dwellings in the Avenue are of slightly different designs and I do not consider that the large areas of glazing in the proposed dwelling, and the resultant modern design, would be harmful to the character of the road.

6.6 The proposed dwelling would be set in a sufficient distance from the site boundaries and I do not consider that the building would appear cramped. There would be sufficient space available on site for two parking spaces and a sizable garden would be

retained. In the light of the above assessment, I consider that the development would have an acceptable impact on the character of the site and surrounding area and that the proposal would comply 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:

- 6.7 Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. The neighbouring property The Meadows (to the west) has been extended to the rear previously and given the relationship of the proposed dwelling with this neighbour, I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to this neighbour in terms of light or outlook.
- 6.8 With regards to privacy, the view from the side window of bedroom 2 into the rear garden of The Meadows would be oblique and I do not consider that it would be reasonable to require this window to be obscure glazed. Any views down into this neighbour's conservatory would be similar to the relationship with the neighbour to the other side of The Meadow and would be acceptable.
- 6.9 The relationship with 1 The Cobblers (to the northeast) would also not result in any adverse impact on this neighbour in terms of light or outlook due to the distance to this neighbour. With regards to overlooking, the windows in the east elevation of the proposed dwelling would face the front garden and driveway of 1 The Cobblers and this is an area that is visible from public viewpoints. I do not consider that these side windows would result in any adverse overlooking.
- 6.10 The rear wall of the proposed dwelling would be positioned closer to 1 The Cobblers and at its closest point would be around 10m from this neighbour. The proposed dwelling has been designed to avoid any additional overlooking of this neighbouring property. The rear window closest to the boundary with 1 The Cobblers would be obscure glazed up to a height of 1.7m, the rear roof light would be high level and the bedroom window furthest from the boundary would be recessed to block any direct views to the side. Subject to conditions to ensure that these measures are implemented and retained, I consider that the development would have an acceptable impact on neighbouring privacy, in accordance with policies H4 and D4 of the SOLP.

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. Heathfield Avenue is an unmade, no-through road and the site is located near to the end of the road. The proposal would include two parking spaces for the proposed replacement dwelling and the existing access would be closed.
- 6.12 A condition would ensure that the parking spaces are provided before the new dwelling is occupied and that the existing access is closed. The level of parking would meet the council's parking standards and as such, I consider that the development would not be prejudicial to highway safety and would comply with the relevant policies.

Other matters:

- 6.13 The surface of Heathfield Avenue is poor and residents have recently paid to improve the surface. Concern has been raised that construction vehicles would cause harm to the surface. This is not a matter that can be controlled under the conditions of the planning application as Heathfield Avenue is outside of the application site and the matter is controlled by other legislation. Any accidental damage to the road caused by

construction traffic would be a civil matter for the owners of the road to resolve with the applicant / contractor. Any damage to the public footpaths would be the responsibility of the applicant / contractor to put right. I recommend that the owners of the road and the applicant take a photographic record of the condition of the road surface before development commences to assist in any issues that may arise in this respect.

- 6.14 The application plans show that one of the rooms on the ground floor would be used as a home office. The applicant has advised that this room would be used as a home office and ground floor accessible bedroom and would provide some flexibility in how the space is used in the future. On the basis that any office is used in a manner that is ancillary to the main use of the dwelling as a private residence, I have no objection to the use of part of the house for home working, which has the benefit of reducing car journeys. I have recommended a condition stating that the office space should remain ancillary to the use of the dwelling.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 This proposal replaces an existing dwelling in a village 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 development would not detract from the character and appearance of the site, would not be unneighbourly and would not result in conditions prejudicial to highway safety. As such, the application is recommended for approval.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**That planning permission is granted for the development contained in planning application P15/S1375/FUL subject to the following conditions:**

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Development to be as shown on approved plans.
3. Sample materials to be approved.
4. Parking to be provided as on plan.
5. Existing access to be closed prior to occupation.
6. Home office to be ancillary to residential use of the site.
7. Rear window to bedroom four to be obscure glazed up to 1.7m.
8. Recess to bedroom two window to be retained.

**Informative about bats.**

**Informative about footpaths.**

**Author:** Emma Bowerman  
**Contact No:** 07717 150603  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank