
APPLICATION NO.	P16/S0827/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	11.3.2016
PARISH	HENLEY-ON-THAMES
WARD MEMBER(S)	Joan Bland Lorraine Hillier Stefan Gawrysiak
APPLICANT	Jamie Smith Estates Ltd
SITE	76 St Andrews Road, Henley on Thames, RG9 1JE
PROPOSAL	Demolition of 76 St Andrews Road to create two detached 3 bedroom dwellings with associated parking.
AMENDMENTS	None
OFFICER	Simon Kitson

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to Planning Committee as it is both in the public interest and the Officers' recommendation conflicts with the views of the Town Council.
- 1.2 The existing dwelling at no. 76 St Andrews Road (which is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix A) is a detached 1.5 storey property, set in a generous 910 sq.m plot towards the western end of St Andrews Road and approximately 850m from the Henley Town Centre boundary. This part of St Andrews Road is generally characterised by large, extended dwellings in sizeable plots, though there are also smaller properties within the street and its connecting roads. Although the dwellings have predominantly traditional forms, they have a bespoke appearance and there is architectural variety within the locality, in terms of external finishes, roof structures, fenestration detail and boundary treatment.
- 1.3 The site does not fall within a conservation area and there are no tree preservation orders or other planning constraints. An aerial photograph illustrating the character of the area is **attached** as Appendix B.
- 1.4 In 2014, planning permission was granted for significant alterations and extensions to the dwelling, which would add a full second storey to the property and a part single, part two storey extension to the rear with a balcony enclosure. The plans accompanying that application are **attached** as Appendix C. Although unimplemented, this permission remains extant until August 2017 and is a material planning consideration afforded some weight.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 As detailed in the application submission, this proposal seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of two detached dwellings occupying a similar gross footprint to the previously approved scheme.
- 2.2 Each dwelling would have three bedrooms, a ground floor area of approximately 99 sq.m and a height measuring approximately 8.3m to the highest point of the roof. To take account of the local topography, the dwelling in plot 2 would be set below the dwelling in plot 1 by approximately 0.7m
- 2.3 The proposed site plans, elevations and floor plans are **attached** as Appendix D. All

associated documents and consultation responses can be viewed on the council's website: www.southoxon.gov.uk

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Henley-on-Thames Town Council – Objection

The development is overintensive and doesn't respect the character of the existing settlement or the street scene.

The Henley Society - No strong views

- This proposal would be improved if it were for two semi-detached houses (as discussed in the paperwork submitted) rather than two detached houses. This would improve the street scene as most neighbouring buildings are large and it would also provide better energy efficiency.

Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objections

- The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact upon the highway network.

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

Neighbour – 8 letters of objection have been received:

- The scale, size and density is too large for the single plot. This would contravene SODC's design policies.
- While many other properties have been extended well beyond their original forms, none have been subdivided.
- The proposal would radically alter the street scene and it would not accord with the existing development pattern.
- There would be additional noise and other disturbance, to the detriment of the residential amenity of the neighbours
- The open frontage and parking are not in keeping with the other properties in the area.
- The side elevations would impact upon the adjacent neighbours, by increasing the visual bulk and reducing afternoon sunlight.
- There is insufficient parking provided. 4 cars are required for each 3-bed house. This will cause traffic congestion and issues at peak times

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P14/S1718/HH](#) - Approved (08/08/2014)

Proposed conversion from a two storey dormer property to a two storey house including an extension to rear.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 The Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan (JHHNP);

Housing Strategy

Primary Housing Objectives H04

Policy H4 - Infill and self-build dwellings

Policy DSQ1 – Local Character

Policy T1 – Impact of development upon the transport network

5.2 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) policies;

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSH1 - Amount and distribution of housing

CSQ3 - Design
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

5.3 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP) policies;

- 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
- 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 (SODG)

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main considerations in relation to this application are:

- the principle of the development
- the impact of the design, height, scale and materials upon the character of the site, the street scene and the wider area;
- the ecological and landscape impact;
- the impact upon neighbouring amenity, in terms of light, outlook and privacy
- the impact upon the highway network, in terms of highway safety, access and parking provision.

6.2 The existing dwelling is not considered worthy of protection on the basis of historical or architectural merit and the council has no objection to its demolition and replacement, particularly when the council has previously permitted substantial remodelling of the property and the addition of a first floor. However, the proposed redevelopment into two detached properties has attracted a number of local objections from neighbouring residents and the Town Council, primarily focussing on the perceived impact in terms of overdevelopment, the relationship with the street scene, character of the area and highway safety. Officers agree that these are the main issues for consideration and an assessment of these factors against the relevant Local Development Plan policies now follows.

Principle of development

6.3 As the proposal falls within the built-up limits of Henley, the principle of this type of redevelopment is established by SOCS Policy CSHEN1 and the JHHNP, which has now been made and carries full weight in the assessment of this application. The SOCS allows for housing on 'suitable infill and redevelopment sites', subject to compliance with other Development Plan policies; and the JHHNP emphasises, as a primary housing objective, the importance of intensifying existing land uses within sustainable locations.

6.4 Officers are satisfied that the proposed development complies with the requisite criteria.

On the basis that the scheme would intensify an existing land use within a housing area and the site is in a location within walking distance of key services and public transport links, officers are satisfied that this proposal would comprise sustainable development as envisaged by both the NPPF and the Local Development Plan.

Scale and design

- 6.5 The submitted site plan (drawing 073-2) demonstrates that a plot of this size can accommodate two dwellings and comfortably meet the minimum residential amenity standards set out under Section 3.2.8 of the SODG. Officers note that each dwelling would benefit from a garden area in excess of 220 sq.m, more than double the recommended 100 sq.m and the gardens would have a depth of approximately 26m, considerably more than the 10m minimum. There would also be a reasonable distance of approximately 1.9m between the two dwellings and more than 3m to each neighbour. As each dwelling would also benefit from two off-street parking spaces in accordance with the council's maximum standards set out under Appendix 5 to the SOLP, officers consider that the site can comfortably accommodate this scale of development.
- 6.6 In considering whether this proposal comprises an overdevelopment of the site, it is necessary to consider the relationship of the scheme to the surrounding pattern of development, as required by SOLP Policies D1 and D3, and DSQ1 of the JHHNP. Whilst it is accepted that the application site is within a line of larger properties with relatively consistent garden sizes, this is not a designated area worth of special protection and the proposal should not be considered in too narrow a context. Both the NPPF and the Local Development Plan require new housing development to be informed by a wider context, having regard not just to any immediate neighbouring buildings but the townscape and landscape of the wider locality. There are clearly a range of plot sizes within the wider area, both to the south side of St Andrews Road and to the east, closer to the town centre. There are also comparable plot sizes within the connecting streets at Green Lane, Manor Road, Berkshire Road and Belle Vue Road. Officers therefore consider that the insertion of two smaller properties within this area would not constitute an overdevelopment within the wider context of the site and the townscape
- 6.7 With regard to the impact upon the street scene, the dwellings along the full length of St Andrews Road are highly varied in terms of plot width, height, form, age, detailing and materials and the diversity of built form travelling uphill from the town centre contributes significantly to the attractive character of the area. In this regard, the proposal would add more variety within the street scene, whilst also taking some cues from the prevailing architectural vernacular. Whilst the Henley Society's comments are noted, that the proposal would be improved if the dwellings were semi-detached, officers disagree with this statement on the basis that the detachment allows the two dwellings to make better use of the topography of the land, as illustrated by drawings 073-1 and 073-5. Officers also consider that one of the main strengths of this scheme is the variety in the detailing between the two properties, whilst retaining a cumulative volume and similar visual impact to the previous householder approval.
- 6.8 Officers do acknowledge that there are visual impacts associated with the opening up of the front of the site for parking of 4 vehicles. On the other hand, the existing property already has a relatively open frontage and the council rarely has any control over the formation of off-street parking and laying of hardstanding, as these forms of development can ordinarily be implemented without the need for planning permission. It is noted that the proposal would be able to provide some landscaping to the front of the site, with planting between the frontages of the two properties. Officers are satisfied that this aspect of the proposal would not be at variance with the overall character of the

street, where off street parking is an increasingly common feature.

Other material planning considerations

- 6.9 Whilst officers do not consider that there would be a significant level of harm to the street scene of the wider area, it is also worthy of note that the proposal would replace one larger property with two smaller 3-bed units. Given that the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identified the greatest housing need to be 3-bed units and this is a highly sustainable location, officers consider this to be compelling material planning consideration, adding significant weight to the case for approval of a more efficient use of previously developed land.

Neighbouring amenity

- 6.10 The adjacent properties at nos. 74 and 78 St Andrews Road were visited over the course of the application and the owners of both properties are aware of the scale of the previous, extant householder approval. Drawing no. 073-1 shows the outline of the previous approval relative to the proposed scheme.
- 6.11 Whilst it is not disputed that the new dwellings would be visible from both properties, the two storey elements of the dwellings would not project as far to the front or rear than the previous approval and officers consider that the 1.7m reduction to the rear, coupled with a hipped roof, would reduce the visual impact upon both neighbours. Although the single storey flat-roofed element would project 1.5m further than the previous extensions, neither neighbouring property would endure a significant loss of sunlight, due to the orientation of the site, nor would there be a material loss of daylight, due to the width and position of the rear openings at the adjoining properties. There would also be some screening afforded by the existing detached annex at no. 78 and the boundary treatment at no. 74. Although it is evident that the outlook from a side facing bedroom window at no. 78 would be diminished, it was observed on site that that room is served by an alternative south-east facing opening and the impact upon that room is unlikely to be materially worse than if the extant scheme were to be implemented.
- 6.12 In terms of the impact upon privacy, the rear facing openings now proposed would only allow oblique views of the neighbouring gardens, consistent with this type of built-up location. As the side-facing openings would be obscure glazed, officers are satisfied that there would not be a material loss of privacy with respect to any of the adjacent dwellings, nor would there be a material impact in terms of noise and other disturbances.

Highway safety

- 6.13 The submitted site plan demonstrates that it is possible to provide two off-street parking spaces per dwelling, in accordance with the adopted parking standards and the Local Highways Authority have provided an expert opinion which concludes that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the local highway network or be prejudicial to the safety of other road users or pedestrians. Officers concur with the conclusion and, for the reasons set out above, the proposal complies with SOLP Policies D1, T1 and T2 and the Transport Objectives of the JHHNP.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 6.14 The council's CIL charging schedule was adopted on 1 April 2016. CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area, and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. In this case CIL is liable for the development because the proposal involves the creation of new dwellings. The CIL charge applied to new residential development in this case is £150 per square metre of additional floorspace.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposal is in accordance with the relevant Development Plan policies and national planning policy. The proposed development would make more efficient use of residential land within a sustainable location, close to the town centre and officers consider that the proposal to redevelop the site to accommodate two detached properties would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the site, the street scene or the wider area. The proposal is also acceptable in terms of its impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and it would not be prejudicial to highway safety.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development must commence within three years of the date of this permission.**
- 2. Development to be implemented in accordance with the approved plans.**
- 3. A schedule of all external materials is to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development.**
- 4. Existing and proposed levels to be approved prior to commencement of development.**
- 5. Withdrawal of permitted development (PD) rights for all extensions and outbuildings within the curtilage of the dwellings.**
- 6. Parking and manoeuvring areas to be provided as on plan and retained unobstructed.**
- 7. All areas of front hardstanding to be of permeable construction, or make suitable provision for surface water run-off.**
- 8. The trees within the site shown to be retained must be protected in accordance with measures to be approved by the local planning authority.**
- 9. Obscure glazing to applied to all upper storey side-facing openings prior to first occupation of the dwellings and retained thereafter.**

Officer: Simon Kitson
Contact Number: 01235 422600
e-mail: planning@southoxon.gov.uk