

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P16/S1013/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	30.3.2016
<b>PARISH</b>	SHIPLAKE
<b>WARD MEMBERS</b>	Will Hall and Paul Harrison
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mrs M Brown
<b>SITE</b>	Vale Cottage, Northfield Avenue, Lower Shiplake
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of a 2.5 storey 5 bedroom detached dwelling with a detached double garage following demolition of the existing house and detached garage (height of dwelling reduced, rooflight cill level shown and garage repositioned, as shown on amended plans received 6th May 2016 and height of dwelling reduced as shown on amended plans received 21 June 2016).
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Two – see above
<b>OFFICER</b>	Paul Lucas

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application is referred to the planning committee as a result of a difference in views between the officers' recommendation and Shiplake Parish Council's consultation response.

1.2 The site is shown at **Appendix 1**. It comprises a large residential plot occupied by an early 20<sup>th</sup> century two-storey dwelling located within the built up confines of Lower Shiplake. There is a detached flat-roofed garage located towards the north-east corner of the frontage. The site is bordered by two storey dwellings on either side, Basswood to the south-east and Bunbury to the north-east. The land rises from south-east to north-west across the site so that the site is higher than Basswood, but lower than Bunbury. The land also rises towards the end of the long rear garden. There is a line of mature Leylandii along the boundary with Bunbury, on the neighbours' side of the boundary. The boundary with Basswood is largely open. There are also some trees on the frontage boundary. There are no special designations on the site.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage and the erection of a replacement two and a half storey five bedroom detached dwelling and detached double garage, as detailed in the plans and supporting documents submitted with the application.

2.2 The application was amended to reduce the height of the dwelling and to reposition the garage further back from the road. The amended plans can be viewed at **Appendix 2** and other documents can be viewed on the Council's [website](#).

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Shiplake Parish Council** – The latest amended version of the application should be refused due to its scale and bulk

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

**Countryside Officer(South Oxfordshire & Vale of White Horse)** - No objection subject to standard bat informative

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

**Neighbours** – Nine representations of objection/concern to the original plans, summarised as follows:

- House too large for plot and neo-Georgian style is out of character with surroundings
- Overlooking of Bunbury’s garden from upper floor west-facing windows and patio
- Overlooking of Basswood’s lounge from east-facing rooflight
- Damage to trees on boundary during construction with Bunbury

#### 4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None directly relevant.

#### 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

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

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 National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

The policies within the SOCS 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 the relevant policies above.

Paragraph 60: “Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The planning issues that are relevant to this application are whether the development would:

- be acceptable in principle;
- cause the loss of any open space;
- be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding area including retention of any important trees;
- safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and provide sufficient outdoor amenity space for future occupiers;
- result in an acceptable provision of off-street parking spaces for the resultant development or conditions prejudicial to highway safety; and
- give rise to any other material planning considerations.

6.2 Principle of Development

The SOCS Policy CSR1 allows for redevelopment of residential plots in Lower Shiplake. The site is located within the built-up confines of the village and forms part of an otherwise built-up frontage and would therefore be compliant with Policy CSR1 and acceptable in principle. Consequently, the proposal can be assessed against the impact-based criteria of the SOLP 2011 Policy H4.

6.3 Loss of Open Space

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 is not accessible to the public. Although there are views of the site from the road, these are in the context of adjoining development rather than open countryside. The Council's Countryside Officer has also confirmed that there would be no identified ecological implications arising from this proposal that could not be covered by the recommended informative. On this basis, the proposal would be in accordance with the above criterion.

6.4 Visual Impact

Criteria (ii) and (iii) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 are concerned with the impact of a residential development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and ensuring that the design would be appropriate. Officers accept that the proposal would result in the introduction of a significantly larger dwelling onto the plot. This would be evident both from the increase in width and depth compared with the existing dwelling. The plot coverage of the dwelling and garage would be 17%. This would be in accordance with the recommended maximum of 30% in Section 3 of the SODG 2008 and would be comparable with other plots in the vicinity. In addition, there would be a gap of 8.1 metres between the side elevation of the proposed dwelling and Bunbury. There would also be a gap of 5.8 metres between the main side elevation of the proposed dwelling and Basswood. This degree of separation would be comparable with other spaces between dwellings along Northfield Avenue. This is also indicative that the proposal would not overdevelop the plot.

6.5 The ridge height has been dropped so that it would be 0.135 metres lower than the ridge of the existing dwelling. The ridge would reflect the slope by being 0.045 metre higher than Basswood's ridge and 0.185 metre lower than Bunbury's ridge. Consequently, the height of the dwelling would not appear out of keeping with its neighbours. Northfield Avenue contains a variety of detached dwellings from different decades. Bearing in mind national guidance in paragraph 60 of the NPPF, officers consider that the proposed dwelling would add to this variety. In any event, there are neo-Georgian dwellings on Manor Wood Gate, about 100 metres from the site.

- 6.6 The proposed garage would be located closer to the road than the house. In theory this would be at odds with Section 3 of the SODG 2008, which advises that garages should be set back from the frontage. However, the garage would be no closer to the road than the existing flat roofed garage. It would have a pitched roof that would be more aesthetically pleasing and would be located where there is more boundary screening. The garage would therefore have a neutral visual impact on the street scene. The Council's Forestry Officer has confirmed that the trees on and around the site should not be seen as a constraint to the development due to their limited arboricultural value. A tree protection condition could be imposed to ensure retained trees are protected and a landscaping condition to secure replacement planting to help soften the impact of the development. In the light of the above assessment, the proposal would be in accordance with the above criteria.
- 6.7 Neighbour Impact  
Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that there are no overriding amenity objections. Policy D4 of the SOLP 2011 requires that all new dwellings should be designed and laid out so as to secure a reasonable degree of privacy for the occupiers. The proposed dwelling would be brought much closer to Basswood than the existing dwelling. However, the footprint would lie outside a notional 45-degree line taken from the closest rear windows serving habitable rooms at Basswood. This indicates that any loss of light or outlook would not be significant. There are no windows in the north-west facing elevation of Basswood. Concerns about overlooking of the rear from rooflights could be dealt with through a condition to ensure the cill height is positioned more than 1.7 metres above internal floor level. As the proposed dwelling would be located to the north-west of Basswood there would be no discernible loss of sunlight.
- 6.8 The footprint of the dwelling would extend further beyond the rear of Bunbury. In spite of this, it would still lie outside a notional 45-degree line taken from the closest rear-facing windows serving habitable rooms at Bunbury. This means that the neighbouring occupiers would continue to benefit from adequate levels of daylight and outlook. Such a line of sight also passes through the line of Leylandii on Bunbury's side of the boundary. The Forestry Officer has commented that a planning condition to secure general tree protection measures should be sufficient to secure the retention of these trees. These trees would provide significant screening of the enlarged dwelling from the neighbours' garden. The eaves of the proposed dwelling would be about 3 metres from the boundary and the ridge would be around 6.5 metres away. In officers' opinion, these distances would be sufficient to prevent any significant loss of morning sunlight, given the shading already provided by the Leylandii. A planning condition could be imposed to prevent loss of privacy from the north-west facing rooflight by controlling its cill height. A planning condition could also be imposed to ensure that the north-west facing first floor en-suite window would be obscure glazed and fixed shut. The proposed garage would be a sufficient distance from the frontage of Bunbury to not cause any significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.9 The boundary of the neighbouring dwelling to the rear, Raleith, would be about 47 metres from the rear of the proposed dwelling. Consequently, there would be no discernible loss of residential amenity to these adjoining occupiers. The proposed rear garden would comply with the relevant recommended minimum standards set out in Section 3 of the SODG 2008 in relation to area (100 square metres) and depth (10 metres) for a dwelling of this size. On the basis of the above assessment, the proposal would be in compliance with the above policies and guidance.

6.10 Access and Parking

Criterion (iv) of Policy H4 of the SOLP 2011 also requires that there are no overriding highway objections. The Highway Liaison Officer has commented that the proposal would be unlikely to result in any significant intensification of transport activity at the property. No change is proposed to the existing access arrangements. The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network. As such, the proposal would comply with this element of the above criterion.

6.11 Other Material Planning Considerations

Officers consider that it is reasonable to restrict permitted development rights for the proposed dwelling for extensions, roof extensions, rooflights and outbuildings. This would allow officers the opportunity to ensure that any future expansion of the proposed dwelling would not give rise to any visual harm or loss of residential amenity.

6.12 The Council's CIL charging schedule has applied to relevant proposals since 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 new dwelling. The CIL charge applied to new residential development in this case is £150 per square metre of additional floorspace (Zone 1). 15% of the CIL payment would go directly to Shiplake Parish Council (in the absence of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan) for spending towards local projects.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 I have recommended that planning permission is granted on the basis that the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and National Planning Guidance and, subject to conditions, the development would not detract from the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area, would not be unneighbourly and would not be prejudicial to highway safety.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. **Commencement of development within three years.**
2. **Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.**
3. **Schedule of materials to be agreed prior to commencement of development.**
4. **Obscure glazing for north-west facing first floor window.**
5. **Rooflights to be at least 1.7m above cill level and no additional rooflights**
6. **Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions, roof extensions and outbuildings.**
7. **Parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained as approved.**
8. **No garage conversion into accommodation without planning permission.**
9. **Details of hard and soft landscaping to be agreed prior to commencement of development.**
10. **Details of tree protection measures to be agreed prior to commencement of development.**

**Author:** Paul Lucas  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank