

## **SHR/2573/4 – Mr T Gee. Demolition of existing garage and erection of three dwellings. 33 High Street, Shrivenham**

### **The Proposal**

1. This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage building and its replacement with a terrace of three no. three bedroom cottages fronting the High Street with parking at the front of the site.
2. The area surrounding the site is largely residential although there are some commercial uses including shops, a hairdresser and a number of public houses along the High Street. The garage currently carries out vehicular repairs and MOT's, there are no petrol sales or any retail element.
3. The proposed dwellings continue the existing pattern of development along the High Street and would be constructed of natural stone on the front and side elevations with brick detailing and a plain clay tile roof.
4. Extracts from the application drawings are at **Appendix 1**.
5. The site is located in the Shrivenham Conservation Area.
6. The application comes to committee as the parish council objects.

### **Planning History**

7. Planning permission was granted in August 1978 and July 1982 for extensions to the existing garage.
8. A previous application for three dwellings on the site was withdrawn in February 2010 due to concerns over the design of the proposed dwellings.

### **Planning Policies**

#### Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

9. Policy H11 lists Shrivenham as one of the larger villages in the district capable of accommodating new residential development of up to 15 dwellings on sites within the built up area of the settlement and providing the scale, layout, mass and design of the dwellings would not harm the character of the settlement.
10. Policy HE1 refers to development within conservation areas and states that it will not be permitted unless the established character of the area is preserved or enhanced.
11. Policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 relate to the design of new development, parking and access considerations and impact on neighbouring properties.

## Consultations

12. Shrivenham Parish Council – “Object to proposed change of use. The removal of a valuable and viable business in the High Street would be detrimental and contrary to Policy H11. The art nouveau style architecture at the front of the garage is important in the street scene and should be preserved.”
13. The County Engineer has re-iterated comments from the previous application raising no objections subject to conditions given the site’s existing traffic movements and parking requirements for staff and customers.
14. The County developer funding officer has requested a contribution of £17,866 towards education, library and other local facilities.
15. The Council’s conservation officer has raised no objections to the loss of the existing garage building stating that whilst it is art deco in style it is of no architectural merit
16. Three letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties raising the following concerns:
  - The proposed houses will overlook the neighbouring property to the rear.
  - The vicarage to the rear of the site is frequently visited and therefore builders would not be able to access the site during construction.
  - The proposed boundary treatment is inadequate.
  - Shrivenham Garage provides an essential service to the community.
  - Parking on the High Street is already at a premium and the proposal will make things worse.
  - The proposal would harm the character of the High Street.
  - The proposal would result in the loss of an art deco building.

## Officer Comments

17. The main issues to consider in determining this application are; i) the principle of the loss of the garage and its replacement with three dwellings; ii) the design of the proposed dwellings and their impact on the character of the conservation area; iii) the impact of the proposed dwellings on immediate neighbouring properties; and iv) parking considerations.
18. The site is located within the centre of Shrivenham and is surrounded largely by residential properties. The existing garage carries out vehicular repairs and MOT tests which would not normally be considered appropriate uses within a residential area. It is therefore considered that given the central location of the site and the fact that a residential use would be more appropriate that the principle of the development is acceptable. Concern has been raised in relation to the loss of the garage as a commercial facility within

the village. However, there are no policies protecting such commercial uses, therefore there is no planning reason to object to the loss of the garage.

19. The proposed dwellings would front immediately onto the High Street, continuing the built form of adjacent dwellings. The main span of the proposed dwellings is of traditional proportion at about 6.5 metres with a rear two storey projection set at a lower height from the main dwelling. The ridge line would be broken up with chimneys to provide some articulation in the design. The dwellings would be faced in natural stone with brick detailing to the front and side which are most prominent and the roof would be covered with plain clay tiles. Your officers consider that with appropriate detailing and good quality materials the proposal would enhance this part of the conservation area. Whilst the existing garage is of an art deco form, the conservation officer has confirmed that the building is of limited architectural merit and refusal on the grounds of retaining this largely utilitarian building could not be justified.
20. The existing garage building covers the majority of the site, with a small yard to the rear. The proposed dwellings themselves would only cover the front half of the site with about 11.5 metre long rear gardens, therefore the built form on the site would be significantly reduced from that existing. The proposed dwellings would adjoin no 35 High Street, however the rear projection to the dwelling on plot 1 which is closest to this neighbour is set off the boundary by between 1.7 and 2 metres and angled away from the neighbour's nearest first floor window, which is a bedroom. The proposal would meet the 40 degree rule as set out in the adopted Residential Design Guide thereby ensuring that the neighbouring property does not suffer loss of light to any primary living accommodation as a result of the development.
21. St Andrews Vicarage lies to the rear of the site with the front parking and driveway bounding the rear of the garage. The loss of the large bulky utilitarian garage building and its associated use, and its replacement with rear gardens would in your officers' view have a positive impact on the residential amenity of this neighbour. However concern has been raised over potential overlooking from the rear windows of the proposed dwellings. These are set over 11 metres from the rear boundary and face the parking area to this neighbour. The main front windows of the neighbouring dwelling are approximately 24 metres from the rear of the proposed units, therefore the proposal meets the requirements of the council's design guidance in terms of the distance between main windows. Your officers therefore consider that refusal on the grounds of the impact on neighbour amenity could not be justified.
22. In terms of parking provision the scheme proposes on street parking at the front of the dwelling where traditionally the garage has been accessed and utilised as parking for staff and customers. Although not ideal, off street parking is not achievable within this constrained site. Given the traffic and parking requirements generated by the existing use, the County Engineer is satisfied with the parking arrangements for the proposed dwellings.

23. As the property is located in the conservation area, conservation area consent is required for the demolition of the existing building. An informative is recommended to be added to the decision notice to alert the applicant to this requirement.

***Recommendation***

***It is recommended that planning permission is delegated to the Chair and Vice Chair subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement with the County Council in order to secure the necessary financial contributions and subject to the following conditions:***

- 1 TL1 – Time Limit***
- 2 MC2 – Materials Samples***
- 3 MC9 – Building Details***
- 4 MC24 – Drainage Details (Foul and Surface water)***
- 5 MC22 – Contaminated Land***
- 6 Submission of a construction traffic management plan.***
- 7 HY7 – No drainage to Highway***
- 8 RE2 – PD Restriction***