

APPLICATION NO.	P12/V1948/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	19 September 2012
PARISH	GREAT FARINGDON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Roger Cox Mohinder Kainth Alison Thomson
APPLICANT	Mr Rob Stewart
SITE	Landview Canada Lane Faringdon SN7 8AR
PROPOSAL	Construction of a single dwelling
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	428270/195371
OFFICER	Laura Hudson

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application relates to Landview, Canada Lane, Faringdon which is a part two, part three storey dwelling located to the north-west of Canada Lane on a relatively large plot. Landview forms part of a small group of sporadic dwellings on the north-western fringe of Faringdon. The main built-up area of the town lies on the south-east side of the lane.
- 1.2 The application site forms a relatively large gap between Landview and the neighbouring property, 1 Maple Cottages, and the site slopes steeply downwards away from the road.
- 1.3 The site is located outside the Faringdon development boundary and within the North Vale Corallian Ridge as defined on the local plan proposals map.
- 1.4 Planning permission has previously been refused for a single dwelling on the site and extension to Landview. That scheme was dismissed on appeal in 2011. The current scheme is an amended design and set slightly further forward on the site.
- 1.5 The application comes to Committee at the request of the local member Cllr. Alison Thomson.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single dwelling adjacent to Landview. The proposed four bedroom dwelling would be located within the gap between Landview and 1 Maple Cottages, fronting Canada Lane, and would be built into the slope of the site appearing from the front as a 1 ½ storey bungalow but dropping away to the rear to form a 2 ½ storey dwelling with rooms in the roof space.
- 2.2 The proposed dwelling would be accessed from Canada Lane with parking for two cars at the front of the dwelling.
- 2.3 The proposed dwelling features a double pitched roof at different heights, creating gable ends on both the front and rear elevations.
- 2.4 Extracts from the application drawings are **attached** at appendix 1.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Faringdon Town Council – No objection.

3.2 Cllr. Alison Thomson – “I fully support this application which appears to have minimal impact on the surrounding environment, contributes to the need for housing (even in a minimal way), is clearly eco-friendly, and above all is definitely just infill on an empty site. The applicant has gone to enormous trouble to demonstrate that it complies with Council and planning policies. Although it is clearly more modern than its immediate neighbours in Maple Cottages, other properties to the north of Landview in Canada Lane are also modern so it is not out of keeping with them. I trust this will receive approval from the planners.”

3.3 Cllr Mohinder Kainth – “Rob’s application is in keeping with the environment and the local area. I know he has spent a substantial amount of time and resources to ensure that his application is successful. He has worked with his architect to ensure that all previous issues raised have been addressed. I have reviewed his plan and see no reason for rejection.”

3.4 County Engineer – No objections subject to conditions.

3.5 Drainage Engineer – No objections subject to conditions.

3.6 Four Letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties raising the following concerns:

- The proposal would disrupt the character of the area and the North Vale Corallian Ridge.
- The proposed dwelling is out of keeping with existing properties.
- Increased traffic would have a harmful impact on Canada Lane.
- The proposal would erode the transition between the countryside and the town.
- The proposed dwelling would overlook neighbouring properties.
- The proposed dwelling would over-dominate the neighbouring property.
- Canada Lane is also a public footpath which will be affected by additional traffic.
- The proposal would result in the loss of existing parking as people park opposite the proposed new entrance.
- There is no need for additional development in Faringdon (this is not a material planning consideration)

3.7 Three letters have been received from local residents raising no objections to the scheme.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P10/V2132](#)

Erection of a four bedroom dwelling together with associated parking and landscaping in garden of Landview. Erection of a rear and side extensions and alterations to existing dwelling. Refused on 24 March 2011 and dismissed on appeal on 25 November 2011. Copies of that scheme’s plans and the appeal decision are **attached** at appendix 2.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011

5.1 Policy H10 states that residential development within the Faringdon development

boundary as defined on the local plan proposals map will be permitted subject to criteria.

- 5.2 Policy H13 refers to development outside the built-up areas of the towns referred to in Policy H10, including Faringdon, and only permits infilling within the built-up area of settlements or if the development essential to meet the needs of agricultural or other rural enterprises. The accompanying text to this policy lists the settlements to which the policy refers and states that “the policy will not apply to very small groups of houses and ribbons of development...”
- 5.3 Policy GS1 provides the general locational strategy for development, concentrating most new development (including Faringdon) on the five main settlements which are defined by development boundaries.
- 5.4 Policy GS2 seeks to resist new development outside the built-up areas of existing settlements.
- 5.5 Policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 refer to the design of new development, access and parking considerations and impact on neighbouring properties.
- 5.6 Policy NE7 refers to the North Vale Corallian Ridge, stating that development which would harm the prevailing character and appearance of the area as defined on the proposals map will not be permitted unless there is an overriding need for the development and steps have been taken to minimise the impact on the landscape.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 5.7 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paras. 14 and 49). Paragraphs 34 and 37 encourage minimised journey lengths to work, shopping, leisure and education, and paragraphs 57, 60 and 61 seek to promote local distinctiveness and integrate development into the natural, built and historic environment. Paragraph 109 requires development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.
- 5.8 Paragraphs 47 – 49 require local planning authorities to identify a five year supply of housing land. Where this cannot be demonstrated, relevant local plan policies for the development of new housing should not be considered up-to-date until the shortfall is rectified.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Planning permission was previously refused and dismissed on appeal for a new dwelling on this site for three reasons, which are the determining issues in relation to this current proposal. These are; i) the principle of a dwelling in this location in policy terms; ii) the visual impact of the proposal in landscape terms; and iii) the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 6.2 The site is located outside the Faringdon development boundary as defined on the local plan proposals map. Canada Lane marks the outer edge of the built-up limits of the town under policy H10, and therefore the site is considered to fall outside this area. Policies H13, GS1 and GS2 also seek to resist new residential development outside the built-up areas of existing settlements.
- 6.3 It is clear that the proposed development lies outside the Faringdon development boundary and so is contrary to the adopted local plan – the previous application was

refused and dismissed on appeal for this reason. However, whilst the council does not have a five year supply of housing land, these policies are not wholly consistent with the NPPF, which was issued in March 2012 – i.e. since the appeal decision. The proposed development, therefore, must be considered on its site specific merits and, in particular, whether it constitutes a sustainable form of development.

- 6.4 The site is located in close proximity to the main built-up area of the town and can be viewed no differently in terms of its distance to the town centre as the houses opposite the site, which fall within the development boundary. It is, therefore, considered that within the context of the NPPF, refusal under Policy H10 could not be justified.
- 6.5 The previous application was also refused on the grounds of the impact of the dwelling on the rural character of the area. Although close to the built-up area of the town, the existing site represents a transitional zone between the built-up area and open countryside beyond. Such loosely-knit areas of development on the edges of the Vale's settlements are a common feature at the transition between the built-up areas and the open countryside.
- 6.6 The site is located in the North Vale Corallian Ridge, an area recognised for its landscape quality within local plan policy NE7. Such policies are consistent with the NPPF. To the rear of the site the land falls away making the location of Landview and the proposed dwelling very prominent from the wider area due to its elevated nature. Whilst the proposed dwelling has been designed to take account of the sloping site, from the rear it appears as 2 ½ to 3 storeys in height, and would appear very prominent from the surrounding area. This concern is further enhanced given the set back of the proposed dwelling on the site compared to the neighbours. Whilst the current proposal is different in terms of its design compared to the previous scheme, the impact is not any less harmful, and it could be argued to be even more prominent given the double gabled three storey elevation facing the open countryside to the rear..
- 6.7 The inspector dismissed the previous appeal on the grounds that the proposal would *“significantly consolidate the built form along the lane to the material detriment of its rural character”* (para. 9). In paragraph 10 the inspector stated that the proposed development would *“cause material harm to the rural character and appearance of the area.”* Whilst that decision related to a proposed dwelling and an extension to Landview, the current proposal would have a similar urbanising effect by infilling the existing rural gap when viewed from the wider area. The current proposal is not significantly different from the previous scheme and would still have a harmful impact on the rural character of the area.
- 6.8 The final reason for refusal of the previous application related to the impact of the proposed dwelling on the residential amenity of 1 Maple Cottages, as the proposed dwelling was located to the north-east of this neighbours' main patio area at the rear of their house. Although the patio area is at the same level as the house at 1 Maple Cottages and therefore the higher part of the site, the previous proposed dwelling had a six metre high gable wall located two metres from the boundary which was considered over-dominating.

6.9 The current proposal is set slightly further forward on the site compared to the appeal scheme, so it is not adjacent to the whole patio area of 1 Maple Cottages. It is also three metres from the boundary and, although it still has a ridge height of six metres, the roof pitch slopes away from the boundary, with the side wall having an eaves height of three metres. Whilst the amended scheme, is better in terms of its impact on the neighbour, the proposal would still result in over-dominance to the main private amenity space immediately outside the rear of the neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 Whilst it is accepted that the council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, the contribution of this single dwelling to the overall shortfall does not outweigh the significant harm the proposed development would have on the rural character of the area and the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to local plan policies DC1, DC9 and NE7.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Refusal of planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed dwelling, by reason of its size and bulky design, particularly when viewed from the rear of the site, would appear prominent and out of keeping with the surrounding area and would have a harmful impact on the prevailing rural character and appearance of the North Vale Corallian Ridge. As such, the proposals are contrary to the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan in particular policies DC1 and NE7 and the advice contained in the NPPF.**
- 2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed dwelling by reason of its size and proximity to the boundary, would have harmful impact on the residential amenity of the immediate neighbouring property in terms of over dominance. As such the proposal is contrary to the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan, in particular policy DC9.**

Author / Officer: Laura Hudson, Principal Planning Officer
Contact number: 01235 540508
Email address: laura.hudson@southandvale.gov.uk