

APPLICATION NO.	P12/V2142/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	23 October 2012
PARISH	CUMNOR
WARD MEMBER(S)	Dudley Hoddinott Judy Roberts John Woodford
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Malmoudi
SITE	3 Marley Close Botley Oxford OX2 9FQ
PROPOSAL	Proposed side extension and alterations to existing dwelling
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	447488/205791
OFFICER	Abbie Gjoka

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension. A copy of the site plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

1.2 The application comes to committee because Cumnor Parish Council objects.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The property, a detached dwelling, is situated at the end of a row of modern dwellings on an angled plot. The proposal is to erect a two storey side extension on the east elevation.

2.2 A copy of the plans is **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Cumnor Parish Council objects as “the proposal will over dominate the property of no. 2 Marley Close on the south elevation and cause significant loss of seasonal light as a result of the first floor of the side extension.”

3.2 Two letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of nos. 2 and 5 Westminster Way. The objections can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of light to no. 2 Marley Close
- Over dominance

3.3 County Engineer - No objections

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P12/V1804/HH](#) – Withdrawn (28/09/2012)
Proposed side extension and alterations

4.2 [P12/V0858](#) - Approved (01/06/2012)
Single storey side and rear extension, alteration of roof to approved planning application P11/V1287

4.3 [P11/V1287](#) - Approved (28/07/2011)
Proposed single storey side and rear extension

- 4.4 [P06/V0102](#) - Approved (13/03/2006)

Demolition of 109 Eynsham Road and erection of eight dwellings

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

Vale of White Horse Local Plan

- 5.1 Policy DC1 refers to the design of new development, and seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality design and takes into account local distinctiveness and character.
- 5.2 Policy DC5 seeks to ensure that a safe and convenient access can be provided to and from the highway network.
- 5.3 Policy DC9 refers to the impact of new development on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment in terms of, among other things, loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, and dominance or visual intrusion.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension to create a utility room and bathroom at ground floor level and a fifth bedroom at first floor level. The previous application was withdrawn as there were concerns in relation to the size of the extension, its close proximity to the neighbouring boundary and that the extension included a separate kitchen, bathroom and living area making it wholly self contained with insufficient car parking. The extension has now been reduced in size with the kitchen omitted from the scheme. The extension will have a separate staircase and therefore to avoid any doubt, a condition will be imposed to ensure the extension is used only as ancillary accommodation. The extension will measure 6.5 metres deep and 4.1 metres wide and will be angled away from the side boundary and located 1.0 metre from the neighbouring boundary to the front. The extension will have a pitched roof to match the existing dwelling, but it will be lower so that it appears subordinate to the main house.
- 6.2 The main issues in determining this application are the impact on the visual amenity of the area, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, and whether there is adequate parking on the site. The side elevation and rear garden of no. 2 Marley Close are to the north of the proposed extension. That property has an existing south side ground floor window which serves existing living space, but the room is also served by french doors located on the rear of the property. The extension is located due south of no. 2 Marley Close, so there will be some loss of light to the garden area and the ground floor side window. However, as the side window is not the principal source of light for the room it is considered that the proposal is not so harmful to justify refusal of the application.
- 6.3 The proposed extension will have lower ridge and eaves heights than the existing house not considered that the proposal would appear out of place within the street scene or harmful to the visual amenity of the area.
- 6.4 Parking provision remains at the front of the property for two vehicles, which is considered acceptable in this location, with no change to the existing access.
- 7.0 **CONCLUSION**
- 7.1 The proposal meets the requirements of policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 of the adopted local plan. The design is acceptable and will not harm the character of the area, and the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on the residential amenity of neighbours, parking provision and highway safety.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : TL1 - Time limit
- 2 : Planning condition listing the approved drawings
- 3 : RE1 - Matching materials
- 4: RE12 - Ancillary accommodation

Author: Abbie Gjoka
Contact number: 01235 547676
Email: abbie.gjoka@southandvale.gov.uk