

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P13/V0605/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	21.3.2013
<b>PARISH</b>	GREAT FARINGDON
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Roger Cox Mohinder Kainth Alison Thomson
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Martin Phillips
<b>SITE</b>	32 Westland Road Faringdon Oxfordshire, SN7 7EY
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Proposed extensions to property and subdivision of existing dwelling to create an additional dwelling.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	15.5.2013
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	428045/194741
<b>OFFICER</b>	Katie Rooke

---

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The application comes to committee as Faringdon Town Council objects.

1.2 The property, a semi-detached dwelling, is situated on a broadly rectangular plot that runs north to south. Located towards the south-west side of Faringdon within an established residential area, vehicular access to the site is obtained from Westland Road to the north. A copy of the site plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 This application seeks planning permission to extend the existing property and then sub-divide it to create two dwellings, creating a terrace of three properties. The development involves raising the roof of an existing extension by 0.5 metres, increasing the size of existing front and rear dormer windows, infilling under an existing roof slope on the rear elevation, converting the existing integral garage, and creating a second vehicular access. Further to concerns regarding the parking provision as originally proposed, this element was altered and revised plans provided. The application is therefore being considered on this amended basis. A copy of the application drawings is **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 In response to the original plans the following consultation responses were received.

3.2 **Faringdon Town Council** objects for the following reasons;

- It is inappropriate development.
- There are problems with access/egress.
- It is not in keeping with the rest of the residential properties.

3.3 **County Highway Liaison Officer** raised a holding objection stating “A parking layout is proposed providing two parking spaces per dwelling which is an appropriate level. However, the spaces shown measure 2.4 x 4.8 metres which do not meet the current standard of 2.5 x 5 metres. The turning space proposed is also insufficient to allow a vehicle to easily turn and leave the site (approximately 4 metres is proposed where 6 metres is recommended). A revised layout detailing spaces to current standards is therefore required. Turning within the site is not necessarily required”.

3.4 **Tree Officer** makes the following points;

- There are two trees (a maturing Silver Birch and a maturing Pine) which would be lost if the development were to be built as proposed.
- The Birch is typical for its suburban locality and is appropriate in terms of the space available but the Pine would be unlikely to attain its mature dimensions due to the limited space available for its development.
- Both of the trees make a contribution to the streetscene, although their proximity is such that have developed one-sided canopies and the visual amenity each brings is less than the sum of the parts.
- The trees do not merit long term protection.

3.5 **Waste Management Officer** has provided details in respect the bins which will be provided and the time they must be presented for collection.

3.6 **Neighbours** Three letters of objection have been received, which make the following points;

- The sub-division alters the character of the street because it will look like a row of terrace house on a street comprised of semi detached and detached dwellings.
- The raising of the roof will go above the roof line and detract from the flow of the properties.
- It is unlikely that four car parking spaces is sufficient as there are no spaces for guests, and the spaces are not large enough for a standard size vehicle.
- Development not in keeping with the look or feel of the estate.
- If passed a precedent would be set for other developers to buy an split the houses.
- The proximity and angle of cars on the front area will encroach onto the drive of no.30.
- In the past two years there have been two blockages in the pipes that run in the road outside the row of houses. Adding another property will add to the problem.

Two petitions were attached to two of the letters of objection, including four and 35 signitures respectively, from residents opposing the application.

3.7 In response to the amended plans, which were put out for re-consultation, the following comments were received.

3.8 **Faringdon Town Council** object on the basis that

- It is inappropriate development
- There are problems with access/egress
- It is not in keeping with the rest of the residential properties.

3.9 **County Highway Liaison Officer** raises no objections subject to conditions, stating “The applicant now seeks to replicate the existing parking arrangements for the new dwelling. This is considered acceptable as vehicle turning is not considered essential in this location”.

3.10 **Tree Officer** raises no objections subject to conditions, making the following points;

- The revisions to the front parking spaces have reduced the area available to replace the prominent trees that are lost to the proposed driveway.
- Whilst the latest proposal remodels the front garden space there is room to mitigate the loss of the mature trees with new planting.

3.11 **Waste Management Officer** confirms there is enough space for bins for both properties, and that they need to be presented for collection by 7am on the day of collection.

3.12 **Neighbours** Two letters of objection received, which make the following points;

- The proposal is not in keeping with the neighbourhood. There is not one terrace property on the whole street.
- There is no room for visitor parking.
- Conversion would create a terrace; numerous extensions have been previously denied because they would create a terrace effect.
- The roof line would disrupt the roof line of the street.

#### 4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

##### 4.1 [P90/V0642](#) - Approved (06/08/1990)

Erection of a front extension to enlarge lounge.

##### 4.2 [P82/V0471](#) - Approved (26/05/1982)

First floor extension over garage together with alterations to garage and porch at front.

##### 4.3 [P78/V0453](#) - Approved (14/06/1978)

Extension and alterations to provide additional accommodation.

#### 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

##### **National Planning Policy Framework**

5.1 The NPPF replaces all previous PPG's and PPS's and also indicates the weight to be given to existing local plan policies. The adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan was not adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, so paragraph 215 of the NPPF applies. The local plan policies that are relevant to this application are considered to have a high degree of consistency with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

5.2 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 56 – 66 seek to promote good design and local distinctiveness and integrate development into the natural, built and historic environment.

5.3 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.

##### **Vale of White Horse Local Plan (adopted July 2006)**

5.4 Policy H10 states that development within the five main settlements (including Faringdon) will be permitted provided it would not result in the loss of facilities important to the local community, and it makes efficient use of land, and the layout, mass and design of the dwellings would not harm the character of the area.

5.5 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.

5.6 Policy DC5 seeks to ensure that a safe and convenient access can be provided to and from the highway network.

5.7 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 main issues in determining this application are whether the principle of development is acceptable, the impact on the visual amenity of the area, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, and whether adequate parking is available for the existing and proposed dwellings.

**Principle of development**

6.2 The principle of creating a new dwelling within the built-up area of Faringdon is considered acceptable, as it accords with policy.

6.3 **Impact on visual amenity**

The proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling, which maintain the design and form of the existing side extension, will be seen within the context of the existing property and will not appear out of place within the street scene. The extension which is being altered is still subordinate to the main house, and its relative position in relation to the neighbour to the west (no.30) is such that the visual relationship between the two would remain.

6.4 The proposal would create a terrace of three dwellings, rather than a pair of semi-detached properties. Whilst there are no other terrace properties along Westland Road, because the development maintains the form of the existing extended semi-detached dwelling, it is not considered that the over riding character of the street would be compromised.

6.5 The creation of an additional access and parking spaces, which could be undertaken under the provisions of permitted development, will not appear out of place within the street scene. The trees in the front garden, which will be lost as part of the development, are not considered to be of sufficient quality to warrant their retention or specific protection. In order to ensure that replacement vegetation and landscaping is appropriate it is considered reasonable and necessary to condition it.

**Impact on neighbours**

6.6 Given the position and orientation of neighbouring properties it is not considered that the amenities of these dwellings would be harmed by the proposal in terms of overshadowing or dominance. The existing first floor rear windows in the south elevation of no.32, together with the revised south facing dormer window which will serve the new property, will cause mutual overlooking of each others gardens. The relationship is, however, not uncommon in a residential area, and it is not considered that the application could reasonably or justifiably be refused on this basis.

**Impact on highway safety**

6.7 The county highway officer raises no objection to the application, and advises that two parking spaces per dwelling are considered to be an appropriate level in this location. In order to ensure the parking shown on the plans is provided and maintained it is considered reasonable and necessary to condition it. The creation of the new vehicle access does not require planning permission as it is not onto a classified road.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The principle of the proposed development is considered acceptable, it will not harm the visual amenity of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties, and there is adequate car parking on the site. The proposal, therefore, complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policies H10, DC1, DC5 and DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan. The development is also considered to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:**

1 : TL1 - Time limit - Full Application

2 : List of approved plans

3 : RE1 - Matching Materials

4 : Prior to the use or occupation of the new development, the car parking spaces shown on approved drawing number A1/A12922/112 rev.B shall be constructed and surfaced. The parking spaces shall be constructed to prevent surface water discharging onto the highway. Thereafter, the parking spaces shall be kept permanently free of any obstruction to such use.

5 : HY19 - No Drainage to Highway

6 : Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, the sites internal and external boundaries shall be enclosed in accordance with a detailed scheme and programme of implementation which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme shall ensure that the approved boundary treatments for each dwelling are completed prior to the occupation of that dwelling, and the approved boundary treatments for the whole site are completed prior to the occupation of the last dwelling.

7 : No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include hard surfacing materials, schedules of new trees and shrubs to be planted (noting species, plant sizes and numbers/densities), the identification of the existing trees and shrubs on the site to be retained (noting species, location and spread), any earth moving operations and finished levels/contours, and an implementation programme.

8 : All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the details and programme approved under Condition 7 above. Thereafter, the landscaped areas shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or shrubs which die or become seriously damaged or diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Author: Katie Rooke  
Contact number: 01235 540507  
Email: katie.rooke@southandvale.gov.uk