

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V1682/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	12.8.2013
PARISH	CUMNOR
WARD MEMBER(S)	Dudley Hoddinott Judy Roberts John Woodford
APPLICANT	Mr Tony Rosser
SITE	4 Colegrove Down Oxford, OX2 9HT
PROPOSAL	Erection of a two storey side extension. (as amended by plans received 29 August 2013.)(as amplified by additional information received by email dated 10 September 2013.)
AMENDMENTS	Yes
GRID REFERENCE	447395/204751
OFFICER	Miss Sarah Green

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application is referred to planning committee as the parish council view differs to the view of officers.

1.2 No 4 is a detached dwelling within the built up area of Cumnor Hill. It is situated in a cul-de-sac which slopes downhill. The house is on a corner plot where the road bends. An OS extract of the site location is **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for a side extension to the property, which would replace the existing attached double garage to the property. The extension would provide accommodation for an elderly relative at first floor level and an home office at ground floor for the applicants business which he currently already runs from the property. Copies of the application plans are **attached** at Appendix 2. The full application can be viewed on the website at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

Highways Liaison Officer (OCC) No objection

Cumnor Parish Council Object

- Over-development of site, out of character in location
- Reduction in parking, inadequate
- Concerns over run-off drainage
- Would want conditions to match materials and prevent separation from dwelling

Drainage Engineer (VOWH) No objection, subject to condition

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

N/A

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;

DC1 - Design

DC14 - Flood Risk and Water Run-off

DC5 - Access

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

H20 - Accommodation for Dependent Relatives

National Planning Policy Framework

Residential Design Guide

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning considerations are the following:

6.2 Design and scale

The proposed extension is set down from the main ridge of the house and is set back from its front elevation. The extension is 7.8m in width which is relatively substantial. There is currently a double garage of 5.2m width with a lean-to on the end of 3.4m. The front of the extension would be 4.8m further forward than the front of the existing garage. It is acknowledged that the extension is substantial in size, however its set back and down will make it appear subservient to the main house. The house is at a higher level than the road, making it fairly prominent in the street, however the character of the road is of relatively large properties within a spacious setting and therefore it is considered that it would be difficult to justify that the enlarged property would be wholly out of keeping with its surroundings.

6.3 The applicant has submitted some further information to justify the size of the extension. The first floor will be to accommodate an elderly relative with the ground floor as extended office for the applicant who works from home with his son. The extension would be connected internally to the main house and would not be used separately. This can also be ensured by the suggested condition.

6.4 Overall the extension is considered, on balance, to be acceptable and would not harm the character of the street.

6.5 Impact on neighbours

The neighbour to the side, No 6, is set further down the hill than the application property. Its garage is to the side and there is a gap between the two buildings. The extension would be 4.2m from the side of the garage and 9.2m from the side elevation of the property. Given the separation distance and that the position of the neighbour's garage, it is considered that the extension would not be oppressive or overbearing to the rear garden of this property. There are no proposed first floor side windows in the extension and a condition can be imposed to ensure this remains the case.

6.6 To the rear of the site is No 2. The rear garden of No 4 slopes up and there is mature vegetation along the boundary with No 2. Given this and the distance away from the neighbouring property, it is considered that the proposal will not result in harm to the neighbouring occupants' amenity.

6.7 Highways

The proposal results in the loss of the double garage. However the property has a large driveway which can accommodate 4 cars. The local highway officer therefore has no

objection to the scheme. It is considered that the level of provision shown is reasonable for the size of dwelling.

6.8 Drainage

Concern has been raised by the parish council regarding run-off drainage. The council's drainage engineer has been consulted and he has no objection to the proposals subject to the suggested condition requiring details of the drainage for both surface and foul water to be submitted for approval.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposed extension to the property is considered, on balance, to be an acceptable design and scale in relation to the property and the character of the area. It is also considered that it would not be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would provide adequate levels of parking.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant Planning Permission subject to the following conditions;

1 : Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission

2 : Approved plans

3 : Matching Materials

4 : Use of extension shall remain ancillary and not separated from main dwelling

5 : No windows or openings at first floor level in north-east side elevation

6 : Drainage details (surface and foul) to be submitted for approval

Author/Officer: Sarah Green
Contact number: 01491 823273
Email address: sarah.green@southandvale.gov.uk