

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V1997/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	9.9.2013
PARISH	KENNINGTON
WARD MEMBERS	Ron Mansfield Jerry Patterson
APPLICANT	Dr. & Mrs. A. Rogers
SITE	157 Upper Road, Kennington, OX1 5LR
PROPOSAL	Two storey extension at the front and single storey extension at the rear.
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	452148/202253
OFFICER	Peter Brampton

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 No.157 is a detached dwelling set within the built up limits of Kennington. Located close to the southern end of Upper Road, it is a two-storey property of brick, render and tile construction. The house is set somewhat back from the road, and the site slopes downwards from the front boundary in an easterly direction.

1.2 The property benefits from a link-attached garage and a single storey rear lean-to store. There is garden to front and rear, with a long driveway providing parking for several vehicles.

1.3 The application comes to committee as Kennington Parish Council recommends refusal.

1.4 A location plan is **attached** as Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The applicants propose a part single, part two-storey front extension and a single storey rear extension. This extended property will benefit from separate play, kitchen, dining, study and living facilities on the ground floor, and four bedrooms on the first floor.

2.2 The extensions will be built in materials to match the existing house.

2.3 Extracts from the application plans are **attached** as Appendix 2.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Kennington Parish Council** – Recommends refusal, *“The Council objects to this planning application due to the size of the proposed extension. It is very large and would be domineering. It is felt that the proposed does not fit in with the other dwellings along the road and that the character of the neighbourhood would be affected. Finally, the proposed front extension encroaches far outside the existing building line of all the dwellings along the road.”*

3.2 **Neighbour Representations** – Three letters of objection received. Main concerns can be summarised thus:

- Scale of extension at the front of the property
- Manner in which front extension breaks established building line
- Over dominant impact and loss of sunlight from front extension on No.155

Upper Road

- Over dominant impact and loss of sunlight from front and rear extensions to No. 159 Upper Road

3.3 **Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objections**

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;**

DC1 - Design

DC5 - Access

DC6 - Landscaping

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

5.2 **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

Vale of White Horse Residential Design Guide 2009

5.3 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

Design and Visual appearance

6.1 Policy DC1 requires all new development to be of a high quality design that takes into account local distinctiveness and character. From observations on site, there is a variety of property types and designs around this end of Upper Road. Nos. 155 and 157 appear to have been built as a pair. There are chalet bungalows to the north of No.155, and No.159 to the south is a bungalow. There are further two and single storey properties on the opposite western side of the road. Consequently, there is no overriding architectural style or scale of building that this proposal needs to follow. Furthermore, whilst each property is set well back from its front boundary, these setbacks vary.

6.2 Turning first to the rear extension, it is crucial to note this addition would, if built separately, represent permitted development. It has been carefully designed so that it projects no more than 4 metres beyond the original rear wall, whilst no part of the roof exceeds 4 metres in height. The simple lean-to roof design ensures a subservient appearance with an acceptable impact on the character of the dwelling.

6.3 The front extension does require planning permission. The council's residential design guide states, "*Front extensions can be challenging to design as they can detract from the continuity of the street scene and significantly change the appearance of a dwelling...Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered, or where the dwelling is set well back from the road.* Local objection has focussed on the size and scale of the extension. It is undeniably quite a large addition to the building, but the overall harm to the character of the dwelling and the street scene is not sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

6.4 The ridge of the two-storey section of the front extension is set down from the ridge of the main dwelling. This ensures a degree of visual subservience. The roof of the extension is hipped away at the same pitch as the main roof, again ensuring some visual coherence.

6.5 In terms of depth, the extension projects around 3 metres forward of the main house, which is around 6.2 metres deep. This projection is not considered significant.

- 6.6 The “L” shaped lean-to single storey extension is a minor addition that will have not have a significant impact on the character of the dwelling.
- 6.7 Crucial to the recommendation of approval is the set back from the front boundary and the staggered building line in this part of Upper Road. The front wall of the two-storey extension will be around 10.5 metres back from the front boundary of the site. This depth of frontage is consistent with a number of other properties in this part of Upper Road, particularly on the opposite western side.
- 6.8 Furthermore, the building line on this eastern side of the road is staggered. At the closest point, the front extension will project only 1.5 metres in front of No.159 to the south. This projection is not significant and will not cause material harm to the appearance of the street scene.
- 6.9 Finally, it is important to reiterate the variety of architectural styles in the street. This particular property has a simple design, but does not have sufficient architectural merit to warrant retention unaltered. The resultant property will not appear unduly out of keeping with the street scene. There are insufficient grounds to warrant a refusal of planning permission on character grounds.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.10 Both immediate neighbours have objected to this proposal on neighbouring amenity grounds. No.159 is a bungalow affected by both extensions, which are on the southern side of the building, closest to this neighbour. The bungalow is orientated in a manner so that its rear elevation faces northeast across the rear of the application site. This means the single storey rear extension will have some impact on the light received to rear windows in the bungalow, which lies around 2.5 metres away.
- 6.11 However, as discussed, the rear extension, if built separately, would represent permitted development. Thus, there are insufficient grounds to warrant objection on this point. Regardless, it is unlikely the loss of light or outlook to the rear of No.159 would warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 6.12 The two-storey front extension would project 1.5 metres forward of windows in the front elevation of No.159. The front elevation of No.159 turns away slightly from the extension. As such, the loss of light or outlook to this window is unlikely to be significant. This is particularly as this neighbour sits south of the application site, so there will be no loss of sunlight. Overall, the impact of the extensions on this neighbour does not warrant a refusal of planning permission.
- 6.13 No.155 to the north is not so affected. The existing shared garage block will screen the rear extension from view. The two-storey part of the front extension will sit around 9.5 metres from the front of No.155. Even allowing for a rise in land levels, this distance will ensure there is no material impact on this neighbour in terms of a loss of light or outlook.
- 6.14 There are no windows within the extensions that would allow an increase in direct overlooking and so this proposal will preserve the amenity of neighbours appropriately.

Highway Safety

- 6.15 The existing driveway and garage will remain unaltered to serve the extended property so there are no objections on this point.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposed extension accords with Development Plan policies as it will not cause material harm to the character of the building, the site or the surrounding area. Neither amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties or highway safety will be significantly affected. Thus, subject to the recommended conditions, this application should be approved.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Commencement Three Years
- 2 : Approved Plans
- 3 : Materials in Accordance with Application
- 4 : Car Parking to be retained

Author: Peter Brampton
Contact Number: 01491 823751
Email: peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk