
APPLICATION NO.	P13/V2239/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	23.10.2013
PARISH	SUTTON COURTENAY
WARD MEMBER(S)	Gervase Duffield
APPLICANT	Mr Les Wells
SITE	Land to rear of 10 - 14 Milton Road Sutton Courtenay
PROPOSAL	Erection of a detached bungalow. (Amendment to approved application P12/V0052). Retrospective (additional information on fences submitted 20 December 2013 and 2 January 2014)
AMENDMENTS	
GRID REFERENCE	449912/193011
OFFICER	Sarah Green

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to planning committee as the officer recommendation is different to the parish council's view.
- 1.2 The application site is within the built up area of Sutton Courtenay. It is located behind the main frontage of properties which face Milton Road. An OS extract of the site is **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 A bungalow has been built on site but has not been done so in accordance with a scheme approved in 2012. This application therefore seeks planning permission for the bungalow as built. The differences between the scheme approved and that now built include an increase in the size of the building, changes to the internal layout and window arrangement and the parking layout. Copies of the plans for this application are **attached** at Appendix 2. The agent has also submitted a plan indicating the boundary fencing for the development with is also included for information. The full application can be viewed on the council's website at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council)
- No objection subject to condition
- Drainage Engineer (Vale of White Horse District Council)
- No objection
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council
- Object. An application for a 2 bed bungalow has been refused previously. The current application does seem an attempt to get around a previous refusal. The parish council objects to the application as the larger dwelling is located in an unsatisfactory location to the rear of existing properties. It is an

intrusive development which impacts on the available car parking spaces and which does not provide satisfactory standards of private amenity space.

Neighbours

- No comments received

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P07/V0259](#) - Refused (03/05/2007)

Conversion of two garages into single dwelling.

Refused on the impact on neighbouring property

[P10/V1156](#) - Refused (24/08/2010)

Erection of a new bungalow with detached garage.

Refused on being cramped and contrived within small plot, impact on neighbouring properties, impact on amenity of future occupiers, insufficient parking and turning areas

[P11/V0128](#) - Refused (11/03/2011) - dismissed on appeal

Erection of a 2-bed bungalow.

Refused by officers for appearing cramped and contrived within small plot. Bedrooms would have immediate outlook of a boundary fence and a limited amenity area was proposed, resulting in an unacceptable level of amenity for future occupiers and contrary to good standard of design required by PPS1 and PPS3 and policies of the local plan.

In the appeal against the refusal the Inspector considered that the design of the dwelling resulted in a poor outlook and amenity for the bedrooms in particular. He considered that the amenity space whilst compact would be adequately separated from the adjacent flats such that it would not be unduly overlooked. However he considered overall it would create a poor standard of living conditions for its future occupiers. The appeal was dismissed on this ground only.

[P12/V0052](#) - Approved (01/03/2012)

Erection of a one bedroom bungalow

This scheme was for a smaller bungalow than the appeal scheme with only one bedroom. The internal arrangement of the rooms was different which provided the bedroom window with a more open aspect. The scheme was considered by officers to have addressed the issues raised by the Inspector in his decision. Copies of the plan for this scheme are **attached** at Appendix 3.

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

GS1 - Developments in Existing Settlements

H11 - Development in the Larger Villages

National Planning Policy Framework
Residential Design Guide

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning considerations in this application are the following:

6.2 Impact on amenity of future occupiers

The bungalow has been sited in the same location as in the scheme that was approved but is larger in footprint. The footprint of the approved building was around 64 square metres and the footprint of the building built is 96 square metres. The internal arrangement of the rooms has changed from the approved scheme. The main bedroom and the living area have been swapped over but both still have an outlook to the south. The kitchen and bathroom are served by a roof light. Currently there is a fence at close proximity to the living room window. Officers have suggested that this is reduced in height or perhaps removed to improve this outlook to this living area. The agent has agreed and submitted the boundary fence plan to show their intention, which is to remove it. It is suggested that this could be conditioned.

6.3 A second smaller bedroom/study has been added to this proposal and this will be served by a rooflight. The main reason for the inspector's dismissal was the outlook from both bedrooms onto a boundary fence. In the current scheme the main bedroom has an open outlook and the smaller secondary bedroom has a rooflight. Whilst not ideal for the second bedroom to have a rooflight, officers consider that given the main bedroom would be adequately served by daylight and that the rest of the living areas would be too, it would be difficult to justify that the amenity of the future occupiers would be significantly harmed by this arrangement.

6.4 The enlargement of the property has resulted in the amenity space for the dwelling being reduced in size. The amenity space now is around 38 square metres, which is around the same as that proposed in the earlier application P11/V0128 which was considered at appeal. Generally this size of amenity space would not normally be considered appropriate for a dwelling of this size by your officers and this did form part of the reason for refusal of application P11/V0128. However on appeal the Inspector considered that the garden would be a particular compact size, yet would be adequately separated from the flats such that it would not be overlooked unduly. He stated, that if considered in isolation this area would be capable of serving as an adequate private amenity space. Given this conclusion of the Inspector at that time, officers consider it would be difficult to refuse the current application based on the size of the amenity space alone. The amenity area is fairly private and secluded given the sites location. Given the issue of outlook and light to the dwelling is considered acceptable and would not be harmful to the future occupiers amenity, it would be difficult, also given the Inspector's comments, to sustain that the current size of the amenity area would result in significant harm to the amenity of the future occupiers. Officers therefore consider that overall, the design of the development will not unduly harm the amenity of future occupiers, and would comply with intentions of policy DC1 and DC9.

6.5 Design

In terms of overall general design, the bungalow that has been built is similar in style to the scheme approved. As set out above, its footprint has been increased over the approved scheme. The Inspector in the appeal did not consider that the design or location of the dwelling was inappropriate. He instead commented that the site is barely visible from public vantage points and as a consequence the scheme would have no material effect upon the appearance of the locality, which is comprised of a range of different building styles and plot sizes. Given this your officers have no objection to the design. It would comply with policy DC1.

6.6 Impact upon amenity of neighbouring occupiers

The dwelling is sited in the corner of the plot. Its single storey nature and shallow pitch roof means it would not result in a harmful impact upon the neighbouring properties to the north (1 Southfield Drive) and east (6 Milton Road). The neighbouring properties to front along Milton Road are over 16m away from the boundary with the site and approx 20m from the front windows. It is not considered that the bungalow would be harmful to neighbouring properties in your officers' view.

6.7 Highways

The parking in the current scheme has been rearranged to a tandem arrangement as oppose to a side by side arrangement in the previous applications. This rearrangement raises no significant concerns from the Highway Authority. From on site it is clear that there is space for cars to turn on site and exit onto Milton Road. The fence that had been erected across the parking spaces has been removed so that they can both be used. A condition has been recommended that will ensure that the parking spaces remain unobstructed except for the parking of vehicles at all times.

6.8 Other

The drainage arrangements for a dwelling on the site have already been submitted to the council and approved under the previous application. There is therefore no need for them to be resubmitted again.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The building has not been built in accordance with the approved plans, and this is clearly unacceptable and regrettable. However in this case the scheme is not considered to result in sufficient harm to the amenity of future occupiers to warrant taking enforcement action.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. List of the approved plans
2. Parking and turning area to be retained unobstructed at all times except for the parking of vehicles
3. Removal of permitted development rights for extension and ancillary buildings
4. Within 6 months of first occupation, the boundary fence shall be as indicated on drawing called 'detail of fences/boundaries' unless otherwise agreed with LPA.

Author: Sarah Green
Contact Number: 01491 823273
Email: sarah.green@southandvale.gov.uk