

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P14/V0296/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	10.2.2014
<b>PARISH</b>	DRAYTON
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Richard Webber
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Michael Holt
<b>SITE</b>	Land Adjacent To 3 Marcham Road Drayton Abingdon, OX14 4JH
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 1 x Semi-detached house and 2 x 1 bedroom maisonettes in a 2 storey block for Social Housing use. (As amended by site address to include 'Land Adjacent To') (as amended by revised plan DRA/301RevB received 10 April 2014.)
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Yes
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	447577/194184
<b>OFFICER</b>	Miss S Green

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The site is within the built up area of Drayton. It is currently an open piece of land within a residential area. It is accessed off Marcham Road which is a dead end road. A location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.

1.2 Permission was granted in 2008 for the removal of a light industrial building and the construction of 4 dwellings and a class B1 unit on a large site which included the application site and the adjoining site. It was stated by the council at the time that if the B1 unit were to be converted to housing, that affordable housing provision would be required in line with the council's policy. The four dwellings, now known as 1- 4 Ashbury Court, were built following a revised application in 2010 for their design on the adjoining site. Permission was sought for 2 semi-detached market dwellings on the application in 2012 but was refused due to the lack of affordable housing. The subsequent appeal was dismissed in 2013.

1.3 This application is referred to planning committee due to the level of local objection.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks permission for the erection of 3 affordable dwellings. These would consist of two 1 bedroom flats and 1 three bedroom house. All would be for affordable rented. The two flats would be across the front of the building, with the 3 bedroom house across the rear. A parking court would be provided to the front.

2.2 The plans have been amended to make some minor adjustments to the number and size of side windows to the property and some design features. Copies of the plans are **attached** at Appendix 2. The full application can be viewed on the council's website at [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk).

## 3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 County Archaeologist (OCC) • No archaeological constraints

Highways Liaison Officer (OCC) • No objection  
• Level of parking is acceptable for the mix of units.

## Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 29 May 2014

Housing Development Team	<p>Visibility has been demonstrated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The combined development of 7 units equates to 2.8 affordable units. This proposal therefore meets policy requirement (40%)</li><li>• The unit mix is considered acceptable and all should be provided for rent through a Registered Provider.</li></ul>
Drayton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No strong views</li><li>• 4 parking spaces are too few for the number of houses, particularly with the parking issues along Marcham Road.</li></ul>
Neighbour Object (8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Already parking problem in road and more vehicles will increase the problem</li><li>• Access for delivery vehicles, refuse collection and emergency vehicles will only worsen</li><li>• Marcham Road used as the main route for school children and elderly people to access the bus stop and stops at the end of the road – will make this route more hazardous</li><li>• Development is out of character with rest of street.</li><li>• One house more acceptable as there is limited parking</li><li>• Overdevelopment of site</li><li>• Removal of brick wall and fence between site and 4 Ashbury Court, proposal makes this a joint path</li><li>• 3 bedroom property will overlook adjoining properties and will be an infringement of privacy</li><li>• Side on design is out of keeping. Design issues resolved with one dwelling</li><li>• No other single bedroom maisonettes in Marcham Road. All other houses are 3,4,5 bed properties</li><li>• Not uncommon for 2 cars per dwelling, especially being in a village location with limited public transport. Lead to vehicles parked on highway, obstructing other highway users.</li><li>• Lack of notice of application and consultation.</li><li>• Concerned with house design which feel is not in keeping.</li><li>• Parking already difficult</li><li>• Windows would lead to overlooking adjacent gardens</li><li>• Not against new property being built but one of a similar design to others in Ashby Court</li><li>• Believe recent development was given approval on the principal that this plot was held for industrial/commercial development. Therefore disregards this principal. Want to understand on what grounds this application acceptable.</li><li>• Question adequacy of parking provision</li><li>• Has there been a formal environmental impact assessment carried about</li><li>• Strongly dislike the consideration of plans</li><li>• Too many cars for the road, making it unsafe for children</li><li>• Lack of parking available to current residents as well as visitors</li></ul>

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P82/V0408/COU](#) - Approved (29/11/1982)

*Change of use of Drayton Labour Club to 4/5 light industrial units, retaining existing caretakers flat.*

[P97/V0163](#) - Approved (19/03/1998)

*Erection of an extension to engineering works.*

[P07/V1048](#) - Refused (21/08/2007)

*Demolition of existing building. Erection of 4 dwellings*

This included the application site and the adjoining site not known as 1-4 Ashby Court. This was refused on design and a non efficient use of land. The site was capable of accommodating 6 dwellings and therefore above the affordable housing threshold.

[P08/V0684](#) - Approved (03/07/2008)

*Demolition of existing works building and redevelopment to provide 4 dwellings and Class B1 unit including parking and access.*

This included the application site and the adjoining site, now known as 1-4 Ashby Court. An informative was added to the permission advising the applicant that should an application to convert the B1 unit to residential use come forward in future, that affordable housing provision will be required in line with policy H17.

[P10/V0911](#) - Approved (15/07/2010)

*Substitution of approved house designs for 4 link detached houses on former works site, approved under P08/V0684*

This amended the design of the 4 approved houses

[P12/V1493/FUL](#) - Refused (13/09/2012) - Dismissed on appeal (01/02/2013)

*Construct a pair of semi-detached two storey houses on the site of former works*

This was for a pair of semi-detached 3 bedroom properties on the application site. They were proposed to be market housing. The application was refused for the following reason:

‘The site originally formed part of a larger development proposal that was capable of accommodating five or more dwellings whereby a requirement for affordable housing would have been required. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the site has been deliberately sub-divided to avoid the threshold for affordable housing provision. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy H17 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and its supplementary planning guidance on affordable housing and to the National Planning Policy Framework.’

The subsequent appeal against the decision was dismissed. The Inspector agreed that the council’s policy H17 and supporting SPG made the council’s policy position clear and that if housing is to be developed on this site it should attract a requirement for affordable housing.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;

DC1 - Design

DC5 - Access

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

E14 - The Retention of Small Scale Commercial Premises in Settlements

H11 - Development in the Larger Villages

H17 - Affordable Housing

Adopted Residential Design Guide SPD

Adopted Affordable Housing SPG

- 5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework published in 2012 has replaced all previous PPGs and PPSs. Central to the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving proposals that accord with an adopted local plan, or where relevant policies of the adopted local plan are out-of-date, to grant planning permission for sustainable development unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. The National Planning Policy Guidance, published this year, supports the NPPF.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 The main considerations are the following:

6.2 Principle

The site previously had permission for a B1 employment unit. The NPPF sets out that sites should not be protected for long term employment use if there is no reasonable prospect of that use coming forward. As part of the 2012 application it was shown that the site had been marketed for this use and had not been taken up. Consequently the change from a B1 use to residential was accepted.

- 6.3 It has been established through the appeal of the previous application that the application site now was part of a larger site (Asbury Court) and therefore the affordable housing threshold would apply. This scheme before members therefore provides 3 affordable rented units to meet this original requirement. They consist of two 1 bedroom flats and one 3 bedroom house. The principle of development is therefore acceptable. The affordable housing will be secured by a section 106 agreement.

6.4 Design and scale

The proposed scheme is in the style of a pair of semi-detached in appearance from the front with gabled projections to the rear. The two flats have been designed across the front of the building, with the house across the rear which is accessed via a front door along the western side elevation. It is noted that elements of the building are quite large, the porch for example. It had been suggested by your officers that a scheme which had the properties running back to front, rather than across side to side would be a more logical layout. The architect looked into this but apparently, in his opinion, it would not work as well. It is noted that there are certain space standard requirements for access and rooms for affordable housing and that this has played a part in the overall layout. Overall the depth of the main building is not any more than the adjoining properties at Ashbury Court. The design is not exactly the same as those at Ashbury Court however some design references in terms of the details to the side walls to the adjoining development do help tie them together. Taken in the context of the street and other development, the design and scale of the building would not be harmful to the character of the area and would not justify a refusal.

6.5 Neighbour amenity

Objections have been received that the development would result in overlooking of the neighbouring properties. The windows in the rear elevation, which serve the 3 bedroom house, would all look directly south. There may be some oblique views over neighbouring gardens to the side, but this will be no more than is the common relationship between existing properties. The plans have been amended so that the only western side window at first floor is to a bathroom which will be obscured glazed, and on the eastern elevation they will be high level windows to the kitchen, thereby restricting any view obliquely out of the window towards No 3 Marcham Road. The building projects a nominal amount further back than Ashbury Court development and

3m further back than No 3 Marcham Road. The building would also be 4.9m from the side elevation from No 3 Marcham Road and 3m from the side elevation of No 4 Ashbury Court. Given the distances between the neighbouring buildings it is not considered that it would be overbearing or result in a loss of light to either of the neighbouring occupiers.

6.6 Comments have been received regarding the use of the pathway which runs alongside the existing Ashbury Court properties. The red line of the application site does not include this pathway, therefore it is not and cannot be used as part of the development. A separate path is shown within the application site to access the 3 bedroom house. Details of the boundary treatment on the applicants land can be requested by condition to ensure that privacy and amenity for both Ashbury Court residents and the future occupiers of the 3 bedroom house are maintained.

6.7 Overall the proposal is considered to comply with policy DC9 of the local plan.

6.8 Parking

The proposal includes 4 parking spaces, one for each flat and two for the house. This provision is in accordance with the council's adopted parking standards for new dwellings. The county highway officer has reviewed the application and he has no objection to the layout or access. The development would accord with policy DC5.

6.9 Most of the objections to the application relate to the lack of parking and level of on-street parking along the street. Under planning policy, new development can and should be required to provide enough parking for its own residents. The adopted parking standards set out the level proposed and this application meets with these standards. The new development at Ashbury Court was also subject to the same parking standards. The county council, as highway authority, has no objection to the proposals and therefore a refusal on highway grounds would not be sustainable.

6.10 Other

In response to comments regarding the notification of the application, all neighbouring properties were notified of the application and the amended plans, in line with the council's consultation procedures on planning applications.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposal provides 3 affordable housing units in line with the council's requirements. It is considered that the proposed design and scale would not be detrimental to the character of the area and would not be harmful to neighbouring amenity or highway safety.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing, and the following conditions;**

**1 : Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission**

**2 : List of approved plans**

**3 : Access, parking and Turning in accordance with plan**

**4 : Samples of materials to be approved**

**5 : Drainage details(surface and foul) to be submitted**

**6 : Boundary details to be submitted**

**7 : Window cill height for eastern first floor window to be no lower than 1.7m**

**8: Obscure glazing for western first floor window**

**9: No additional windows to be inserted at first floor in east and west elevations**

**Author:** Sarah Green  
**Contact No:** 01491 823273  
**Email:** Sarah.Green@southandvale.gov.uk