

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>APPLICATION NO.</b>  | <a href="#">P14/V1285/FUL</a>                     |
| <b>APPLICATION TYPE</b> | FULL APPLICATION                                  |
| <b>REGISTERED</b>       | 4.6.2014  |
| <b>PARISH</b>           | APPLETON WITH EATON                               |
| <b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>   | Dudley Hoddinott<br>John Woodford<br>Judy Roberts |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>        | Mr Adrian Willett                                 |
| <b>SITE</b>             | 29 Badswell Lane Appleton, OX13 5JN               |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>         | Erection of an attached house (resubmission).     |
| <b>AMENDMENTS</b>       | None  |
| <b>GRID REFERENCE</b>   | 444093/201613                                     |
| <b>OFFICER</b>          | Sarah Green                                       |

---

### SUMMARY

- The application is for an attached dwelling within the built up area of Appleton. It is a revised scheme to one for a detached dwelling which was refused earlier this year as being out of character with the area.
- The application is referred to committee due to an objection from the parish council.
- The main issues of consideration are:
  - Character – it is considered to be more in keeping
  - Amenity – it would not harm neighbour amenity
  - Highways – sufficient parking and access is provided
- The application is recommended for approval

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Badswell Lane is within the built up area of Appleton. No 29 is the end property of two sets of semi detached properties. The properties are one and half storeys in height with box dormers to the front. Currently to the side of each dwelling is a garage with a large open aspect garden to the front. A location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.

1.2 Earlier this year an application for a detached dwelling to the side of No29 and a car port was refused planning permission as the cumulative impact of the scheme overall was considered out of character with the area.

1.3 The application is referred to committee due to an objection from the parish council.

### 2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage at No 29 and the erection of an attached dwelling to the side of No29. The house would be designed in a similar style to No29 and the other set of semi-detached dwellings, with a recessed 'link' to No 29. The ridge of the existing house would be slightly lower than No 29. A shared parking area would be created to the front of both properties. The application plans are **attached** at Appendix 2.

### 3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Appleton Parish Council** – Object on grounds of design. Conversion of semi-detached to a terrace will impact upon surrounding properties. Detached would be more appropriate as originally proposed.

**Countryside Access** - No strong views

**County Archaeologist (OCC)** - No constraints

**Neighbours – 3 letters of objection have been received.**

- Previous application refused in part because of division of plot. Current plans suffer from same problem; will still be prominent; double density of houses and cars on small plot of land; result in cramped development
- Disparity between front and back gardens is emphasised by setting new house in line with 23-29 when it could be lessened by bringing it forward.
- Support good use of large garden for infill. Don't think attached is best solution. Disadvantages are loss of light to existing building, loss of access to rear garden, less attractive design.

#### 4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

##### 4.1 [P14/V0217/FUL](#) - Refused (02/05/2014)

Erection of a house and car port (as amended by plans received 19 March 2014.)  
Copies of the site plan and elevation are **attached** at Appendix 3.

The application was refused for the following reason:

*The proposed development, by reason of its design and layout, and the division of the existing plot, results in a cramped and prominent form of development that does not reflect the attributes that make a positive contribution to the character of the area. Therefore the proposal is out of keeping with, and harmful to, the character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to policy DC1 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, and to the adopted residential design guide, 2009.*

##### [P12/V0257](#) - Approved (30/03/2012)

Erection of new front porch and single storey rear extension.

##### [P66/V0544](#) - Approved (16/08/1966)

Residential development - 6 detached houses and 12 terraced houses all with garages.

##### [P65/V0642](#) - Approved (26/07/1965)

L.232 Outline Residential development, approx. 2.250 acres.

#### 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

H11 - Development in the Larger Villages

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Guidance

Residential Design Guide

#### 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

##### 6.1 The main considerations are the following:

##### 6.2 Principle

Appleton is a village where new housing development within the built up area would be supported. The principle of a dwelling would therefore be acceptable subject to the criteria below.

6.3 Design and scale

The council's adopted residential design guide sets out at section 4.2 that the key factor for the sub-division of plots for development is that the site's context should dictate the approach that is adopted for designing and laying out the new buildings. New buildings need to fit comfortably within the street scene and there should be a positive relationship between the built form and the street. Policy DC1 of the adopted local plan requires that new development should not detract from the attributes that make a positive contribution to the character of an area.

6.4 There is some variation in the built form along Badswell Lane. The eastern end is the older, more historic end of the road and is within the conservation area. Properties here are more clustered together and closer to the street. Further along to the west, the properties along the lane are more modern. The north, and opposite the site, there are a number of large linked detached two storey properties. Towards the end of the lane is Town Furlong, a street of semi-detached and terraced properties. A rear parking court for these properties forms the side boundary to the application site. To the south, where the application site is, there are two sets of semi-detached properties (Nos 23-29) which have low eaves and box dormers. These properties are set back from the road and have large open frontages and a single garage to the side. The three sets of housing, to the north, south and Town Furlong, may not be of any particular architectural merit in themselves however they share distinctive characteristics within their groups.

6.5 The previous application was for a detached pitched roof dwelling with its gable end to the front. It was located 3m further forward than No29 and was tapered towards the rear. The proposal also included a large car port within the frontage. Due to the more forward position, higher eaves, the bulk and massing of that dwelling would have markedly contrasted with the existing buildings, as would its detached nature. This, in combination, with the car port to the front was considered to result in a development which would appear prominent and cramped in the street scene.

6.6 This proposal by contrast proposes an attached dwelling. It would be designed in a similar style to the existing dwellings albeit with a slightly more modern twist. The set down of the ridge slightly and set back of the 'link' to No 29 makes the house appear narrower and more subservient to No 29. There would also be a larger gap to the side boundary. The roof pitch follows the same direction as No 29, thereby reducing the bulk and massing of the building. Officers consider the general design is more in context with the existing sets of dwellings along this side of the street. The frontage would have 4 car parking spaces, one less than the refused scheme. Whilst the frontage would still be formalised to a degree by having the parking marked out, the removal of the car port building will retain the sense of openness to the frontage. Combined with the reduced bulk and appearance of the dwelling, the effect on the open frontage will not be so prominent or stark in comparison to the refused scheme. Low boundary treatments to the frontages will also help retain the sense of openness, and this can be ensured as part of the landscaping condition.

6.7 Impact upon amenity

The dwelling would be attached to No 29. The rear elevation does not project past the end of No29. Any mutual overlooking would be no more than expected between adjacent houses. The existing side window in No 29 is to a landing which is not a main living area and therefore its loss would not be harmful to their living conditions. Similarly the loss of the downstairs toilet and shower room. The proposed dwelling projects forward by 1m in front of No29. The fact that this scheme has a lower eaves height to the front as well means it would not in your officers view result in a significant loss of

light or be overbearing on No 29.

6.8 To the side of the dwelling are the row of garages and then the rear elevations of the properties of Town Furlong. These properties would be over 20m away from the side elevation of the proposed dwelling. There is only proposed to be a window to a bathroom which will be obscured glazed. The development would therefore not result in overlooking, nor would it be overbearing to these properties. It would also not affect the properties to the north on the opposite side of the lane.

6.9 Access and parking

The proposal includes moving the access slightly and a shared parking area for 4 cars. The layout is similar to the previous application and the highway officer did not raise any significant concerns subject to the existing access being stopped up. In highway terms therefore the proposal therefore raised no issues.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 This revised scheme would be more in keeping with the character of the area and would not dominant the visual appearance of the street. The frontage would retain a more open character. Overall, the scheme as a whole is considered to be acceptable and meet the relevant development plan policies.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant planning Permission subject to the following conditions;**

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

**2 : Approved plans**

**3 : Details of materials to be submitted**

**4 : Access, parking and turning in accordance with plan**

**5 :Landscaping scheme including boundary details (submission)**

**6 : Landscaping scheme (implementation)**

**7 : Drainage details to be submitted**

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