

APPLICATION NO.	P14/V2505/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	03/11/2014
PARISH	KENNINGTON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Jerry Patterson, Ron Mansfield
APPLICANT	Ms Megan Morys
SITE	21 Bagley Close, Kennington
PROPOSAL	Rear single and two storey extension
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	452039/202425
OFFICER	Martin Deans

SUMMARY

The application comes to committee because Kennington Parish Council objects.

The proposal has been designed to address reasons that led to a dismissed appeal earlier in 2014. The proposed extensions have been reduced in size and re-designed. The main issues are:-

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area, particularly the space between the dwelling and its neighbour, and the design of the extension
- The impact on neighbours, particularly the side facing kitchen window in no.19 Bagley Close

Due to the changes made to the scheme from that which was dismissed at appeal the impacts are considered to be acceptable and the recommendation is to grant planning permission.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application site is a semi-detached house that forms part of a crescent of residential development at the end of Bagley Close. A site location plan is **attached** at appendix 1. The application site forms part of five pairs of semi-detached houses that form the crescent. Each pair is set at an angle to each neighbouring pair, with the front walls being closer than the rear walls. There is a local slope that falls down towards the east.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 The application has been submitted following a dismissed appeal for a proposed extension to the house. The appeal was dismissed on 23 September 2014 and the appeal plans and appeal decision are **attached** at appendix 2. The current proposal is materially smaller in floor area than the appeal scheme. It comprises a single storey and two storey rear and side extension to provide a kitchen a dining room at ground floor and a bedroom, bathroom and en-suite at first floor. The front wall of the side extension will be set back behind the main front wall of the house by 6.5 metres. The rear extension has been designed to comply with the council's 40-degree rule. As in the appeal scheme the existing single storey detached garage that lies to the side of the house will be removed. The current plans are **attached** at appendix 3.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Kennington Parish Council** – objects for the reasons **attached** at appendix 4.

Local Residents – One round robin letter of objection, signed by six local residents, and one individual letter of objection, have been submitted stating that the issues that led to the appeal dismissal still apply. One letter of support and one letter stating no objections have also been submitted.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P14/V0533/HH – Rear single storey and two storey extension – Appeal dismissed (23/09/2014)

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework, 2012, replaced all previous PPG's and PPS's and introduced the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

5.2 The National Planning Practise Guidance, 2014, supplements the NPPF.

5.3 The adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 contains the following relevant policies:-

DC1 – Design

DC5 – Highway safety

DC9 – Impact on neighbours

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues are, first, the impact on the character and appearance of the neighbourhood; second, the impact on neighbours; and third highway safety. With regard to the first issue the appeal inspector identified the positive attributes of the locality to be the regularity of the spacing between the houses in the crescent and the simple design of the houses themselves (paragraph 4 of the decision letter). He considered that the appeal scheme would have largely filled the space between the flank wall of no.21 and the common boundary with no.19, and that the relatively complex form of the proposed roof, together with the relative size of the extension, did not respect the simple form of the house, or its scale (paragraph 5).

6.2 The current proposal has sought to address the inspector's concerns, The proposed extension is materially smaller in size than the appeal scheme, and the front wall of it has been set back significantly behind the front wall of the house – in fact almost as far back as the rear wall of the house. Therefore almost all of the space between the flank wall of the house and the boundary will remain. The design of the main roof has been simplified so that, from the front and side, there is one simple eaves line that coincides with the eaves of the main roof. This design has been amended slightly since originally submitted and has been further improved. These elements mean that, due to the angled layout of the houses, the extension will be less obvious in views from the street, and where it is seen, it will clearly be a recessive element that does not intrude into the space between the houses themselves. The simpler, hipped roof design also pays more respect to the simple form of the house. Officers consider that the changes have been successful in addressing the concerns of the inspector.

6.3 The second issue is the impact on neighbours. The impact on the attached neighbour, no.23, has been tackled through ensuring that the design of the extension complies with the council's adopted 40-degree rule. With regard to this neighbour, the proposal therefore meets the council's adopted standard. The other, unattached neighbour, no.19, has a ground floor kitchen window that faces the application site and is the sole window to the kitchen. In his decision the inspector considered that the extension pro-

proposed at appeal would cause harm to the neighbour through loss of light to, and loss of outlook from, the kitchen window.

- 6.4 The element of the appeal scheme that was closest to the neighbour's kitchen window, the two storey element containing the garage and bedroom over, has been deleted from the current proposal. The impact of this element on the kitchen window was enhanced by its position relative to that of the existing garage that is to be removed. The garage is a significant component in the existing outlook from the kitchen window and the original, two storey element sat almost entirely in front of the garage. Consequently the impact of the element on the window was significant.
- 6.5 With this two storey element removed the proposed extension will now lie in the same area as the existing garage, when viewed from the window, but its closest corner would be approximately 1.5 metres further away and the main wall set at a much greater angle. The kitchen window is side facing, and cannot be afforded the same degree of protection as a front- or rear-facing window. Consequently, when compared to the impact of the existing garage, the impact of the extension as now proposed, with the two storey front element deleted, will not be enough to warrant refusal of the application.
- 6.6 The proposal includes a bathroom window in the side elevation facing no.19. This window will be obscure glazed with top-hung opening windows. This will prevent any harm from overlooking of the neighbour.
- 6.7 The attached neighbour, no.23, lies to the south-west of the application site. The closest part of the proposal to this neighbour is the proposed single storey extension along the boundary. It is similar in size to the one contained in the appeal scheme, to which no objection was raised by the inspector. The first floor element of the extension has been designed to meet the council's 40-degree rule and also has an acceptable impact.
- 6.8 With regard to highway safety, there is space on the site to park three cars. The extensions would provide four bedrooms and the car parking provision is considered to be acceptable.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The size and design of the proposed extension is sympathetic to the scale and design of the existing house. There will be no harm to neighbours from either loss of light or overlooking. Access and parking are also acceptable. The proposal therefore accords with the relevant policies of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, and to the NPPF.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

- 1. TL1 – Time limit.**
- 2. PL002 – Application plans.**
- 3. RE1 – Materials to match.**
- 4. RE28 – Obscure glazing (opening).**
- 5. HY7 – Car parking.**

Author / Officer: Martin Deans
Contact number: 01235 540350
Email address: martin.deans@southandvale.gov.uk