

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P14/V2791/HH</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>REGISTERED</b>	9.12.2014
<b>PARISH</b>	SHRIVENHAM
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Simon Howell Elaine Ware
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr & Mrs L Minchinton-Smith
<b>SITE</b>	11 The Green, Shrivenham, Swindon, Oxfordshire, SN6 8AR
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Demolition of existing rear conservatory. Erection of a single storey rear extension (re-submission of refused application P14/V1558/HH).
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	423506/188705
<b>OFFICER</b>	Martin Deans

---

## SUMMARY

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension. The application comes to committee as Shrivenham Parish Council objects. The main issues are –

- The impact on the character and appearance of the area
- The impact on neighbours in terms of loss of light and loss of outlook

The proposal is an amendment to a proposal refused planning permission in August 2014. The key change is a significant reduction in the depth of the proposed extension so that it now complies with advice in the adopted design guide. For this reason the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The recommendation is to grant planning permission.

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 No.11 The Green is a modern semi-detached dwelling located off Townsend Road in Shrivenham. The Green is a cul-de-sac of 16 dwellings. The attached neighbour, no.13, has its rear wall set behind that of no.11 by approximately 0.5 metre.

### 2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 Permitted development rights for extensions were removed from the dwelling at the time of the grant of planning permission for its construction. This gives the local planning authority the opportunity to assess individual applications. However it does not mean that extensions are unacceptable in principle. The application seeks permission for the replacement of an existing rear conservatory with a flat-roofed, single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

2.2 An application for a larger extension was refused permission in August 2014. In this new application, the depth of the proposed extension has been reduced from approximately six metres to 4.8 metres. The height is approximately 2.7 metres. A copy of the application plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

### 3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Shrivenham Parish Council** objects "...on the same grounds as the previous refused application - This is a large extension to this property and we believe there is a

condition that restricts future development and that this application is a classic example of over development, especially as this is now a full extension on the back of the property.”

3.2 **Local Residents** No letters have been submitted

3.3 **Thames Water** No objections

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

4.1 [P14/V1558/HH](#) - Refused (29/08/2014)

Demolition of existing rear conservatory. Erection of a single storey rear extension.

[P05/V0551](#) - Approved (07/06/2005)

Proposed rear conservatory.

[P00/V1540](#) - Approved (30/11/2000)

Erection of a conservatory.

#### 5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

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

DC1 - Design

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

5.2 **Design Guide (SPD adopted March 2015)**

Principle DG110: Rear extensions

5.3 **National Planning Policy Framework, 2012**

5.4 **Planning Practise Guidance, 2014**

#### 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues are the design of the proposal and its impact on neighbours, particularly no.13 The Green. In terms of design, although the proposed extension is flat-roofed, it would lie completely behind the house. Thus it would not be particularly prominent from public viewpoints. It would be clearly subordinate in scale. If built, the extension would reduce the rear garden from approximately 50 sq.m. to approximately 30sq.m. in area. This is considered to be adequate to serve the property, and, for this reason, the proposal is not considered to represent an overdevelopment of the site.

6.2 Taking into account the slight stagger in the line of the rear walls of no.11 and no.13, the proposed extension would project approximately 3.9 metres beyond the rear wall of the neighbour. This complies with the adopted design guide, which recommends a projection of no more than four metres for a semi-detached house. This is a significant difference between the previously refused proposal and the current application. The rear gardens of both properties face approximately towards the north. Thus, although there will be some impact on the amenities of no.13, from loss of outlook and loss of light, the impact will not be so great as to warrant refusal of the application.

#### 7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposal is acceptable in terms of design and its impact on the character and appearance of the area. It is also acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbours. Consequently the proposal accords with relevant policies of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, the adopted design guide, and with the NPPF.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Time limit - Full Application (Full).
- 2 : Approved plans.
- 3 : Materials in Accordance with application (Full).

Author	Martin Deans
Email	<a href="mailto:martin.deans@southandvale.gov.uk">martin.deans@southandvale.gov.uk</a>
Contact telephone	01235 540350