

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | P15/V1244/FUL |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION |
| REGISTERED | 28.5.2015 |
| PARISH | GROVE |
| WARD MEMBER(S) | Ben Mabbett Chris McCarthy |
| APPLICANT | Bellwood Projects Ltd |
| SITE | The Firs, Main Street, Grove, Wantage, OX12 7LE |
| PROPOSAL | The erection of six dwellings with car parking and works there to. |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| GRID REFERENCE | 440138/190312 |
| OFFICER | Sarah Green |

SUMMARY

- This application is referred to planning committee due to an objection from the parish council.
- The proposal is for 6 dwellings within the built up area of Grove
- The main issues are the impact on the character of the area, impact on the highway and impact on neighbouring properties.
- Officers consider that on balance the scheme would be acceptable and accord with the NPPF
- The application is recommended for approval

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to planning committee due to an objection from the parish council.
- 1.2 This application relates to The Firs, a former bungalow located on a corner plot at the junction of Main Street and School Lane in Grove. The site is located opposite the Tesco Express at Millbrook Square in Grove. A location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.
- 1.3 Outline planning permission (ref P10/V2052/O) was granted for 3 dwellings on the site in March 2011.
- 1.4 Full planning permission (ref P12/V1400/FUL) was granted for 4 dwellings on the site was granted on 18 September 2012. The same scheme was re-granted planning permission on 22 July 2015 (ref P15/V1020/FUL).

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application is for the erection of 6 dwellings on the site. The dwellings would be arranged as 3 sets of semi-detached properties. Each dwelling would have 2 car parking spaces on site. The existing access onto School Lane would be moved slightly further along the lane. Extracts of the application plans are **attached** at Appendix 2.
- 2.2 Additional information has been received during the application to address the concerns of the drainage engineer and the highway officer.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Below is a summary of the responses received to the application. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

| | |
|--|--|
| Grove Parish Council | <p>“We object as feel this is over development of the site. There appears to be insufficient turning space for cars and are concerned that 6 properties and associated visitors would add to further cars parked on School Lane/Main Street.</p> <p>As with the previous application we have concerns about pedestrian and road safety due to the ingress/egress of these properties. Double yellow lines are required in front of the properties facing Main Street and on both sides of School Lane to prohibit car parking. It is already dangerous, and several near misses have occurred, as there is very limited visibility onto/off of School Lane near the junction when cars are parked there.”</p> |
| County Archaeologist (OCC) | No archaeological constraints to application |
| Thames Water Development Control | No objection |
| Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) | <p>Holding objection. No objection in principle but clarification and additional information needed.</p> <p><i>Additional information:</i> Has reviewed the revised information comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of car ports and reversion to car parking and swept path plan shown on drawing no: 5225:SK1 Rev. 1 is acceptable. • The opportunity for visitor parking in the vicinity is noted and acceptable. • The vision splays shown on drawing no: 2897.103 Rev. D are acceptable. • The proposed vehicle access as a dropped kerb arrangement is acceptable. • The cycle parking stands will need to be in the form of ‘Sheffield’ type stands at 0.9m centres and covered and secure – this is not clear but could be conditioned to be submitted for approval. <p>In light of the above I revise my original holding objection to one of no objection subject to suitable conditions reflecting the above.</p> <p>He also verbally commented that a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) should be conditioned, given it is close to the school and on a junction.</p> |
| Drainage Engineer (Vale of White Horse District Council) | Holding objection. Submitted FRA relates to previous site layout, is out of date and does not reflect any changes in flood mapping and legislation |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | <i>Additional information:</i> Revised FRA now adequate to support application. Remove holding objection subject to conditions on surface water drainage |
| Neighbour Object (2) | Too many dwellings, density greater than surroundings, contribute to great congestion on School Lane Not in keeping with surrounding housing, corresponding traffic increase using School Lane will simply exacerbate an already difficult problem. |

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P15/V1020/FUL](#) - Approved (22/07/2015)
Proposed residential development of four dwellings.

[P13/V2536/DIS](#) - Approved (22/12/2014)
Discharge of conditions 1, 2, 5, 6, 13 and 15 on P12/V1400/FUL

[P12/V1400/FUL](#) - Approved (18/09/2012)
Erection of four dwellings.

[P12/V0184](#) - withdrawn (20/04/2012)
Proposed residential development comprising 2x1 bed, 2x2 bed and 2x3 bed dwellings with associated parking.

[P10/V2052/O](#) - Approved (17/03/2011)
Outline application for demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 3no. two storey detached dwellings with garages and parking spaces.

[P10/V0049/O](#) - Other Outcome (27/07/2010)
Outline application for the erection of 4 dwellings

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

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

The development plan for this area comprises the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan 2011. The following local plan policies relevant to this application were 'saved' by direction on 1 July 2009.

DC1 - Design
DC5 - Access
DC6 - Landscaping
DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
H10 - Development in the Five Main Settlements

5.2 **Grove Neighbourhood Plan**

Grove does not have a designation for a neighbourhood plan.

5.3 **Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1**

The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF. At present it is officers' opinion that the emerging Local Plan housing policies carry limited weight for decision making. The

relevant policies are as follows:-

- CP3 – Settlement Hierarchy
- CP4 – Meeting our housing needs
- CP15 – Spatial Strategy for South East Vale Sub-Area
- CP33 – Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
- CP37 – Design and local distinctiveness
- CP42 – Flood Risk
- CP44 - Landscape

5.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Design Guide – March 2015
- Parking Standards SPG

5.5 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012

5.6 Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (PPG)

5.7 Other Relevant Legislation

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation
- Human Rights Act 1998
- Equality Act 2010
- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)

5.8 Human Rights Act

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

5.9 Equalities

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. Principle of the development
2. Design and layout
3. Residential amenity
4. Highway Safety and parking
5. Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

Principle of development

6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan currently comprises the saved policies of Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the

plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

- 6.3 Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and PPG and the emerging Vale of White Horse Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Sites and Policies and its supporting evidence base.
- 6.4 The relevant housing policies of the adopted and emerging local plan hold very limited material planning weight in light of the lack of a 5 year housing supply. Consequently the proposal should be assessed under the NPPF where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through the decision making process. Having a deliverable 5 year housing supply is considered sustainable under the 3 strands. Therefore, with the lack of a 5 year housing supply, the proposal is acceptable in principle unless any adverse impacts can be identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of meeting this objective.

Design and Layout

- 6.5 Policies DC1 and H10 require that development should be a scale, layout and design that would not materially harm the form, structure or character of the settlement.
- 6.6 The layout provides 3 sets of semi-detached houses. The houses along Main Street would front the street. Either side there is the Tesco store on the opposite side of School Lane which is located close to Main Street, and on the other is No 1 Sims Garden, Main Street which is set back from the main road. The proposed properties would face Main Street which is appropriate. They are set further forward than the immediate properties to the north, and are more in line with the Tesco store. The front of plot 3 has been stepped back to help provide a transition No1. There are other properties further up and down Main Street which are sited close to the road, as well as those which are set back. It is therefore considered that the proposed dwellings would not appear out of character for the area in this regard.
- 6.7 Plot 6 has been designed to 'turn the corner', with active elevations to both Main Street and School Lane. The removal of the carport from in front of plots 1 and 2 will allow the frontage of these dwellings to face the road and provide a more active frontage. The retention of the stone wall along School Lane and the use of brick boundary walls within the development at 1.5m in height, will provide the sense of enclosure within the development but also allow for natural surveillance.
- 6.8 The built form is traditional in its form with pitched roofs, gables and dormers. There is some variation in the ridge lines. The general proportions of the dwellings are considered appropriate. Each dwelling would have its own 2 car parking spaces and a rear garden. The rear gardens range from approx. 34sqm to 64sqm. These are below the recommended sizes for 3 bedroom dwellings in the design guide, however the provision of such spaces should also take account of the sites context and location. The garden sizes are considered generally reasonable given this is within the centre of the settlement. The development will have a higher density than the sites immediately adjoining, but this in itself does not represent harm. Along Main Street there is variation in the density and size of plots. In the wider context officers consider it would be difficult to justify it was harmful to the wider character of Main Street. It is considered that the proposal would meet policy DC1.
- 6.9 The site is not within a conservation area and trees on the site are not protected. It is unlikely that the existing trees on the site could be retained given the location of the buildings. New landscaping and planting would be part of the proposals and the landscaping conditions would ensure that the development was suitably landscaped.

Residential Amenity

- 6.10 Policy DC9 seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment. Design principles DG63-64 of the Design Guide pertain to amenity, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.11 The closest neighbouring properties to the site are No 1 Sims Gardens and Nos 14 and 15 Old Mill Close. The flank wall of plot 3 would be forward of the flank wall of No 1. There would be 3.5m between the properties, with plot 3 being approximately 2.5m from the boundary at its closest point. The front of plot 3 would be approximately 6.5m in front of No 1, however the property has lowered eaves at 4.2m in height and the ridge line is lower than plot 4. The proposed dwelling would have an impact on the frontage of No 1. However officers consider that given the separation distance between them and the lower eaves lines of plot 3, this impact would be small. Plots 1 and 2 would be between 8.4-9.2m from the boundary with No 1. Given this and the distances between the buildings it is considered that these dwellings would not feel overbearing on this property or its garden.
- 6.12 The flank wall of plot 1 would be over 13m away from the rear elevations of Nos 14 and 15 Old Mill Close. This distance is considered acceptable. The side elevation of plot 1 would not have any windows in the side, so there will not be any direct overlooking. The proposal would not have a harmful impact on the neighbours' amenity.

Highway Safety and parking

- 6.13 Policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely. Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states: *"Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."*
- 6.14 The proposal includes moving the existing access on site along School Lane. Parking and turning for the dwellings are included on site. All dwellings have 2 car parking spaces, which accords with council parking standards. Following the highway officers original comments further information on vehicle tracking, and revised site plan showing vision splays and dropped kerb arrangement have been submitted and reviewed. The details are acceptable to the highway officer who now has no objection to the scheme. He does recommend that further details on the type of cycle parking is required by condition and that a construction traffic management plan should be required due to the site's location near to the school and road junction. These are both reasonable and are included in the recommended conditions.

Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

- 6.15 The NPPF provides that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be appropriately flood resilient and resistant (paragraph 103). A revised flood risk assessment has been submitted which the council's drainage engineer considers is adequate to support the application. He has therefore removed his holding objection subject to conditions requiring a fully detailed scheme for the sustainable surface water drainage to be approved and that the surface water scheme is developed and implemented in accordance with the FRA.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 This application has been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), relevant saved policies in the local plan and all other material planning considerations. The NPPF states that sustainable development should be permitted

unless the adverse effects significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

- 7.2 The proposal would provide six new dwellings in a sustainable location. It is considered to generally reflect the character of the wider area which is varied. There will be some impact upon neighbouring properties however this is considered to be small and would not in your officers opinion be significant and demonstrably harmful to justify a refusal.
- 7.3 Overall, and in view of the emphasis in the NPPF, the development is considered to amount to sustainable development. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Commencement of development – three years.**
2. **Approved drawings.**
3. **Material details to be submitted.**
4. **Window and door details to be submitted.**
5. **Removal of permitted development for extensions.**
6. **Access, visibility splays, parking and turning in accordance with plan.**
7. **Closure of existing access.**
8. **Construction traffic management plan to be submitted.**
9. **Details of cycle parking to be submitted.**
10. **Landscaping scheme, including boundary details (submission).**
11. **Landscaping scheme, including boundary details (implement).**
12. **Sustainable drainage scheme details to be submitted.**
13. **Drainage scheme to be in accordance with flood risk assessment.**

Contact officer: Sarah Green

Email:sarah.green@southandvale.gov.uk