

APPLICATION NO.	P16/V0565/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	1.3.2016
PARISH	KENNINGTON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Edward Blagrove Bob Johnston
APPLICANT	Mr Mark Saunders
SITE	10 Manor Grove, Kennington, Oxford, OX1 5QY
PROPOSAL	Demolition of current lean to garage extension and replacement with single story extension to existing bungalow.
AMENDMENTS	None
OFFICER	Emma Hawthorne

SUMMARY

The application is referred to committee as the applicant is related to a member of staff and as Kennington Parish Council's qualified comments mean that it objects to the application.

The main issues are:

- Impact on visual amenity of the area, which is considered acceptable;
- Impact on amenities of neighbouring properties, which is considered acceptable; and
- Whether there is adequate off-street parking within the site, which it is considered there is.

The application is recommended for approval.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The property, a detached bungalow, is located in Kennington. The property is situated within a well-established residential area. Neighbouring properties are situated to the east, south and west boundaries of the site. Vehicular access is obtained from Manor Grove which adjoins the north boundary of the site. A copy of the site plan is **attached** as Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of a lean to garage and erection of a single storey side extension on the east elevation of the property.

2.2 The proposed extension will facilitate a study, bathroom and store room.

2.3 The proposal measures 13.15 metres in width, the full width of the existing dwelling, 2.3 metres in depth and is an overall height of 2.7 metres to the highest point.

2.4 A copy of the application plan is **attached** as Appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Kennington Parish Council	No objection subject to 2 conditions:- 1) Materials stored within curtilage of property 2) Upon completion damaged footpaths/verges/highways are properly and completely made good (not just patched) If these conditions are considered unreasonable then the Parish Council wish to object
Highways	Initial holding objection to request parking plan showing provision of two parking spaces to current standards to be supplied
Neighbours	No comments

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 [P06/V0181](#) - Approved (08/05/2006)
Demolition of garage and erection of single storey extension.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 ***National Planning Policy Framework 2012***

The NPPF replace all previous PPG's and PPS's and also indicates the weight to be given to existing local plan policies. The local plan policies that are relevant to this application are considered to have a high degree of consistency with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

5.2 ***Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014)***

This document provides supplementary guidance to the NPPF.

5.3 ***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.

Policy DC1 - Design

Policy DC5 - Access

Policy DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

5.4 ***Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1 Core Policies***

The draft Local Plan Part 1 is not currently adopted policy and this emerging policy and its supporting text has limited weight as per paragraph 216 of the NPPF. Greater regard therefore is to be given to the NPPF in line with paragraph 14 and where relevant, the saved policies (listed above) within the existing Local Plan.

Core Policy 37 – Design and local distinctiveness

5.5 ***Supplementary Planning Document***

Design Guide (adopted March 2015)

The following sections of the Design Guide are particularly relevant to this application;
DG103 – Responding to Local Character
DG104 – Consider your Neighbours

DG105 – Scale, Form and Massing
DG106 – Design Considerations
DG109 – Side Extensions

5.6 **Neighbourhood Plan**

Kennington has not submitted a neighbourhood plan.

5.7 **Human Rights Act 1998**

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.

5.8 **Equalities Act 2010**

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 main issues in determining this application are the impact on the visual amenity of the area, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the impact on highway safety.

6.2 **Impact on visual amenity:**

Policy DC1 requires the development to be of a scale, layout, design that does not adversely affect those attributes that make a positive contribution to the character of the locality.

6.3 The proposal is for a single storey side extension on the east elevation of the dwelling which will replace an existing lean to garage. The proposal will span the width of the existing dwelling, extend in depth to the eastern boundary of the site and have a mono-pitched roof. Render and timber cladding are proposed materials for the extension which will be similar in appearance to the existing dwelling. The proposed extension will be seen within the context of the existing property and will not appear out of place within the street scene or harm the visual amenity of the area. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy DC1, and the provisions of the NPPF, NPPG and the design guide.

6.4 **Impact on neighbouring properties:**

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.

6.5 The proposed extension will meet the boundary of the neighbouring property to the east of the site, however, the majority of the proposal will match with this neighbouring properties extension and no harmful impact will be caused. The proposal has one small, high level window on the side elevation but views from this window across to 8 Manor Grove are limited to viewing their roof scape and harmful overlooking will not be caused. Given the position and orientation of neighbouring properties, the amenities of these dwellings will not be harmed by the proposal in terms of overshadowing, dominance or overlooking. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of local plan policy DC9, and the provisions of the NPPF, NPPG and Residential Design Guide.

6.6 **Impact on highway safety:**

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 that “development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”. The county highways officer has issued an initial holding objection to request a drawing demonstrating two parking spaces on site, one of which is in place of the existing garage to be lost. The applicant has declined to produce this as he argues the existing garage is not wide enough to enable a car to be safely parked and is not used for parking. He has one car parking space at the moment. Officers consider that the applicant’s argument is reasonable. At the time of writing the report officers were in discussion with the county highways officer and an update on this issue will be reported verbally to committee.

6.7 Other Issues

The parish council has requested that two conditions be applied to any planning permission. Officers have assessed these against the six tests contained in paragraph 206 of the NPPF. The first suggested condition is that all materials must be stored on the site. This is an unreasonable requirement as during any construction project there may be occasions when delivery of materials requires temporary storage at the roadside before being moved to site. The second suggested condition is that once construction is finished any damage to footpaths or verges is repaired. The public highway is owned by Oxfordshire County Council who can ensure repair using its own legal powers if necessary. A planning condition is not therefore reasonable or necessary.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed development will not harm the visual amenity of the area, the amenities of neighbouring properties or, subject to the discussion with the county highways officer, negatively impact upon highway safety. The proposal therefore complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan. The development is also considered to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and the council’s Residential Design Guide.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Time limit - full application.**
- 2. Approved plans.**
- 3. Materials in accordance with the application.**

Author: Emma Hawthorne
Contact: emma.hawthorne@southandvale.gov.uk