

## **KBA/6770/10 – W Associates**

**Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of 4 detached dwellings, garages, parking and access road. Stanab, Faringdon Road, Kingston Bagpuize, OX13 5BG.**

### **1.0 The Proposal**

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of Stanab, a modest single storey bungalow set within a large plot, and its replacement with 4 detached dwellings (3 x 4 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom) with associated parking and garage space.
- 1.2 The property, located on the north side of Faringdon Road, is bounded by a mixture of residential styles with a traditional cottage to the north, known as Sunny Lawn, and Blenheim Way, a modern development comprising detached executive style dwellings to the east. The Waggon and Horses Public House lies to the west of the site.
- 1.3 The application is a resubmission following an earlier scheme that was withdrawn in January 2007. The key change is the relocation of plots 2 and 3 further to the west to increase their distance from the properties in Blenheim Way from 11.7m to 14.6m.
- 1.4 A copy of the submitted plans showing the location of the proposal, its design and layout together with the design and access statement are attached at **Appendix 1**. A copy of the block plan of the withdrawn scheme is attached at **Appendix 2**.
- 1.5 The application comes to Committee because several letters of objection have been received and Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council's view differs from the recommendation.

### **2.0 Planning History**

- 2.1 In 1990 and 1991 planning permission was refused for the erection of a bungalow in the garden of Stanab. In 1992, planning permission was refused for two bungalows on the site. All of these properties were proposed to have access off the track that runs along the western boundary. In 1994, planning permission was granted for the erection of a 2 bedroom bungalow.

### **3.0 Planning Policies**

- 3.1 *Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011*  
Policy GS5 (making efficient use of land and buildings) seeks to promote the efficient re-use of previously developed / unused land and buildings within settlements (provided there is no conflict with other policies in the Local Plan).
- 3.2 Policy H11 (development in the larger villages) enables new housing development within the built-up areas of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, provided the scale, layout, mass and design of the dwellings would not materially harm the structure, form and character of the area and the proposal does not involve the loss of facilities important to the local community (i.e. informal public open space).
- 3.3 Policy H15 (housing densities) seeks net residential densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare in the larger villages, provided there would be no harm to the character of the surrounding area or the amenities of adjoining properties.
- 3.4 Policies DC1, DC5, DC6, and DC9 (quality of new development) are relevant and seek to ensure that all new development is of a high standard of design / landscaping, does not cause harm to the amenity of neighbours, and is acceptable in terms of highway safety.

3.5 PPS3, "Housing", is also relevant and reiterates the key objectives of developing previously developed sites ahead of greenfield sites and making the most effective and efficient use of land.

#### 4.0 **Consultations**

4.1 Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council objects to the proposal. Their full comments are attached at **Appendix 3**.

4.2 County Engineer – no objections, subject to conditions and a financial contribution towards enhancement of the bus route to assist sustainability.

4.3 Drainage Engineer – no objections (subject to conditions).

4.4 5 letters of objection have been received, which are summarised as follows:

- The proposal is out of keeping with other properties in the area, especially in having no set back from Faringdon Road and being 3-storey.
- It is an overdevelopment of the site, and should be 2 detached dwellings only.
- 4 new dwellings will ruin the outlook from properties adjoining the site.
- The proposed plans fail to take account of the rear extension to no 3 Blenheim Way which is only 9.1m from plot 3. This does not comply with the Council's guidance of 12m.
- The rear first floor window in plot 3 will overlook no 3 Blenheim Way.
- Plots 1 and 2 are too close to the boundary wall with Faringdon Road, and will be oppressive to pedestrians walking along this road.
- Plot 4 fails to meet a 21m distance in respect of no 9 Blenheim Way.
- Back to back distances of 21m and side to back of 12m are too short. Other Oxfordshire Councils consider 25m and 15m respectively to be the minimum acceptable distance.
- The pond to the southwest of the existing dwelling is a habitat for dragonflies, which will be lost with the construction of plot 1.
- The Local Plan shows that sufficient dwellings will be built in the village up to 2011. This scheme should therefore be rejected. The village does not need more housing.
- The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement to provide a mix of housing in that no 2 bed units are proposed.
- The revised plans do not address previous concerns raised.

#### 5.0 **Officer Comments**

5.1 The main issues in this case are considered to be 1) the principle of the development in this location, 2) the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including its design and its impact on existing trees, 3) the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties, and 4) the safety of the access and parking arrangements.

5.2 On the first issue, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is identified in the Local Plan as a larger village that can accommodate new housing development within its built up area providing the layout, mass and design would not harm the character of the area. PPS 3 'Housing' also makes it a priority to use previously developed land for new housing. Previously developed land includes the curtilage of an existing dwelling. Furthermore, PPS3 seeks the building of homes for families and encourages the use of innovative approaches to achieve higher densities within existing settlements. In this respect, the principle of a development detached family dwellings is therefore considered acceptable and an appropriate form of development in this location.

5.3 Regarding the second issue, the development in the form proposed is not considered to be out of keeping with the locality, and has been designed to appear as four family dwellings, with plot 3 being deliberately set back from Faringdon Road to enable the retention of the existing tree located in the corner of the site. Whilst the plots fronting Faringdon Road will have

accommodation in the roof, in terms of bulk and massing, they are not considered to be overly tall or large, having ridge heights of 8.3m. When compared to properties in Blenheim Way, the bulk and massing of the proposed units are not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, and they would sit comfortably within the site so as not to appear cramped when viewed from the street. Consequently, Officers consider the visual impact of the proposal to be acceptable.

- 5.4 In terms of density, the proposal is just over 23 dwellings per hectare. Whilst below 30 as sought under Policy H15, this is considered acceptable in this location
- 5.5 Turning to the third issue, the impact on neighbouring properties, it is considered that no harm would be caused to those properties opposite the site on Faringdon Road, or to the property, Sunny Lawn that lies to the north of the site. The properties most affected lie to the east, in Blenheim Way. The Council's guidance is a minimum 12m distance between windows and flank elevations. Within this context, plot 3 is sited 14.6m to the west of no 1 Blenheim Way and 12.6m west of no 3 Blenheim Way. Whilst the extension to no 3 Blenheim Way is not shown on the submitted block plan, the distances quoted above are the parallel distances, and plot 3 does not encroach on the alignment of the rear elevation of the extension where the 12m rule would be applied. Consequently the spatial relationship between plot 3 and the properties in Blenheim Way are considered acceptable.
- 5.6 The new dwellings are also sited to respect the amenity and privacy of existing dwellings that adjoin the site, where no direct overlooking between dwellings will occur from plots 1, 2 and 3. Whilst Plot 4 is orientated to face the rear garden area of no 9 Blenheim Way, any impact on light or privacy to this property is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal, given that plot 4 is 16m from the common boundary.
- 5.7 In terms of parking and access, the proposed arrangements are considered acceptable. The parking provision shown provides at least 2 spaces for each unit. Adequate visibility can also be achieved at the new access onto Faringdon Road to ensure pedestrian and highway safety. The County Engineer has raised no objection subject to conditions.
- 5.9 With regard to concerns raised in over provision of dwellings in the village in respect of figures quoted in the current Local Plan, the unit numbers stated in table 8.2 of the Local Plan do not prevent further windfall sites such as this being permitted.

6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 *That authority to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions is delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Committee Chair to allow the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required financial contribution.*

1. TL1 Time Limit
2. MC2 Sample Materials to be submitted.
3. RE2 Restriction on extensions / alterations to dwellings (PD rights removed)
4. RE8 Submission of drainage details
5. RE7 Submission of boundary details
6. RE22 Slab Levels
7. RE14 – Garage accommodation to be retained.
8. Access in accordance with specified plan

9. *Turning space in accordance with specified plan*
10. *Car parking layout in accordance with specified plan*
11. *LS4 – Submission of landscaping scheme*
12. *HY11 – Specified vision splays (access)*
13. *No development shall commence until tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837 (2005) have been erected and inspected by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. Such measures shall be retained as approved at all times during construction, and no storage of plant, equipment or materials or any burning of waste shall take place within the protected areas.*

6.2 *That authority to refuse planning permission is delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Committee Chair should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed within the 8 week period (which ends on 3 April 2007). The reason for refusal would be based on the lack of necessary financial contributions towards improving local services and facilities.*