**APPLICATION NO.** P17/V0366/HH

**SITE** Viewlands, Stainswick Lane,

Shrivenham, SN6 8LB

PARISH SHRIVENHAM

**PROPOSAL** Erection of double garage with bedroom

above

**WARD MEMBER(S)** Simon Howell

**Elaine Ware** 

APPLICANT Mr Christopher Gay
OFFICER Anthony Hamilton

### RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:

1 : Commencement three years - full planning permission.

2 : HY6[I] - Access, parking and turning in accordance with approved plans

3: MC3 - Materials in accordance with application (full).

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application has been called into Planning Committee by Councillors Simon Howell and Elaine Ware.
- 1.2 The application site is located on the eastern side of Stainswick Lane, in the open countryside and approximately 490 metres southeast of the village of Shrivenham. On the site is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling, which is known as Viewlands. The dwelling has walls of stone and brick and a tiled roof. A detached, single storey outbuilding, which has a tiled roof and walls clad with timber panelling also lies within the site, as do garden areas, an area of hardstanding and a driveway.
- 1.3 Planning permission is sought to erect a detached, two storey building. This would provide a double garage on the ground floor and an en-suite bedroom at first floor level. The building would have a length of 9 metres and a width of approximately 6.3 metres. It would have a gabled roof, with an eaves height of some 2.8 metres and a ridge height of 6 metres. Two small, mid-roof dormers would be inserted into the front roof slope of the building. A single, larger dormer and two rooflights would be inserted into the rear roof slope. All three dormers would have pitched roofs. The garage would provide two parking spaces, each measuring 3.7 by 6 metres. Like the existing outbuilding on the application site, the proposed structure would have timber clad walls and a tiled roof.
- 1.4 A site location plan is provided overleaf and the application plans are <u>attached</u> at Appendix 1.



# 2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 Comments received on the application are summarised in the table below. Comments may be seen in full at <a href="https://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk">www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk</a>.

Shrivenham Parish	Grounds for objection are:
Council	
Objects	<ul> <li>The site is not constrained for space, so extra habitable space could be added to the existing dwelling;</li> <li>The building could be converted into a separate dwelling in the open countryside;</li> <li>The proposal was the subject of a previous application, which was refused at committee in June 2005 and the current application should be refused on the same grounds.</li> </ul>
Local Highway Authority No objections in principle, but several points raised	<ul> <li>Sought an amended site location plan, showing the red line bounding the site extending up to the edge of the adjacent highway at Stainswick Lane;</li> <li>Noted that the proposed garage spaces did not meet the minimum internal space standard;</li> <li>Stated that the proposal would need to be conditioned to be used in conjunction with the main dwelling only; and</li> <li>Stipulated that the car turning space shown on the submitted drawings would need to be retained, to enable egress to the highway in a forward gear.</li> </ul>

#### 3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 The following planning applications have been received for development on the application site:
- 3.2 <u>P73/V5335</u> Two garages and access. Planning permission was granted on 7<sup>th</sup> August 1973.
- 3.3 <u>P74/V0220</u> Erection of a pair of garages. Planning permission was granted on 7<sup>th</sup> June 1974.
- 3.4 <u>P74/V5431</u> Erection of one house plot adjacent to Cowleaze Cottages. Planning permission was refused on 15<sup>th</sup> January 1974.
- 3.5 <u>P93/V0742</u>- Erection of a two and single storey side extension to provide lounge with bedroom above. Planning permission was granted on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 1993.
- 3.6 <u>P98/V0666</u> Erection of a detached double garage. Planning permission was granted on 30<sup>th</sup> June 1998.
- 3.7 <u>P01/V0288</u> Detached double garage with first floor accommodation (annex to main house) Planning permission was refused on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2002.
- 3.8 <u>P04/V1911</u> Erection of a garage with storage above. Planning permission was refused on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2005.
- 3.9 <u>P05/V0144</u> Erection of detached garage with first floor residential accommodation above (amended plans). Planning permission was refused for the following reason on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2005:

The proposed garage with residential accommodation above, by reason of the buildings size, bulk and poor design would be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the locality. In addition, the proposal would be tantamount to the erection of a new dwelling in the open countryside. As such, the proposal is contrary to the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan in particular policies H18 and H8 and the Second Deposit Draft Local Plan in particular policies H24 and GS2.

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 The proposal is not 'Schedule 2 development' within the meaning of that term set out by Schedule 2 to *The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011*, because it is an urban development project with a development area that does not exceed 0.5 hectares (description 10. (b) refers). Consequently, the selection criteria set out by Schedule 3 to the aforementioned regulations do not apply in this case.

#### 5.0 MAIN ISSUES

### Design, layout and visual amenity

- 5.1 Core Policy 37: Design and Local Distinctiveness of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 states that all proposals for new development will be required to be of high quality design that, among other things, responds positively to the site and its surroundings, is visually attractive, and, in its scale, height, density, grain, massing, type, details and materials, is appropriate to the site and surrounding area. Core Policy 44: Landscape notes that the key features that contribute to the nature and quality of the district's landscape, including trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries and watercourses, will be protected from harmful development and, where possible, enhanced.
- 5.2 Officers consider that the proposal complies with these policies. With an eaves height of approximately 2.8 metres and a ridge height of some 6 metres, the proposed building would, it is held, be of similar massing and scale to a single storey domestic outbuilding. The building's materials would be similar to those of the existing outbuilding on the site, which, it is contended, has a rural, rather than an urban, or suburban, appearance. The front-facing dormer windows would, it is considered, comply with principle DG11 of the Vale of White Horse Design Guide, which states that dormers should be small and sit appropriately in the roof-slope, well above the eaves line, well below the ridge line, and set in from gable ends. The rear-facing dormer window would not be readily apparent from viewpoints in the public domain.
- 5.3 Officers believe that, when seen from viewpoints to the north and south of the site on Stainswick Lane, the proposed building would, by reason of its limited scale, be clearly subservient to Viewlands and the adjacent semi-detached dwelling, which is known as Vale House. It would, in addition, be screened to a degree by roadside vegetation and, from some viewpoints to the south of the site, by the two dwellings. As such, it is concluded that the proposal would not be a prominent feature in the landscape and that it would not, as such, be detrimental to landscape features.

#### **Residential Amenity**

- Policy DC9 Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 states that development will not be permitted if it would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment through, among other things, dominance or visual intrusion, or loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight.
- 5.5 The proposed building would face the garage and driveway of Vale House and would be positioned some 18 metres away from the boundary between the two properties. As such, Officers believe that the amenities enjoyed by the residents of Vale House would not be detrimentally affected through overlooking, overshadowing or the creation of an overbearing impact. The main amenity space area of Vale House is located to the rear of that dwelling and would not be seen from any window in the proposed building.

#### Access

- Policy DC5 Access of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 observes that proposals for development will only be permitted where, inter alia, safe and convenient access would be provided, the road network could accommodate the traffic arising from the development, and adequate provision would be made for vehicle manoeuvring and parking.
- 5.7 As has been seen, the Local Highway Authority raised several matters with regard to the proposal. An amended location plan, showing the red line bounding the site extended up to the edge of Stainswick Lane, has been received, as have revised drawings showing that the two parking spaces in the building would meet the Local Highway Authority's minimum internal space standards and that the car turning area in front of the building would be retained for that purpose. The other issue raised by the Local Highway Authority, with regard to the use of the building in conjunction with that of the main dwelling, is considered below.

### **Ancillary Accommodation**

5.8 The Parish Council's concern that the proposed building could be converted into a separate dwelling is noted. However, notwithstanding both this concern and the fact that previous applications for development of a similar nature were refused on the basis that a new dwelling might be created, Officers consider that a suitable, robustly-worded condition could ensure that the building would, from first occupation, remain ancillary to the dwelling on the site.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 It is concluded that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design, its impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and its proposed access arrangements. Furthermore, it is considered that the Council's enforcement powers provide it with the means to remedy any breach of planning control caused by an attempt to create a separate dwelling unit in a building permitted as ancillary accommodation. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and with the National Planning Policy Framework. In reaching this conclusion, the following planning policies, planning guidance and other legislation have been taken into account:
  - Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1, Policies CP37: Design and Local Distinctiveness and CP44: Landscape;
  - Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, Policies DC5 Access and DC9 Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses;
  - Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015;
  - National Planning Policy Framework 2012;
  - National Planning Practice Guidance 2014; and
  - The Equality Act 2010. The application has been assessed under Section 149 of the Act, the public sector equality duty. It is considered that no identified group would suffer disadvantage as a result of the proposal.

# Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 12 June 2017

**Author**: Anthony Hamilton

Email: Anthony.Hamilton@southandvale.gov.uk

**Tel**: 01235 422600