

APPLICATION NO.	P17/V1376/HH
SITE	55 Meadow Close Farmoor OXFORD, OX2 9PA
PARISH	CUMNOR
PROPOSAL	Single storey rear conservatory
WARD MEMBER(S)	Dudley Hoddinott Judy Roberts
APPLICANT	Dawn Webster
OFFICER	Kerry Street

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Development to be commenced within three years.
2. Development to be built accordance with approved plans.

Compliance conditions

3. Materials to be in accordance with application.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application is referred to committee at the request of ward member, Councillor Judy Roberts.
- 1.2 The property, a semi-detached dwelling, is located in Farmoor at the end of a cul-de-sac. The property faces Meadow Close to the south-east where vehicular access is obtained. Farmoor village is washed over by the Oxford Green Belt.
- 1.3 The proposed is for a single storey rear extension on the north east elevation of the property. It will measure 5.7m in length and 4.8m in width. The height of the eaves will measure 2.3m with an overall height of 3.4m.
- 1.4 A site location plan is included below.



1.5 Extracts of the application plans can be found **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 A summary of the responses received in respect to the original and amended plans is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

<p>Cumnor Parish Council</p>	<p>Recommends refusal. The grounds for refusal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of the brick will have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property
<p>Councillor Judy Roberts</p>	<p>Recommends refusal. The grounds for refusal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of 2.3m for an extension 5.75m long will be overbearing on the neighbouring property
<p>Neighbours</p>	<p>A letter of objection has been received. The grounds for objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The height of the brick wall will be visible above the fence and the overall height is higher than other conservatories on adjacent properties • The height will obstruct views and create a closed feeling to the adjoining neighbours garden • Maintenance of the conservatory

3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 [P91/V0695](#) - Approved (11/07/1991)

Extension and alterations to form playroom, garage, bedroom and study.

[P88/V0940](#) - Approved (16/11/1988)

Extension and alterations to form playroom, bedroom and garage.

[P73/V0373](#) - Approved (15/01/1974)

88 Houses and garages.

[P73/V0648](#) - Approved (15/01/1974)

88 houses and garages.

[P73/V0270](#) - Approved (15/01/1974)

88 Houses and garages.

[P74/V0855/O](#) - Approved (15/01/1974)

88 houses and garages. 23 Mayfield Road, Farmoor. Planning Application History

3.2 **Pre-application History**

None

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 Householder development does not fall within the defined scope for potential EIA development.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues relating to this application are as follows:-

1. Design, layout and visual amenity
2. Residential amenity
3. Green Belt

5.2 **Design, layout and visual amenity**

The proposed extension is single storey and will be built of matching materials. It is considered to be subordinate in scale and acceptable in terms of design and appearance.

5.3 **Residential Amenity**

The adjoining neighbour is concerned that the height and length of the proposed side wall of the extension in particular will cause harm to amenities through dominance. Officers have assessed the proposals against what could be built as a “fall-back” position under permitted development. Members will be aware of the government’s recent relaxations of householder permitted development for rear extensions. For a semi-detached house, like the application site, a pitched roof rear extension up to 6 metres long and up to 4 metres high, with eaves up to 3 metres high, can be built under the larger

permitted development rules. These larger permitted development proposals are subject to neighbour consultation.

5.4 An eaves height of 2.3 metres is only slightly higher than a boundary fence or wall that can be erected under permitted development. The height of such a permitted fence or wall is 2 metres, and can be of any length. Officers are aware that proposals that are marginally taller than what could be built under permitted development rules are unlikely to find support at appeal. The difference in height, 300mm, is not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application on the grounds of dominance to the neighbour.

5.5 **Green Belt**

Policy CP13 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 states that extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt are acceptable provided they do not represent a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling. In 1991 planning permission was granted for a two storey side extension to the house which added approximately 35% in terms of volume. This current proposal will add a further 8% approximately. The combined total increase is not considered to be disproportionate to the original dwelling and the proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of Green Belt policy.

6.0 **CONCLUSION**

6.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and in terms of impact on neighbours. Existing parking is considered to be sufficient. The proposal is considered to accord with relevant policies of the development plan and with the NPPF.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1, policies:

CP37 – Design and Local Distinctiveness

CP13 – The Oxford Green Belt

Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, policies:

DC5 – Access

DC9 – Impact on neighbours

Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

National Planning Practice Guidance 2014

Equality Act 2010

The application has been assessed under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the public sector equality duty. It is considered that no identified group will suffer disadvantage as a result of this proposal.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 2 August 2017

Author: Kerry Street

Email: kerry.street@southandvale.gov.uk

Telephone: 01235 422600