APPLICATION NO.	P17/V2713/HH
SITE	5 West Street, Sparsholt, WANTAGE, OX12 9PR
PARISH	SPARSHOLT
PROPOSAL	Proposed two storey rear extension
WARD MEMBER(S)	Yvonne Constance
APPLICANT	Mr. Edward Vaizey
OFFICER	Anthony Hamilton

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

Standard
1 : Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2 : Approved plans

Compliance
3 : Matching materials (walls and roof)
4 : Trellis fencing in accordance with plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

1.1 After being called in by Councillor Yvonne Constance, this application was considered at the 31st January 2018 meeting of the Planning Committee. Committee voted to defer the application, to allow members to visit the site and neighbouring properties.

1.2 A site plan showing vision splays from the proposed bedroom window was received from the applicant's agent on 9th February 2018. This is **included** in Appendix 1, with the other plans for the proposal.

1.3 The application site is located on the northern side of West Street, in the settlement of Sparsholt. On the site is a two storey semi-detached house, which has a hipped roof, brick walls, a two storey side extension and two single storey rear extensions. To the front of the dwelling is a hard-surfaced parking area. To the rear is a long garden. Other dwellings may be found to the east, west and south of the site. A wooded area lies to the north.

1.4 Planning permission is sought to erect a two storey rear extension. The proposal would be constructed behind the existing side extension. It would have a length, measured along the side that would face no.6 West Street, of 2.8 metres and a width of 6.2 metres. Along the side that would face the grassed area in front of no.4C West Street it would be 4.6 metres long. Like the original dwelling and the side extension, it would have a hipped roof. In keeping

with the side extension, the roof would have an eaves height of 4.8 metres and a ridge height of 6.8 metres.

1.5 The brickwork and tiles of the proposal would match those of the existing dwelling. At ground floor level, two sets of bi-fold doors would be inserted into the rear elevation of the extension and two windows would be inserted into the southeast-facing side elevation of the dwelling. Another ground floor window would be inserted into the northwest-facing side elevation of the extension. At first floor level, there would be two windows in the rear elevation of the extension. Another window would be inserted into the southeast-facing side elevation of the dwelling. The submitted drawings show that a new front porch would also be erected, though this isn't included in the description of the proposal on the application form. Internally, the proposed extension would provide a sitting and dining area on the ground floor and a bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. A revised block plan received on 24th October 2017 indicates that a 400 millimetre high trellis would be mounted on top of a section of the fence that runs along the southeast boundary of the site. Another trellis would be erected on top of a short section of the fence that marks the northwest boundary.

1.6 A site location plan is provided below and the application plans are **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 A summary of comments is provided below. Comments can be seen in full at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

Vale - Highways Liaison Officer	Has no objections. Considers that there is an adequate area to the front of the dwelling to accommodate the necessary car parking spaces. Suggests that a drainage informative note be passed onto the applicant.
Conservation Officer, Vale of White Horse District Council	Has no objections. Holds that the proposed alterations would not adversely affect the character

	or appearance of the Sparsholt Conservation Area.
Sparsholt Parish Council	No objections.
Neighbours at 4B, 4C and 6 West Street	Object to the application, asserting that: • The proposed extension would be out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings, huge and an unsightly addition; • Neighbouring residences would be dominated, overshadowed and overlooked; • 5 West Street has already been extended and this would be a further extension; • Supplementary planning guidance adopted in 2006 stated that rear extensions should not normally exceed 4 metres in length; and • The introduction of trellising on top of the fences on the eastern and western site boundaries, as shown on the revised block plan received on 24th October 2017, would not prevent overlooking or overshadowing.

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 Planning Application History

P83/V1738 - Approved (23/02/1983)
Two storey extension to form lounge with bedroom over.

P63/V5040 - Demolish existing sub-standard cottage and build a pair of semi-detached houses for residential user - Planning permission on 30/07/1963.

3.2 Pre-application History

P11/V0142/PEO - Erection of a front porch and rear extension.

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 2017*.

5.0 MAIN ISSUES

5.1 The main issues are:

- Design and layout;
- The impact on residential amenity;
- Traffic, parking and highway safety; and
- The impact on the historic environment.

5.2 Design and Layout

With regard to the design and layout of the proposal, officers consider that:

- With a width of 6.2 metres, a length of between 2.8 and 4.6 metres, and a roof form and ridge height that would match those of the existing side extension, the proposal would be of modest scale and subordinate to the dwelling;
- Being of modest scale, the proposed extension would not be an obtrusive or incongruous feature in the street scene;
- The use of wall and roof materials matching those of the dwelling would enable the proposal to blend into its surroundings;
- Because the proposal would be positioned to the rear, rather than the side, of the dwelling, it could not give rise to a terracing effect; and
- The proposal would not be out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings, huge or an unsightly addition.

Officers conclude that the design and layout of the proposal would not be detrimental to visual amenity.

5.3 Residential Amenity

On the impact of the proposal on neighbours' living conditions, officers hold that:

- The proposal complies with the 40-degree rule set out in the 2015 Vale of White Horse Design Guide;
- Given the compliance of the proposal with the 40-degree rule, there would be no overshadowing or overbearing impact on any habitable room window in the rear elevation of no.6 West Street;
- There could be an impact on a side window in a small rear extension to no.6 West Street, but that window is obscure glazed and, in her objection, the occupier of no.6 stated that it is a bathroom window. As such, the window in question is not one to a habitable room. It might also be noted that the rear elevations of no's 5 and 6 are both northeast-

facing, in view of which any impact on sunlight received should be limited;

- By virtue of its position and scale, the proposed extension would not overshadow or have an overbearing impact on any other neighbouring dwelling. Because nos.4A to 4C West Street have southwest-facing front elevations and no.5 is not positioned in front of those dwellings, there should be no impact on the sunlight and daylight received by those properties;
- The first floor rear windows in the extension would not materially overlook another residence. Both of these windows, one of which would serve a bathroom, would look straight down the back garden of no.5. Corner to corner, no.4C West Street would be located some 7 metres away from the extension and at angle to it. It is considered that the distance between the extension and no.4C, together with the orientation of the buildings, would preclude casual overlooking; and
- The proposed side windows would not overlook another dwelling. The two ground floor windows in the southeast-facing side elevation would look out at the trellis and fence on the adjacent site boundary. Even without the trellis, these windows would face a grassed area which can be seen from the road and several neighbouring properties and is, therefore, not a private amenity space. The first floor side window would face the side of no.4 West Street, which would be some 35 metres away. The ground floor window in the northwest-facing side elevation would look towards the fence and trellis on the boundary with no.6 West Street. Without the trellis, there might be some overlooking impact on the bathroom window at no.6, but, given that the occupier of either dwelling could erect a 2 metre high fence on this boundary under permitted development rights, it is considered that any impact on the bathroom window at no.6 wouldn't justify the refusal of planning permission. It is noted that no first floor window would be inserted into the northwest-facing side elevation.

In light of the above officers conclude that the proposal would not be detrimental to residential amenity.

5.4 Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

Given the consultation response of the Highways Liaison Officer, officers consider that the proposed extension would not be detrimental to highway safety.

5.5 Historic Environment

Bearing in mind the consultation response of the Conservation Officer, officers are of the view that the proposal would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the Sparsholt Conservation Area.

5.6 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

It is considered that the proposal would increase the internal floor area of the dwelling by around 29 square metres. As such, a CIL charge would not be payable.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 It is concluded that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design and its impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residents, highway safety and the historic environment. The proposal is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and with the National Planning Policy Framework. 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 CP39: The Historic Environment;
- Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 - Saved policies DC5 Access, DC9 Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses and HE1 Preservation and Enhancement: Implications for Development;
- Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015;
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012;
- National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 onwards; 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 will suffer disadvantage as a result of this proposal.
- The Human Rights Act, 1998. The application has been assessed against Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. The impact on individuals has been weighed against the public interest and officers consider they have acted proportionately in arriving at the recommendation to grant planning permission.

Author: Anthony Hamilton
Email: planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk
Telephone: 01235 422600