

KBA/6770/11 – W Associates

Demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of 4 detached dwellings with 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, to be replaced with 4 detached dwellings with associated parking and garage space. It is a resubmission of a scheme that was refused by Committee in April 2007, and has been proposed in order to address the specific concerns raised by Members and the reasons for refusing the original scheme.
- 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 more 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 key changes compared to the refused scheme are: 1) the reuse of the existing access, 2) the repositioning of plots 1, 2 and 3 further to the north to increase the distance from Faringdon Road, and 3) the relocation of plot 3 further to the west to further increase the distance from the properties in Blenheim Way.
- 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 refused scheme, along with the decision notice 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 objects.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 In 1990 and again in 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.
- 2.2 As mentioned above, a previous residential scheme was refused in April 2007. An appeal against that decision has been lodged.

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 it 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 objective of developing previously developed sites within urban areas, where suitable, 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 6 letters of objection have been received, which are summarised as follows:
- The height of the dwellings fronting Faringdon Road is not acceptable. They will be imposing to those residents who live directly opposite, reducing light and outlook.
 - The existing bungalow provides a visual break in the building line along Faringdon Road. The proposal will spoil this, and will appear cramped and out of keeping with other properties in the area.
 - Stanab represents the boundary between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and the village of Longworth. As such the development cannot be considered to fall within the built-up area of the village.
 - The village is being over-developed in all corners.
 - The houses should be 2-storey only, not 3-storey as proposed.
 - It is a waste of resources to demolish a perfectly acceptable bungalow.
 - It is an overdevelopment of the site, and should be 2 detached dwellings only.
 - The plans are inaccurate, and will result in the developer not being able to meet minimum guidelines for spacing between existing and proposed dwellings.
 - The houses are still too close to Faringdon Road, and do not comply with the Vale's own guidance of 15m back from Distributor Roads.
 - Plot 4 fails to meet a 21m distance in respect of no 9 Blenheim Way.
 - The proposal will result in the loss of Maple / Cherry trees and shrubs to the east of plot 4 that were proposed to be retained previously.
 - The garden areas proposed are too small and do not comply with the Vale's own guidance.
 - 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 gable of Plot 3 will only be 12.9m away from the rear extension of No. 3 Blenheim Way. In addition the garage building of plot 3 will only be 9.9m away. This does not comply with the Vale's own guidance of 12m. All of this will result in a 'gross visual intrusion' that will dominate the rear of the property.
- The garage for plot 3 impedes access for a fire tender to plot 4.
- There are problems with drainage in this area – 4 new dwellings will add to this.

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 areas 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, latest Government advice in PPS3 seeks the building of homes for families and encourages the use of innovative approaches to achieve higher densities within existing settlements. The principle of a development of detached family dwellings, therefore, is 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. The site is not an edge of village location as has been suggested by objectors and cannot be considered as lying outside the built-up area. Furthermore, your Officers do not consider it a 'strategic' gap between Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor and the village of Longworth. In considering the previous scheme Members made it clear that the principle of the residential redevelopment of the site was acceptable.
- 5.4 The proposal has been designed as four family dwellings, which are similar to properties found in Blenheim Way. Whilst the density falls below 30 dwellings per hectare as sought under Policy H15, the scheme is considered to be in keeping with existing densities found in the locality. As such, the proposal is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.
- 5.5 The scheme has also been redesigned to take account of the previous concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed dwellings to Faringdon Road, which has resulted in the dwellings being set back 10m from the existing front boundary wall. Your Officers consider this set back is sufficient to overcome the previous reason for refusal.
- 5.6 Whilst it is still proposed to include accommodation in the roof space, in terms of bulk and massing, the dwellings 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 considered to be similar. They are also considered to sit comfortably within the site so as not to appear cramped when viewed from Faringdon Road, and sufficient private amenity space for each dwelling is provided, similar to that found in Blenheim Way. Consequently, Officers consider the visual impact of the proposal to be acceptable.

- 5.7 The loss of the garden pond is insufficient reason to warrant refusal of this application in respect of wildlife disturbance, and there are considered to be no significant issues of drainage resulting from this proposal.
- 5.8 Turning to the third issue, the impact on neighbouring properties, it is considered that no undue 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 from this revised scheme.
- 5.9 The previous scheme was refused on the grounds that it represented an unneighbourly form of development in relation to those properties to the east, in Blenheim Way, where the positioning of the proposed dwellings was considered to be too close, resulting in undue overshadowing, over dominance and overlooking.
- 5.10 This revised proposal has attempted to address this issue through the relocation of the dwellings further away from the rear of Nos. 1 and 3 Blenheim Way. Again, when applying the Council's general guidance of a minimum 12m distance between rear elevations and side walls, plot 3 (the closest dwelling) is now sited further than 12m from the rear extension of No 3 Blenheim Way (previously it was only 9.5m from the rear of the extension). Consequently the spatial relationship between the proposed dwellings and properties in Blenheim Way is considered to be acceptable.
- 5.11 The occupiers of No 3 Blenheim Way have raised an objection to the garage building of plot 3 being within 12m of their extension. Whilst this is the case, your Officers consider the distance, at 10.2m as measured from the submitted application drawing, is acceptable given this is a single storey building where any impact on light would be minimal. Similarly, the access drive serving plot 4, whilst closer than the existing driveway, is not considered to be any more harmful in terms of noise and disturbance to the dwellings in Blenheim Way as the common boundary is demarcated by a 2m high wall.
- 5.12 Plot 4 remains orientated to face the rear garden area of no 9 Blenheim Way, but any impact on light or privacy to this property is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal, given that plot 4 is 15m as measured from the submitted drawings from the common boundary.
- 5.13 In terms of parking and access, the proposed arrangements are considered acceptable. The parking provision shown provides ample spaces for each unit. Adequate visibility can also be achieved at the access to ensure pedestrian and highway safety. The County Engineer has raised no objection subject to conditions.
- 5.14 The County Engineer has requested a financial contribution towards enhancement of the bus route to assist sustainability, should permission be granted.
- 5.15 Regarding the alleged inaccuracies of the submitted plans, at the time of writing this report your Officers are checking various dimensions against the survey drawing on the ground and will report their findings at the Meeting.

5.16 The scheme now proposed is considered to be materially different to the previously refused scheme and, on balance, it overcomes the previous reasons for refusal.

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 in order to allow the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required financial contribution towards bus route enhancement.*

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 on site 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.*