

**CHI/20377 Mr & Mrs Webb**

**Erection of a detached dwelling. Land adjacent to Eastcourt House, Main Street, Chilton, OX11 0RZ**

**1.0 The Proposal**

- 1.1 The application proposes the erection of a detached four bedroom dwelling with associated parking, and a new access onto Main Street.
- 1.2 Extracts from the application plans are at **Appendix 1**.
- 1.3 Chilton lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 1.4 This application is brought to Committee as the Parish Council objects to the application

**2.0 Planning History**

- 2.1 CHI/17951/1-X Erection of a detached house. Refused, December 2006. The decision notice is at **Appendix 2**.

**3.0 Planning Policies**

- 3.1 Policy DC1 of the Local Plan requires development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings, and to take into account local distinctiveness. Policy DC5 of the Local Plan requires safe and convenient access and parking.
- 3.2 Policy DC9 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 3.3 Policy H12 of the Local Plan limits new housing developments within the built up areas of the smaller villages, and on sites not suitable for more than 4 small dwellings
- 3.4 Policy NE6 of the Local Plan seeks development within the AONB which would conserve/enhance the natural beauty of the landscape.
- 3.5 Manual for Streets, published by central government in May 2007.

**4.0 Consultations**

- 4.1 Chilton Parish Council “objects to the application on the grounds of overdevelopment, the proposed scale being well beyond that which the site by virtue of its location can accommodate.” Full comments of the Parish are at **Appendix 3**.
- 4.2 County Engineer – Does not object to the application due to the recent publication (May 2007) of ‘Manual for Streets’. Full comments of the County Engineer are at **Appendix 4**.
- 4.3 Principal Drainage Engineer – “The applicant has given insufficient details concerning Report 136/07

the intended methods of draining the site. The applicant should be requested to provide details or planning consent could be made conditional for details to be submitted.”

- 4.4 4 letter of objection have been received from neighbouring occupiers, their comments can be summarised as follows:
- Concerns raised with regard to highway issues i.e. the width of the road, parked cars, limited parking for the site and safety
  - Concerns raised with regard to the size and scale of the dwelling, which is out of keeping with the character of the area
  - Concerns relating to the loss of light, and overbearing impact on Eastcourt House
  - Any development past Eastcourt House should be limited to single storey
  - The parking plan within the application does not correspond with the proposed development
  - The northern and western boundary do not belong to the applicants

## 5.0 **Officer Comments**

- 5.1 The proposal is further to the outline application CHI/17951/1-X for a single dwelling on this site which was refused, and dismissed at appeal due to the access arrangements. This previous application did not raise any further objections in terms of the principal of a dwelling on this site.
- 5.2 The proposed dwelling is designed so as to follows the form and design of the adjacent semi-detached dwellings when viewed from the front elevation, and in this regard it is considered to make a positive contribution to the street scene. The proposal would be visible to some extent from the north east, but due to the low eaves height of the north west elevation which significantly reduces its bulk, and the fact that the height is no higher than Eastcourt House, the proposal is not considered to appear overly large or prominent from this view point. It is noted there is some degree of vegetation along this boundary at present. After speaking to the County Engineer it is apparent the existing accessway would need to be widened, whilst this is not desirable in terms of its street scene presence, it is not considered that this is a significant issue as to raise objection.
- 5.3 The proposed dwelling would be sited relatively close to Eastcourt House, although it is noted that this distance is not dissimilar to the distance between other dwellings within the vicinity. Eastcourt House has two windows at ground floor level facing the application site; however these are currently behind a 1.8m trellis fence and serve a kitchen. Given the existing outlook of these windows, and impact is not considered to be significant as to raise objection. The proposed dwelling does project beyond the rear elevation of Eastcourt House, however the proposal just not break the 40 degree line of site from the window to the second bedroom at first floor level. It should be noted the first floor window closed to the proposal serves a bathroom. In any event the catslide roof in the south west elevation pitches the first floor away from the common boundary with Eastcourt House, significantly reducing its impact. There are no windows which would directly overlook Eastcourt House. The proposal is considered to provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupiers. It is noted

the rear of the site is currently at a much higher land level than the rest of the site, and it may be the case that this would be excavated to provide the rear garden area. In this regard it is considered reasonable to add a condition requiring details of any changes to the levels of the site to be submitted to the District planning Authority. However it should be noted that the Design and Access Statement does state that this would be a raised garden.

5.4 Application CHI/17951/1-X, for outline planning permission for a single dwelling on this site, was dismissed at appeal in August 2006 due to inadequate vision splays and the result highway safety implications. In May 2007 the government adopted Manual for Streets as guidance for highway engineers. In accordance with this guidance the County Engineer has categorised Main Street as a 'street' meaning that it does not singularly perform the function of facilitating vehicular movement i.e. it is also used as a residential street which accommodates access to residential premises and some level of on-street parking. In this regard and in accordance with the guidance in Manual for Streets, the County Engineer does not raise objection to the visibility splays and manoeuvring arrangements that could be achieved in the proposal now sought. The County Engineers full report explaining the significance of the guidance Manual for Streets in this instance, and why this has resulted in 'no objection' of the proposal further to the previous appeal decision, is at appendix 4. The proposal provides two off-street car parking spaces. The County Engineer has raised no objection to the proposed level of parking.

#### 6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 *It is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions.*

1. *TL1 Time Limit – Full Application*
2. *MC1 Submission of all external materials (including fenestration and doors)*
3. *MC9 No additional windows in first floor south west elevation*
4. *RE7 Submission of boundary treatments (including the retention of the north east and north west boundaries)*
5. *If any changes are proposed to the land levels of the curtilage full details shall be submitted and approved.*
6. *Revised parking and access details to be submitted.*