

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V1562/HH
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER
REGISTERED	11.7.2013
PARISH	NORTH HINKSEY
WARD MEMBER(S)	Eric Batts Debby Hallett
APPLICANT	Mr Nima Babaahmady
SITE	102 Arthray Road Botley Oxford, OX2 9AB
PROPOSAL	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	448447/205807
OFFICER	Katie Rooke

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The property, a detached dwelling, is located on a corner plot within an established residential area. A copy of the site plan is **attached** at appendix 1. The application comes to committee as North Hinksey Parish Council objects.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension on the south elevation of the property, and the erection of a single storey rear extension on the west elevation. Measuring 3.8 metres wide by 6.3 metres deep, with an eaves height of 4.9 metres and a ridge height of 6.6 metres, the two storey extension will provide a new family room on the ground floor and a new bedroom with en-suite facilities on the first floor. The proposed single storey extension measures 4.5 metres wide by 2.3 metres deep, with an eaves height of 2.6 metres and a ridge height of 3.6 metres. A copy of the application plans is **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 **North Hinksey Parish Council** object to the application, stating “Councillors unanimously agreed to object to the planning application as the side extension should be a minimum of 1 metre from the neighbour’s boundary to allow construction and maintenance to be undertaken from the applicants land”.
- 3.2 **Local District Councillor, Debby Hallett** states “The proposed wall of the new bathroom is right up to the property line. Although I can see a re-design will cause some problems, in my opinion it's not good design to build right up to the edge of an existing building, even if it is a garage. This is one of the smallest lots in the area, and it's questionable whether this large extension wouldn't be an over development of the site. Are there currently two dropped kerbs to allow for parking on each side of the property?”
- 3.3 **County Highway Liaison Officer** raises no objections as “On site it was clear that the property has sufficient off street parking”.
- 3.4 **Neighbours** One letter of objection has been received, which makes the following points;
- Concern about such a large extension.
 - This is a residential area and not suitable for increased traffic that seems to be

- appearing due to increased letting of properties in the area.
- The proposal will change the feel of the area.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 No relevant planning history.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.1 The NPPF replaces all previous PPG's and PPS's and also indicates the weight to be given to existing local plan policies. The adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan was not adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, so paragraph 215 of the NPPF applies. The local plan policies that are relevant to this application are considered to have a high degree of consistency with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

Vale of White Horse Local Plan (adopted July 2006)

- 5.2 Policy DC1 refers to the design of new development, and seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality design and takes into account local distinctiveness and character.
- 5.3 Policy DC5 seeks to ensure that a safe and convenient access can be provided to and from the highway network.
- 5.4 Policy DC9 refers to the impact of new development on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment in terms of, among other things, loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, and dominance or visual intrusion.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The main issues in determining this application are the impact on the visual amenity of the area, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, and whether there is adequate off-street parking for the property.

Impact on visual amenity

- 6.2 The site is positioned at a lower ground level than the neighbouring site to the south-west (2 Hutchcomb Road). Whilst part of the proposed two storey extension is located very close to the boundary with this neighbour, the relative position of 102 Arthray Road on the site and the relationship between the two properties is such that it is not considered that the proposal would appear cramped or out of place within the street scene. It is not considered that the proposed development, including the single storey rear extension, would harm the visual amenity of the area.

Impact on neighbours

- 6.3 Given the position and orientation of neighbouring properties it is not considered that the amenities of these dwellings would be harmed by the proposal in terms of overshadowing, dominance or overlooking. According to records the existing window in the middle of the north-east elevation of 2 Hutchcomb Road serves a landing, a non-habitable room, and the impact on this opening is considered acceptable. The proposed two storey extension incorporates rear facing first floor windows. These windows face towards the rear garden of 2 Hutchcomb Road, which is already overlooked by existing first floor bedroom windows in number 102. It is not considered that the proposal could reasonably or justifiably be refused on the grounds of harmful overlooking.

Impact on highway safety

- 6.4 The county highway liaison officer raises no objections to the proposal. The existing parking provision of three spaces, one on the original driveway off Hutchcomb Road, and two tandem spaces from Arthray Road, is considered sufficient for the extended property.

Future maintenance

- 6.5 There is no specific requirement under planning legislation to require space to be provided or maintained between dwellings to enable future maintenance to be carried out. Separate legislation requires that access for reasonable maintenance is provided between neighbours and committee members will be aware that planning considerations should not duplicate controls that exist in other legislation. Therefore the application could not be refused on the basis that space would not exist between the new extension and the neighbouring property to put a ladder up to undertake maintenance.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The proposed development will not harm the visual amenity of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties, and there is adequate off-street parking within the site for the extended property. The proposal therefore complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policies DC1, DC5 and DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan. The development is also considered to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 **It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:**

1 : TL1 - Time limit - full application (full)

2 : List of approved plans

3 : The materials to be used externally in the development shall match those of the existing dwelling in terms of their colour, finish, method of laying/construction and appearance.

Author: Katie Rooke
Contact number: 01235 540507
Email: katie.rooke@southandvale.gov.uk