

**Case Officer:** Lewis Knox

**Recommendation:** Approve

**Applicant:** Mr J Bonas

**Proposal:** Single storey side extension, canopy porch and alterations to enlarge Kitchen & Dining Room

**Expiry Date:** 11 October 2019

---

## **1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY**

- 1.1. The application site comprises a semi-detached dormer bungalow located in a small close in the southern end of Bodicote, to the south of Banbury. The main dwelling at the site is constructed from facing red brick elevations, white uPVC windows and doors under an interlocking concrete tile roof. The dwelling benefits from a front flat roof dormer window which is constructed from timber cladding.
- 1.2. The site has one off-street parking space to the eastern side of the front of the dwelling. There is also a small shared front garden with the attached neighbour. The site shares boundaries with neighbours to the north, east and west which are separated by low level walls and panel fencing. The rear garden is largely patio with some vegetation.
- 1.3. The application dwelling is not a listed building and is not located within a designated conservation area. There are no other planning constraints relevant to this application.

## **2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 2.1. The applicant seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey side extension, canopy porch.

## **3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1. There is no planning history directly relevant to the proposal

## **4. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS**

- 4.1. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal

## **5. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY**

- 5.1. This application has been publicised by way of letters sent to all properties immediately adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The final date for comments was **26 September 2019**, although comments received after this date and before finalising this report have also been taken into account.
- 5.2. No comments have been raised by third parties

## **6. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

- 6.1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council's website, via the online Planning Register.

### PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

- 6.2. **Bodicote Parish Council** – Commented that the development would restrict access to the rear of the property which may cause issues for future maintenance.

### OTHER CONSULTEES

- 6.3. **Oxfordshire County Council Highways** – Raised no objection

## **7. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

- 7.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 7.2. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the 'saved' policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District's statutory Development Plan are set out below:

### CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011 - 2031 PART 1 (CLP 2031 Part 1)

- ESD15 - The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

### CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

- C28 – Layout, design and external appearance of new development
- C30 – Design of new residential development

- 7.3. Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Cherwell Residential Design Guide (2018)
- Cherwell Council Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2007)

## **8. APPRAISAL**

- 8.1. The key issues for consideration in this case are:

- Design, and impact on the character of the area
- Residential amenity
- Highway safety/parking provision

## Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

- 8.2. Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that: *'Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development'* and that it *'creates better places in which to live and work'*. This is reflected in Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2031 Part 1, which states that new development proposals should: *be designed to improve the quality and appearance of an area and the way it functions...contribute positively to an area's character and identity by creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness...(and) respect the traditional pattern of routes, spaces, blocks, plots, enclosures and the form, scale and massing of buildings.*
- 8.3. Saved Policies C28 and C30 of the CLP 1996 reinforce this, with Policy C30(ii) stating: *that any proposal to extend an existing dwelling (should be) compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the character of the streetscene.*
- 8.4. The proposed single storey extension would be located to the side of the application dwelling and would therefore be readily visible from the public domain and would have an impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
- 8.5. Sefton Place consists of 4 pairs of semi-detached dormer bungalows which have remained largely unaltered to the front and side since their construction; although it is noted that 3 Sefton Place has previously benefitted from a side and rear extension.
- 8.6. Whilst the proposed development would introduce a new feature to the locality, it is not considered to be a development which would be against the established character of the area. Side extensions of this nature are typical of residential dwellings such as the application dwelling and would therefore not have a detrimental impact on the character of the streetscene.
- 8.7. It is considered to be unfortunate that the proposed side extension would disrupt the existing uniformity between the 4 pairs of demi-detached bungalows, however it is not considered that this would result in significant detrimental harm to the character of the area.
- 8.8. The extension would feature small mono-pitched roofs to the front and rear which would match the roof slope of the main dwelling and would therefore respect the established character of the site. The flat roof between would be largely hidden from view.
- 8.9. The clear subservience of the proposed single storey extension through its small scale is a welcome detail and so the proposed development would not appear dominant within the streetscene.
- 8.10. The front elevation of the application dwelling is to be rendered and so the front of the proposed extension would match this. It would have been preferable to keep the existing brick frontage in order to match with the rest of Sefton Place, however given it is not a sensitive area it is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 8.11. The roof tiles would be interlocking to match the existing and would be acceptable.
- 8.12. The proposed canopy porch would be minor in scale and would not have cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

### Residential Amenity

- 8.13. Paragraph 127 of the NPPF includes, as a core planning principle, a requirement that planning should have *a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users*. This is reflected in Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2031 Part 1, which states that new development proposals should: *consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, and indoor and outdoor space*.
- 8.14. The Council's Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2007) provides informal guidance on how the Council will assess proposed extensions to houses, including guidance on assessing the impact on neighbours. This includes assessing whether a proposed extension would extend beyond a line drawn at a 45° angle, as measured horizontally from the mid-point of the nearest habitable room window.
- 8.15. There is a difference in ground levels between the application site and the neighbour to the detached side; closest to the proposed extension; with the neighbouring dwelling set higher than the application property. By reason of this and the relative small scale of the proposed extension it is not considered that the development would impact on the residential amenity of the neighbour to the detached side in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook or overbearing.
- 8.16. There are no additional windows proposed on the eastern (side) elevation of the extension which would face towards the neighbouring dwelling and would therefore not impact on the levels of privacy in the locality.
- 8.17. There would be one door which faces south across the highway along Sefton Place, and all other openings would face towards the rear of the garden at the application site and would not face any other neighbouring dwelling. It is therefore considered that the development would not impact on the levels of privacy.
- 8.18. The Parish Council raised a comment about restricting the access to the rear garden as a result of the development which would cause issues during future maintenance. Whilst outside access would be restricted, you could still access the rear through the main dwelling and therefore works could still be achieved if needed and is therefore not considered to be an issue.

### Highway Safety/Parking Provision

- 8.19. Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2031 Part 1 states, amongst other matters, that new development proposals should: *be designed to deliver high quality safe...places to live and work in*. This is consistent with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which states that: *developments should create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles*.
- 8.20. The proposed development would not result in the loss of any space which is currently in use for off-street parking provision; and would not create any further bedrooms within the application which would require the provision of further off-street parking within the site.
- 8.21. Oxfordshire County Council Highways raised no objections to the proposals. It is therefore considered that the development would not impact on the safety of the local highway network and is acceptable in this respect.

## 9. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 9.1. For the reasons set out in this report, the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies and guidance listed at section 7 of this report, and so is considered to be sustainable development. In accordance with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF, permission should therefore be granted.

## 10. RECOMMENDATION

That permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the information contained within the application form and the following approved plans: 002 ground floor plan, 003 roof plan, 004A elevations, 005 site plan, 006 location plan

Reason – For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Lewis Knox

DATE: 10.10.2019

Checked By: Paul Ihringer

DATE: 11/10/19

---