

SUPPORT STATEMENT

Job Reference: DDC-2022-821
Windrush, Austin Road, Bodicote, Banbury, Oxfordshire. OX15 4AS. Mrs C Robbins

1.0 Introduction

This Support Statement has been prepared to support a proposed scheme, to add an annexe to the single storey bungalow for the mother of the current occupier, in the form of an extension & raise in roof with a loft conversion.

This will allow for the mother (in this case the applicant), to spend her retirement in close quarters with her son, by creating a shared kitchen facility to the ground floor with lounge, main bedroom, guest bedroom and bathroom & ensuite facilities to allow for some separation of living.

This design is the latest iteration of 3 previously submitted schemes two of which were Pre-Apps and the latter being a Planning Application which was refused:

1) 22/03658/PREAPP

2) 23/00962/PREAPP

3) 23/01807/F

The development also benefits from an approval for a detached garage which is referenced as follows: 20/01457/F

2.0 Assessment of the surroundings of the proposed development

Windrush sits at the end of Austin Road and is surrounded by three and four bedroom detached and semi-detached properties, along with a number of detached bungalows of similar style to Windrush. It is worth noting that several of the bungalows in the vicinity (i.e. Sefton Place and Molyneux Drive), have flat roof dormers installed within the roof line.

The properties are characterized by basic pitched roofs throughout, with a mixture roofs and gables affronting the highway, giving a distinct variation to the street scene.

The materials used in construction show limited variation, with brick commonly employed for external walls, interlocking roof tiles, and white UPVC double glazed casement windows throughout.

3.0 Proposed Use

The location of the intended development is to the gable end of the bungalow, which will form the entrance for the upper floor as well access to a shared kitchen/diner for the upper and lower floor. Note that in line with previous comments, the extension has been set back in from the principal elevation.

It is also worth noting that the pitch of the bungalow has been increased to 39.5 degrees, with the wall plate being raised by 460mm to accommodate the head height required for the upper floor. This allows for a more considered roof extension and is not overbearing as per the previous iteration.

The layout of the existing bungalow will not be altered and remains as is currently.

The upper floor sees a living room within the roof space to the extension, with long feature rooflights to take advantage of the views across the fields of Bodicote. The enclosed landing which follows on from the living room, then leads onto the bedrooms, bathroom & ensuite.

Support Statement

The dormer to the rear has been reduced by 50% in line with comments raised previously and sits modestly within the roof zone of the existing bungalow.

As mentioned previously, the materials used in construction show limited variation, with brick to be employed for external walls, interlocking roof slates, and a new upvc double glazed windows and doors to be used for the proposed works as well as replacing the existing fenestration and doors to harmonise the scheme.

4.0 Points to Highlight the Concerns of the Previous Pre-Apps & Refusal:

22/03658/PREAPP

- *"The proposed two storey development relates poorly to the character of the existing bungalow. The bulk and massing is larger than that of the bungalow, along with the extra height, which would dwarf the appearance of the original dwelling. The proposed two storey extension results in an excessive bulk and massing, which is out of character with the original bungalow.*
- *If one then considers the appropriateness of the proposal as a new dwelling, in our view the majority of the dwelling would need to be located where the existing bungalow is located, i.e. broadly in line with dwellings to the north, and facing west towards the track / public right of way."*
- *As currently proposed the development would appear incongruous and would have a detrimental impact to visual amenity, emphasised by its visibility from the public realm and its edge-of-village location, and would likely appearing imposing to the Public Right of Way (PROW) along the site's eastern boundary.*

The scheme has incorporated a more linear development now, to minimise the overbearing nature of the previous schemes.

- *Further to our comments above regarding the proposal comprising a new dwelling, as there are no strong links to the main bungalow (such as shared rooms or front entrance) the current proposal is considered tantamount to a separate dwelling and assessed on this basis we would have concerns with the proposal in this regard too.*

Whilst there remain two separate entrances for the development, the scheme now shows shared kitchen facilities for the mother and son.

- *The proposal includes render for the whole built form associated with the site. It is noted the previous approval accepted a rendered extension and a rendered garage, but that the main house would remain as brick. We have some concerns with the proposed materials, in particular the use of cladding, and the use of a mix of materials. We would encourage the use of brick as the primary facing material for the development but whether it is brick or render there would need to be one primary facing material and then perhaps occasional detailing could be in a secondary material.*

Note that brickwork has been shown to the scheme and references to the render removed.

23/00962/PREAPP

Most of the comments are covered off in the previous Pre-App but wish to answer the following points raised:

- *The second storey for the bungalow is proposed to be facilitated by dormers along both roof planes. As previously mentioned, dormer windows are out of character with the surrounding area, which comprises bungalows and two storey properties. The proposed dormers are overly bulky and overwhelm the roof.*

The dormer has been greatly reduced, by some 50% and now sits within the existing bungalow roof zone rather than spreading across the entire scheme to the rear.

- *While not raised within the previous pre-application enquiry, you should consider appropriate fenestrations to the front and rear of the smaller side extension (providing an en-suite and dressing area), as this would relate better to the dwelling. Further, there is opportunity for a better roof design that assimilates with the bungalow. While it is noted there is a previous approval for this element, the approved scheme incorporated a door to serve the storage area, which was in character with the extension. This is a minor suggestion for improvement, should an application be submitted.*

The smaller side extension is an existing converted garage and should be considered as such, with only a re-roof to this element, to tie in with the rest of the scheme.

23/01807/F – Planning Application

- *The proposed development, by virtue of the scale of the side extensions, increased roof height and proliferation of rooflights, would result in a visually incongruous form of development that overwhelms the original bungalow, would fail to sympathetically integrate into the built environment or reinforce local distinctiveness and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011- 2031 Part 1, saved Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, Cherwell's Home Extension and Alteration Design Guide SPD 2007, and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

The statements above cover off the reduction in overbearing mass of the previous schemes and the elevations now show a more balanced roofline than previously along with the subservience of the extension to the end of the bungalow.

- *The proposed dormer window, by virtue of its excessive mass, scale, and design results in an incongruous form of development that fails to sympathetically integrate with the existing bungalow, the built environment or reinforce local distinctiveness and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policies C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, Cherwell's Home Extension and Alteration Design Guide SPD 2007, and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

5.0 Conclusion

Considering the drawings and evidence shown here, it is anticipated that a more positive outcome can be expected on this occasion, and we would welcome the opportunity of discussing this with the Local Authority during the application process.