

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P17/S2483/HH</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	HOUSEHOLDER
<b>REGISTERED</b>	6.7.2017
<b>PARISH</b>	THAME
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Jeannette Matelot David Dodds Nigel Champken-Woods
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr & Mrs Humphries
<b>SITE</b>	35 Queens Close THAME, OX9 3AZ
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of a 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with a flat roof dormer to the rear and Velux rooflights to the front elevation (as informed by additional plan showing parking, received 04/09/2017).
<b>OFFICER</b>	Edward Church

---

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 I recommend that planning permission is granted for this application.

1.2 35 Queens Close is a semi-detached dwelling in the north of Thame. The application site does not reside within any designated land where planning restrictions apply.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, erection of a box dormer window in the rear roof elevation and installation of roof lights in the principle roof elevation.

**3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Thame Town Council** – Object, design and character

**SGN Plant Protection Team** - No strong views

**Neighbour (2)** – Object, Two letters of objection have been received from neighbours raising concerns regarding:

- Loss of light;
- Sense of enclosure;
- Overbearing;
- Terracing effect;
- Parking;
- Loss of privacy;
- Increase in noise;
- Not in keeping.

**4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None relevant.

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) Policies:

- CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CSQ3 - Design
- CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

## South Oxfordshire District Council – Delegated Report

### 5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies:

- D1 - Principles of good design
- G2 - Protect district from adverse development
- H13 - Extension to dwelling
- T1 - Safe and convenient access to the highway
- T2 - Parking

### 5.3 Thame Neighbourhood Plan (TNP):

- ESDQ16 - Development must relate well to its site and its surroundings
- ESDQ29 Design car parking so that it fits in with the character of the proposed development

### 5.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

### 5.5 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

## 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 6.1 The main considerations when making a determination on this application are:

- Whether the scale and design of the proposed extensions would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;
- Whether the proposed extensions would impact neighbouring amenity.

### 6.2 **Scale and Design Considerations**

This proposal would see the footprint of the dwelling within the curtilage increase by approximately 73%. This size increase is not considered to be unacceptable and would retain ample private amenity space to the rear of the dwelling.

### 6.3 The design of the proposed two storey side extension is simple, being a rectangular projection with a pitched roof over top. The inclusion of a pitched roof dormer window is considered to be acceptable due to its modest scale and traditional design. The two storey extension is subservient to the main dwelling and, due to this subservience, would avoid a harmful terracing visual impact. The use of matching materials brickwork and roof tiles, and limited use of timber cladding, would not be visually harmful to the character or appearance of the site or surrounding area. From the adjacent highway, the main public view point of the site, the proposed two storey side extension is not considered to be a dominant or visually harmful addition to the streetscape.

### 6.4 The proposed single storey rear extension would be wholly obscured from public view being to the rear of the main dwelling. The single storey rear extension is not considered to have a material impact on the character or appearance of the site or surrounding area, due to its scale and unobtrusive location.

### 6.5 The proposed box dormer window would be located on the rear roof elevation. This roof elevation is not visually prominent from Queens Close, Lambert Walk or the Aylesbury Road (B445). Whilst box dormer designs are generally resisted, as they are not considered to be traditional, consideration is given to the permitted development rights of the site. On this roof elevation, a large box dormer could be erected without the need for planning permission. Having consideration for the potential development which

could be erected without planning permission, it is not considered that the proposed box dormer would have a materially greater visual impact. Therefore, it is considered that there is insufficient justification for the refusal of planning permission on the basis of visual impact from the proposed dormer window.

6.6 On balance, the application proposal is not considered to have a harmful visual impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area – in accordance with Policies D1, G2 and H13 of the SOLP, in addition to Policy CSQ3 of the SOCS.

6.7 **Neighbouring Amenity Considerations**

Concerns have been raised by neighbours concerning impacts on light, privacy and outlook. I have visited the application site and assessed the impact of the proposed extension on both 36 and 34 Queens Close.

6.8 34 Queens Close

34 Queens Close is located directly north of the application site, closest to the proposed two storey side extension. The dwellings are currently separated by adjoined single storey garages. There are three side facing windows in the southern elevation of 34 Queens Close, two on the first floor towards the rear of the dwelling and one on the ground floor near the front. The first floor side windows serve a bathroom and a landing. The ground floor window serves an entrance hallway. The bathroom is served by a larger window on the rear elevation, as such the side facing window is considered to be a secondary opening. These windows do not serve primary living accommodation. The impact on the first floor windows will be minimal, due to the relative height of the windows to the proposed extension. The impact on the ground floor window is not considered to be unacceptable or materially decrease the amenity of the occupants of 34 Queens Road. The proposed single storey extension, projecting to the rear, is considered to be sufficiently separated and low to not have a material impact on light or outlook of the occupants of 34 Queens Road. The proposed rear dormer would not reduce privacy to an unacceptable level.

6.9 36 Queens Close

36 Queens Close is located directly south of the application site and is the adjoined neighbour. Due to the geographic orientation of the dwelling relative to one another, the proposed extension would not materially decrease the amount of sunlight reaching the rear elevation windows of 36 Queens Road. Due to the plot shape and design, the single storey rear extension would be angled away from the rear elevation of 36 and is not considered to have an unacceptable overbearing impact on the amenity of the occupants of 36 Queens Road. The proposed rear dormer would not reduce privacy to an unacceptable level.

6.10 On balance, the proposed development is not considered to have a material impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. Whilst some impact is noted, this is not considered severe enough to justify the refusal of planning permission in this instance. As such, the application is judged to accord with criterion (iii) of Policy H13 of the SOLP.

6.11 **Other Matters**

The applicant has demonstrated that two off-street parking spaces can be provided on site. This number of parking spaces is in accordance with the minimum standards outlined in appendix 5 of the SOLP. As such, the proposed development is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of parking and is judged to be in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the SOLP.

6.12 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The proposed development is not liable to pay any CIL as the net increase in residential floor space does not exceed 100m<sup>2</sup>.

6.13 **National Planning Policy Framework Statement**

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals. The Planning Service worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive manner by updating the applicant/agent of issues that arose during the application process, suggesting a solution to objections and providing an opportunity to submit amended or additional plans.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The application proposal is in accordance with relevant development plan policies and national planning policy, as it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, and would not harm neighbouring amenity.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**Planning Permission**

- 1 : Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission
- 2 : Approved plans \*
- 3 : Materials as on plan
- 4 : Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained \*