

**1 Hardwick Road,
Hethe, OX27 8EZ**

14/00810/F

Ward: Fringford

District Councillor: Cllr Wood

Case Officer: Stuart Howden

Recommendation: Refusal

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Beukes

Application Description: Resubmission of 13/00273/F - Single storey front extension

Committee Referral: Called in by Member

Committee Date: 07.08.14

1. Site Description and Proposed Development

- 1.1 The site is located to the south of Hardwick Road. The semi-detached property is located within the centre of the village of Hethe. The dwelling is constructed from brick under a tiled roof. The southern side of Hardwick Road is characterised by semi-detached properties which are similar in appearance. However, a more recent property sits to the east side of the property and is set somewhat forward. The other side of the street includes a range of dwellings of varying sizes, ages and styles. The area is semi-rural in character.
- 1.2 Planning permission is sought for a single storey front extension, which is proposed to have a depth of approximately 4 metres and a width of approximately 5.6 metres, whilst being 4.1 metres high. The roof of the extension is proposed to be standard dual pitched. The front extension would accommodate a bathroom and a bedroom. The proposed construction materials of the extension would match the materials of the existing dwelling. Two windows are proposed on the front elevation of the extension and a door is proposed on the west side elevation of the extension. The windows are proposed to be constructed from UPVC and the door is proposed to be constructed from oak. Two rooflights have also been proposed on the extension.
- 1.3 The building is not listed and no listed buildings are in close proximity to the site. The site is not in a Conservation Area, but is within close proximity to Hethe Conservation Area. The site is within an Area of High Landscape Value.

2. Application Publicity

- 2.1 The application has been advertised by way of neighbour letter. The final date for comment was the 1st July 2014. A letter has been received from a neighbour who supports the application. The reasons for supporting the application include:
 - The applicants deserve the extension;
 - There used to be an extension to the side of the property;
 - The extension would not cause harm to the visual amenities of the locality;
 - Other properties on the street have been extended.

3. Consultations

- 3.1 Hethe Parish Council: We have no objection but would expect the new windows to be the same style and material as the existing ones.

Cherwell District Council Consultees

3.2 None.

Oxfordshire County Council Consultees

3.3 Highways Liaison Officer: No objections subject to a plan showing a car parking provision for three spaces to be accommodated within the site.

Other Consultees

3.4 None

4. Relevant National and Local Policy and Guidance

4.1 Development Plan Policy

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan (Saved Policies)

C13	Area of High Landscape Value
C28:	Layout, design and external appearance of new development
C30:	Design of new residential development

4.2 Other Material Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

Submission Cherwell Local Plan (January 2014)

The Submission Local Plan (January 2014) has now been through public consultation and was submitted for examination in January 2014, although this plan does not have Development Plan status, it is a material planning consideration. The plan sets out the Council's strategy for the District to 2013.

The policies listed below are considered to be material to this case and are not replicated by saved Development Plan policy:

ESD16: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

5. Appraisal

5.1 The key issues for consideration in this application are:

- Visual Amenities and Area of High Landscape Value;
- Setting of the Conservation Area;
- Residential Amenities;
- Highways Safety.

Relevant Planning History

5.2 13/00273/F – Single storey front extension – Refused

A front extension of a similar siting, depth and width was proposed. The main difference with this previous proposal is that a flat roof was proposed instead of a

dual-pitched one. This extension was refused for the following reason:

The proposed extension would be an incongruous form of development that would compete in prominence to the main dwelling and would constitute a visual intrusion within the street scene, out of keeping with and detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, as well as the Area of High Landscape Value, and is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved Policies C13, C28, and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

The decision to refuse planning application was appealed, but dismissed by the Planning Inspector. The Inspector noted that he had no objection to the principle of the front extension because the property is at the end of the row, set well off the street and alongside a detached home which juts forward. However, the Planning Inspector noted that the design solution selected with the *'uninspiring elevations, flat roof and not insubstantial scale both outwards and lengthways would be most inappropriate in terms of lack of harmony, integration and subordination with the original property, with others in the immediate area and with the environs as seen from the street generally.'*

Furthermore the Inspector noted that: *'this scheme would look alien and would be jarring on the eye, there would be an obvious failure to be suitably subtle and the scheme would appear incongruous. The design and scale selected for this proposed extension with this siting does not meaningfully draw upon any local architectural vernacular.'* The Inspector therefore concluded that the proposal would be in conflict with saved Policies C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

Visual Amenities and Area of High Landscape Value

- 5.3 Government guidance contained within the NPPF requiring good design states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Further, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 5.4 Saved Policies C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan exercise control over all new developments to ensure that the standards of layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the context as well as compatible with the existing dwelling. Proposals to extend an existing dwelling should be compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the character of the streetscene. Saved Policy C13 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan states that the council should seek to conserve or enhance an Area of High Landscape Value. In Areas of High Landscape Value, developments are required to be of a high standard and they should use local building materials.
- 5.5 Due to the siting of the proposed extension to the front of the dwelling, it would be clearly visible from the public domain of Hardwick Road. Given this visibility of the front of the dwelling from the public domain, care is required to ensure that the design and scale of any extension to the front of this dwelling is compatible with the existing dwelling and not visually intrusive within the street scene. As noted above the Planning Inspector had no objection to the principle of an extension to the front of this dwelling because the property is at the end of the row, set well off the street and alongside a detached home which juts forward. The Inspector noted that other properties locally have projections forward of their main elevations and with good design these sit successfully in the scene. The Inspector also noted that whilst the cottages on the south side of the road are similar, it is the main roof and repeated chimneys which create the most important aspect of the visual regularity and

symmetry.

- 5.6 Whilst there are properties in the locality which have front extensions, these are on the north side of Hardwick Road where the dwellings are not similar in design and scale. There are no such examples within the immediate vicinity on the south side of Hardwick Road. The Head of Development Management is in agreement with the Inspector that an extension to the front of this property is acceptable in principle. An appropriate extension would not be overly prominent from within the street scene..

As noted above, the proposed extension is of a similar depth and width to the previously refused proposed front elevation and would be sited in a similar position. The Planning Inspector noted that the flat roof in this previous proposal was undesirable and this view is shared by the Head of Development Management. It is therefore considered that the pitched roof is a more desirable design solution.

- 5.7 However, the Head of Development Management considers that the scale of the proposed front extension would make it an incongruous form of development that would compete in prominence to the main dwelling and would constitute a visual intrusion within the street scene. The Planning Inspector also noted that an extension of this scale both outwards and lengthways would be inappropriate. Furthermore, given that the proposed extension would have a gabled front, this would increase the overall scale of this proposed extension. It is therefore considered that the proposed scheme does not sufficiently overcome the previous concerns held by the Head of Development Management and the Planning Inspector.

As the next door neighbouring dwelling, 1a Hardwick Road, projects forward, the Head of Development Management is of the opinion that the depth of the proposed extension could be considered acceptable if the width of the extension were to be reduced, especially if the extension of reduced width were to be sited adjacent to this neighbouring property of 1a Hardwick Road. However, the applicant is not enthusiastic to the idea of reducing the scale of the proposed extension.

5.9

- 5.10 For the above reasons it is considered that the proposed front extension would constitute a visual intrusion within the street scene, out-keeping and detrimental to the visual amenities of the wider locality and the Area of High Landscape Value, and is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved Policies C13, C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the NPPF.

Setting of the Conservation Area

- 5.11 Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that designated Heritage Assets should be preserved, sustained and enhanced. Given that the proposed front extension would not be clearly visible from the Conservation Area and it is considered that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm to the setting of this Conservation Area.

Residential Amenities

- 5.12 The proposed front extension would go beyond the front wall of the neighbouring properties 1a and 3 Hardwick Road. However, it is considered that the proposed extension would be of a sufficient distance away from the principal windows of these neighbouring properties to prevent detrimental harm to these properties in terms of loss of light and overdomination. Furthermore, no windows are proposed in the side walls of the proposed extension and it is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm to these neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy.

Highways Safety

- 5.13 The Highway Liaison Officer has no objections to the proposal subject to a plan showing a car parking provision for three spaces to be accommodated within the site. It is considered that three on-site parking spaces is commensurate for a dwelling of this scale in this location and that these spaces could be accommodated on the site, especially as the planted area to the front of the site could be utilised. If the application were to be recommended for approval, this condition would be attached in the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm in relation to highway safety subject to aforementioned condition.

Engagement

- 5.14 With regard to the duty set out in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the Framework, it is considered that the duty to be positive and proactive has been discharged through negotiation with the applicant to secure an acceptable form of development. In this case however, it is unfortunate that such an agreement could not be met. The call in of the application to planning committee has resulted in the application exceeding the target determination date.

6. Recommendation

Refusal for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension would be an incongruous form of development that would be an incngrous visual intrusion within the street scene, out of keeping with and detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, , and is therefore contrary to the provisions of saved Policies C28, and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

STATEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No 2) Order 2012 and paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), this decision has been taken by the Council having worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive way as set out in the application report.