

22 January 2024

Dear Planning Department,

**Planning Application: Erection of an infill second floor extension storey rear extension at Lower End Cottage Lower End Salford Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 5YP**

- 1.1 I write on behalf of my client 'Dr and Mrs McKay' in respect of the above application, which was submitted by PPL Design. The application is accompanied by the following plans and information:

Completed Application Forms and Certificates  
Drawing Number 101 'Proposed' prepared by PPL Design  
Drawing Number 100 'Existing Layout' prepared by PPL Design  
Drawing Number 103 'Site Location Plan' prepared by PPL Design  
A Sun Path Analysis prepared by EDG Architecture

**The Site**

- 1.2 The application Site relates to a two-storey, stone built detached dwelling located in a residential area of the village of Salford, with residential properties located to the south, east and west. To the north of the Site is Lower End Road, beyond which is an area of open greenspace. The northern façade of the building represents the principal elevation of the building.
- 1.3 Importantly, the residential properties in the immediate area contains a mix of house types, many of which have extensions of differing scale (for example the property known as 'Wayside' to the south), positioning to the highways, and siting. However, the appearance of dwellings is the most noticeable characteristic of the area.
- 1.4 The dwelling is located to the south of Lower End and falls within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Site has been extended over the years, and benefits from a large garden to the south, with tree planting along the boundaries.
- 1.5 The application is a resubmission of application 22/02995/HHD which was refused on two grounds:

The proposal, by reason of its scale and design, would not be a sympathetic and subservient extension to the original building and therefore it does not comply with the

West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2018), policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (2018) and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal would sufficiently maintain the residential amenity of neighbouring residents by minimising overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight. The proposal therefore does not comply with policy OS2, OS4, EH8 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (2018) and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

- 1.6 The proposal seeks to address the concerns raised by Officers, through the submission of additional evidence and the interpretation of guidance.

### **The Proposal**

- 1.7 The proposal is for the erection of rear single storey extension and first floor single storey extension, alongside a lean-to side extension at ground floor level, with pitched roof.
- 1.8 The proposal includes new bi-fold doors along the rear and eastern elevations at ground floor level, alongside new rooflights on the side and rear elevations at ground floor level.

### **Planning Analysis**

- 1.9 The application seeks planning permission for a domestic extension and alterations within the residential curtilage of Lower End Cottage. We note that the principle of development has been found acceptable under application 22/02995/HHD, subject to matters relating to design and amenity issues. Each point will be discussed

Main Issue 1: The proposal, by reason of its scale and design, would not be a sympathetic and subservient extension to the original building.

- 1.10 The West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2018) (Chapter 14) is a material consideration and states that as an overarching principle, the scale, form and character of the original property should be sympathetically reflected in any proposed extensions or alterations. Extensions, including the accumulation of extensions, should be secondary and subservient to the original building in terms of footprint, height and volume.
- 1.11 The original property comprises a traditional, two-storey, pitched roof, detached cottage. The property has been extended and altered since its construction, with Officers confirming during the consideration of application 22/02995/HHD that the cumulative development of the proposal and previous extensions would increase the original building by 42.55% (please see **Appendix 1**). We can confirm that the amount of development has not changed since the previous submission. As such, this figure remains relevant to the consideration of this application; and establishing, if the increase in built footprint would be sympathetic with the scale of the original building.
- 1.12 Expanding on the above, we draw the Council's attention to the Design Guide, which states *'that there is no fixed rule for the extent to which a property can successfully be enlarged; every property is different. In general, however, any extension or accumulation of extensions should remain clearly secondary and subservient to the original property. Extensions which would, through their scale and massing, result in the primacy of the original property being eroded or lost altogether should be avoided'*. The guidance goes on to state that *'an extension*

*or accumulation of extensions which would double, or more than double, the existing volume, is unlikely to be supported. Extensions will usually need to be secondary in terms of footprint, height and volume’.*

- 1.13 In addressing the quantum of development argument, paragraph 1.11 above confirms that that the cumulative increase in volume would be 42.55% which is below 50% of the original building. Thus, we argue that the volume of development is acceptable. However, as per the guidance this percentage is not a fixed rule, and does allow proposals over 50% - as every property is different.
- 1.14 Secondly, the proposed footprint is to the rear of the building, retaining its original character from Lower End which is the principal elevation. Importantly, the build span of the proposed extension will also be set inward from the original elevation, by no less than c.300mm, with development contained by the presence of trees along the boundaries of the garden..
- 1.15 On the matter of scale, Section 14.3 of the Design Guide enables the pitch of the roof of an extension to be similar to the original, as long as there is a differentiation in form from the original building. It is our position that the proposal meets this requirement, with only the first floor south extension following the ridge line, whilst the first floor west extension and ground floor extension falling below. The use of materials can be discussed and/or conditioned to support this position, and importantly pitched roofs are retained to reflect the character of the property and the area.
- 1.16 Expanding on the above, the requirement for the first floor southern extension to follow the existing ridge line - is required to achieve a level floor and an improved internal layout.
- 1.17 Finally, drawing upon recent appeal decisions, the development context of the proposal is material to the determination of this application. This is due to the fact that Policy H6 requires extensions to existing dwellings to ‘respect the character of the surrounding area’ whilst Policy OS4 is directed to achieving high quality design, and ensuring that new development respects the architectural character of the locality and contributes to local distinctiveness. As noted above, other buildings in locality have been extended over the years to respond to modern day living requirements, such as open plan living and additional bathrooms. This proposal follows a similar format.

Main Issue 2: It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal would sufficiently maintain the residential amenity of neighbouring residents by minimising overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight.

- 1.18 In response to the above, a Sun Path Analysis is submitted in support of the proposal has been modelled on an accurate representation of the proposed development – considering both daylight and sunlight levels on the amenity of neighbouring residents, in particular the residents of ‘Hillside’.
- 1.19 The Analysis confirms that the proposal will not result in the significant loss of light, beyond that of the existing situation. This is due to the orientation of the building, and relative position to the adjacent buildings. However, the first floor extensions to the side and rear of the eastern side of the neighbours garden will cause an element of overshadowing on an existing outbuilding, within the neighbouring garden only. Importantly, the garden and main house will not be materially impacted by the proposal - based on the evidence provided.

1.20 In terms of overlooking, a condition could be imposed to ensure that the new proposed windows facing Hillview would be obscure glazed. The proposal will therefore comply with the West Oxfordshire Design Guide (2018), alongside policies OS2, OS4 and H6 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (2018) and the relevant provisions of the NPPF – by ensuring that new development provides for satisfactory daylight and sunlight to existing residents.

1.21 Overall, there is a case for development based on the additional evidence provided, and we would welcome any comments from the Council, prior to a decision being made on the matters raised and addressed as part of this application.

Yours Sincerely,



**Rachel Reaney, MRTPI**

