

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 4 DECEMBER 2018

Application No:	18/01795/FUL
Proposal:	Erection of a pair of semi-detached houses
Location:	Land Adjacent 1 Oak Avenue And 10 Sycamore Road, Ollerton, Nottinghamshire
Applicant:	Mr Brian Rolfe & Brian Ketcheli
Registered:	26.09.2018 Target Date: 21.11.2018
	Extension of time agreed until 07.12.2018

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council comments (support) are contrary to Planning Officer recommendation (refuse).

The Site

The site is located within the Urban Boundary of Ollerton, which is identified by the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy (CS) as a Service Centre within the Sherwood area.

The site forms the side garden area of no. 1 Oak Avenue and the side / rear garden area of no. 10 Sycamore Road. The eastern part of the site is still in use as garden land for no. 1 Oak Avenue whereas the western part of the site has already been fenced off from no. 10 Sycamore Road. It now appears as a vacant parcel of land.

The site measures approx. 238 sqm, it has a width of approx. 14 metres and a depth between approx. 18 and 16 metres.

The site is relatively flat and is grassed. There is a hedgerow along part of the front boundary with the other part of the front boundary being open. Side and rear boundary treatment consists of close boarded fencing between 1 and 2 metres in height.

Neighbouring properties are semi-detached residential properties and form part of the planned colliery village. Ollerton Colliery Village was built in the 1920s and was described at the time as one of the most interesting of the new colliery villages with an emphasis on a more spacious layout and a higher quality of living than previously planned colliery villages. It has a grid iron pattern repeated throughout the entire estate.

Relevant Planning History

None relevant.

The Proposal

Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses.

Each dwelling measures 8.45 metres in depth and 5.25 metres in width. The dwellings have a pitched roof with a side gable and measure 5.1 metres to the eaves and 8.2 metres to the ridge. Ground floor accommodation consists of a lounge, dining / kitchen, hall and WC. First floor accommodation consists of 3 no. bedrooms (1 double and 2 singles) and a bathroom.

The dwellings are set back from the back edge of the highway by 5 metres, meaning that they project marginally further forward than the front elevation of no. 1 Oak Avenue. 1 no. parking space is proposed to the front of plot 1 and the side of plot 2 with 1 no. parking space proposed to the front of 1 Oak Avenue and 1 no. parking space proposed to the side of 10 Sycamore Road. The application includes the construction of 4 dropped kerb crossings to enable these off street parking arrangements. There is 1.1 metre between the side elevation of dwelling 1 and its side boundary and 2.7 metres between the side elevation of dwelling 2 and its side boundary.

With regards to private amenity space to the rear of the proposed dwellings, this measures between 4.7 and 2.6 metres in depth. Plot 1 has a rear private amenity area of approx. 27 square metres and plot 2 approx. 24.5 square metres.

The plans under consideration are;-

Site Location Plan, received 25th September 2018

Block Plan, Drawing No. 986-2, received 25th September 2018

Floorplans and Elevation, Drawing No. 986-1, received 25th September 2018

Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of three properties have been individually notified by letter.

Planning Policy Framework

Neighbourhood Plan – not applicable for Ollerton

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2011)

- Spatial Policy 1 Settlement Hierarchy
- Spatial Policy 2 Spatial Distribution of Growth
- Spatial Policy 6 Infrastructure for Growth
- Spatial Policy 7 Sustainable Transport
- Core Policy 3 Housing Mix, Type, and Density
- Core Policy 9 Sustainable Design
- Core Policy 14 Historic Environment

Allocations & Development Management DPD

- Policy DM1 Development within Settlements Central to Delivering the Spatial Strategy
- Policy DM3 Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations
- Policy DM5 Design
- Policy DM9 Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Policy DM12 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework 2018
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Publication Core Strategy
- The Housing Market and Needs Assessment Sub Area Report (2014)

Consultations

Ollerton Town Council – Support proposal.

NSDC Conservation Officer – provided verbal advice regarding the importance of the planned colliery village and the fact that the colliery village as a whole could be viewed as a non-designated heritage asset.

NSDC Access Officer –

“As part of the developer’s considerations of inclusive access and facilities for all, with particular reference to disabled people, it is recommended that their attention be drawn to Approved Document M of the Building Regulations, which contain useful standards in respect of visitable, accessible and adaptable, and wheelchair user dwellings. The requirements of a dwelling’s occupants can change as a result of illness, accident such as sports injury for example, disability or ageing giving rise to reduced mobility or increasing sensory loss. In order to meet these changing requirements, homes need to be accessible to residents and visitors’ alike as well as meeting residents’ changing needs, both temporary and longer term. Similarly, inclusive access improves general maneuverability for all including access for those with push chairs and baby buggies as well as disabled people etc.

It is recommended that disabled persons and wheelchair users’ access to, into and around the dwelling be carefully examined. External pathways to and around the site should be carefully considered and designed to accepted standards with reference to the topography of the site to ensure that they provide suitable clear unobstructed inclusive access to the proposal. In particular, ‘step-free’ access to and into the dwelling is an important consideration and an obstacle free suitably surfaced firm level and smooth ‘traffic free’ accessible route is important to and into the dwelling from facilities such as car parking and from the site boundary. Any loose laid materials, such as gravel or similar, can cause difficulty for wheelchair users, baby buggies or similar and should be avoided. It is recommended that inclusive step free access be considered to garden areas, amenity spaces and external features.

Carefully designed ‘step-free’ approach, ramps, level flush thresholds, generous doorways, corridors etc. all carefully designed to facilitate easy access and maneuver are important considerations. Switches and sockets should be located at suitable heights and design to assist those whose reach is limited to use the dwelling together with suitable accessible WC and sanitary provision etc.

It is recommended that the developer make separate enquiry regarding Building Regulations matters.”

NCC Highways Authority – No objection.

“This proposal is for the construction of two semi-detached dwellings. The application includes the construction of 4 dropped kerb crossings to enable off street parking for 1 Oak Avenue, 10 Sycamore Road and for the 2 new dwellings. The dropped kerb crossing for 10 Sycamore Road is not clearly demonstrated on the site plan but is expected to be single vehicle width. An existing dropped kerb between the two existing dwellings is required to be reinstated to full kerb.

Therefore, there are no highway objections to this proposal subject to the following:

1. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until 4 dropped vehicular footway crossings are available for use and constructed in accordance with the Highway Authority’s specification. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

2. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until the existing dropped kerb access that is not required as part of this consent is permanently closed and the access crossing reinstated as footway in accordance with the Highway Authority’s specification. Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

Notes to applicant

The development makes it necessary to construct 4 vehicular crossings over a footway of the public highway. These works shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. You are, therefore, required to contact VIA, in partnership with NCC, tel: 0300 500 8080 to arrange for these works to be carried out.

The minor access reinstatement works referred to in condition 2 above involves work on the highway and as such requires the consent of the Highway Authority. Please contact 0300 500 8080 to arrange for these works to be carried out.”

Archaeology Officer – *“No archaeological input required.”*

Two letters of objection have been received by one local residents/interested parties. Concerns are;-

- There is an error with the names quoted on the application forms
- Loss of privacy of rear garden area caused by overlooking from the proposed rear windows
- Unless the houses are constructed in red brick they will severely contrast with the surrounding houses.

Comments of the Business Manager

Principle

Ollerton is identified as a Service Centre within the Sherwood area. Development within the Urban Boundary of Service Centre’s is considered acceptable through polices SP1 and SP2 of the CS and Policy DM1 of the ADMDPD which states that;-

“Within the Urban Boundaries of the Sub-Regional Centre and Service Centre’s and the Village Envelopes of the Principal Villages, as defined on the Policies Map, proposals will be supported for

housing, employment, community, retail, cultural, leisure and tourism development appropriate to the size and location of the settlement, its status in the settlement hierarchy and in accordance with the Core Strategy and other relevant Development Plan Documents.”

The principle of the proposal is therefore acceptable, subject to it complying with other relevant planning policy.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 seeks to secure adequate amenity provision for both neighbouring residents and proposed occupiers. This includes ensuring developments deliver sufficient separation distances which do not lead to unacceptable reductions in terms of overbearing, loss of light or privacy.

Dealing firstly with the available amenity for the proposed occupiers, it is Officers submission that the proposed dwellings would have insufficient private amenity space. Plot 1 would have a private amenity space of approx. 27 square metres measuring between 4.7 and 3.7 metres in depth. Plot 2 would have a private amenity space of approx. 24.5 square metres measuring between 3.7 and 3 metres in depth. The modest length of these areas is not considered to be commensurate with a three bedroom dwelling and would lead the occupiers towards a cramped external experience.

Furthermore, this proposal would significantly reduce the private amenity space for no. 10 Sycamore Road. The submitted plans show no. 10 Sycamore Road to have a rear private amenity area of approx. 21.5 square metres. A recent site visit showed that the site was already fenced off from no. 10 Sycamore Road and therefore at the time of assessing this planning application, their rear garden area was already reduced to this size. However, the Council's historic aerial photos show that in 2016 no. 10 Sycamore Road had a private rear garden area of approx. 97 square metres, measuring approx. 18 metres in depth as well as a sizeable side garden area too.

This issue of insufficient private amenity areas is exacerbated by the fact that all three of the dwellings referred to above are capable of housing a family within their three bedrooms.

There are no set figures within relevant planning policies for minimum garden depth. However, from professional experience Officers would expect minimum rear garden depths in this area to be around 10 metres, depending on each individual site and its surroundings. All neighbouring properties have much deeper garden areas. For example, the adjacent property, no. 1 Oak Avenue, has a rear garden depth of 24 metres.

The small plot and short rear garden depths also means that the rear elevations of the proposed new dwellings, containing main aspect windows at both ground and first floor level are between 3.15 and 4.4 metres from the rear boundary bordering the neighbouring property's (no. 12) rear garden area. The ground floor windows could be screened by boundary treatment, however, I consider that the first floor bedroom windows (4 bedrooms in total) will directly overlook this neighbouring garden area. These windows face the neighbour's rear garden area and therefore would cause direct overlooking. I acknowledge that the rear most part of the garden area can be the least used as it is furthest away from the dwelling (although policy does not specify this). However, given the direct nature of the overlooking, the extent of the overlooking (4 separate bedroom windows) and the extremely short separation distances (between 3.15 and 4.4 metres), I consider this to be unacceptable.

Due to the angle between the proposed new dwellings and this neighbouring building itself (no.

12), I do not consider that these rear bedroom windows would directly overlook the rear windows of the neighbouring building. No main aspect windows are proposed to the side elevation of either dwelling. There are therefore no unacceptable overlooking issues onto either 1 Oak Avenue or 10 Sycamore Road. Due to separation distances and the intervening highway, there are no unacceptable overlooking issues onto the properties to the front of the site.

The proposal does not cause unacceptable massing / overshadowing or overbearing issues onto neighbouring properties. As stated above, the proposal is within 3.15 metres of the rear garden area of no. 12 Sycamore Road. However, the proposal is located directly to the north of their garden area and therefore will not cause unacceptable overshadowing issues onto this property. The proposal does not project significantly further forward or rearwards than the front and rear elevations of the two side neighbouring properties and therefore does not cause unacceptable massing / overshadowing issues onto the main aspect windows on their front and rear elevations. Neither of these two side neighbouring properties has first floor main aspect windows facing the site that could be overshadowed by the proposal. Due to separation distances and the intervening highway, there are no unacceptable massing / overshadowing issues onto the properties to the front of the site. I consider separation distances between the proposed dwellings and all existing windows to be sufficient so as to not cause unacceptable overbearing issues.

For the reasons stated above, I consider that the proposal would result in the 2 new plots as well as one of the existing plots being served by substandard private amenity space. I can see no justification for this substandard amenity space. The proposal will also cause direct unacceptable overlooking issues onto the rear garden of the neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM5 which states that proposals resulting in the loss of amenity space will require justification and that the layout of development within sites and separation distances from neighbouring development should be sufficient to ensure that neither suffers from an unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy.

Impact on Visual Amenity

Policies DM5 and CP9 state that development should achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is capable of being accessible to all and of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments. Policies CP14 and DM9 seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance.

Ollerton Colliery Village was built in the 1920s and was described at the time as one of the most interesting of the new colliery villages with an emphasis on a more spacious layout and a higher quality of living than previously planned colliery villages. It has a grid iron pattern repeated throughout the whole of the estate. Dwellings are all semi-detached, 2-storey, double bay, red bricked dwellings with open frontages and spacious plots. Whilst not formally designated, the site does have some heritage value and I consider the colliery village as a whole to be a non-designated heritage asset.

All neighbouring dwellings on this estate are relatively uniform in style. They are typically 1920s traditional, semi-detached, 2-storey, double bay, red bricked dwellings (although some have been altered with the addition of render). The proposed dwellings are not considered to be in keeping with neighbouring properties. They are single bay and incorporate modern features such as bay windows with canopies over. Proposed window openings are wider but not as tall as neighbouring properties. As such, it is considered that the proposal will not be in keeping with surrounding

properties. This situation is exacerbated by the uniform style of dwellings on the whole estate and the fact that the proposal is on a prominent corner location.

Moreover, the proposal would appear excessively cramped and overly occupied by built form when compared to the established character of the area which features long rear gardens and greater separation distances between the side elevations of the semi-detached pairs. Due to the grid iron pattern of the planned colliery village, any development on this site would set a precedent for further residential development on most of the street corners of the estate. This would erode the original open nature of the planned village and would cumulatively be harmful to the layout and character of the planned village.

The proposed layout is considered to be car parking dominated. The submitted block plan shows that the parking area to plot 1 is to the front of the plot, taking up the majority of the front amenity area. As the proposal results in the loss of side garden area serving no. 1 Oak Avenue, any parking serving this property would also have to be to the front of the plot and this is also shown on the submitted block plan. This is out of keeping with the character of the area where the majority of the dwellings have shared side driveways with parking to the side / rear. Front plots are relatively open in nature and most are lawned.

For the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposal is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and is contrary to policies DM5, DM9, CP9 and CP14.

Highway Safety

Policy DM5 states that;-

“Provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development.”

The application includes the construction of 4 dropped kerb crossings to enable off street parking for 1 Oak Avenue, 10 Sycamore Road and for the 2 new dwellings. 1 no. parking space is proposed for both the existing and new dwellings. This is to the front of the site for no. 1 Oak Avenue and new plot 1 and to the side of the site for new plot 1 and no. 10 Sycamore Road.

The Highway Authority has assessed the proposal and raised no objection. I see no reason to disagree with the Highway Officer comments listed in full above. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, I consider that the proposed access and parking details are acceptable and comply with SP7, CP9 and DM5.

Conclusion

The principle of further residential development at this site is acceptable, subject to it complying with other relevant planning policy. The proposal does not have a significant detrimental impact on highway safety.

However, the proposal results in both the 2 no. proposed dwellings and 1 of the existing dwellings (no. 10 Sycamore Road) being served by insufficient private amenity space. The proposal also causes unacceptable direct issues of overlooking onto the rear garden area of the neighbouring property to the rear of the site. The design and layout of the proposal is car parking dominated and out of keeping with neighbouring properties and, if approved, would set a precedent for

further residential development on most of the street corners of this estate in an overly cramped nature.

For the reasons stated above I consider that the proposal is contrary to policies DM5, DM9, CP9 and CP14. Accordingly, it is recommended that full planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out below.

RECOMMENDATION

That full planning permission is refused for the reasons set out below.

Reasons

01

In the opinion of the District Council, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity by virtue of both the proposed new dwellings and one of the existing dwellings (10 Sycamore Road) being served by insufficient private amenity space. The proposal would also result in an unacceptable and direct overlooking impact onto the rear garden area of the rear neighbouring property to the south (12 Sycamore Road). As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM5 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan as well as the NPPF which forms a material planning consideration.

02

In the opinion of the District Council, the proposal would be out of keeping with its surroundings, by virtue of the car parking dominated layout in contrast to the open and green frontages of neighbouring plots. The elevation design of the proposed dwellings would be at odds with the uniform style of the neighbouring traditional, two-bay properties. Furthermore, any development on the site would create a cramped appearance which would set a precedent for further residential development on most of the street corners of the estate. This would erode the original open nature of the planned colliery village and would be cumulatively harmful to the layout and character of the planned village. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies DM5 and DM9 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document and Core Policies 9 and 14 of the Core Strategy.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Claire Turton on ext 5893.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Matt Lamb
Business Manager – Growth & Regeneration

Committee Plan - 18/01795/FUL

