



Report to Central Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee

Application Number:	18/00172/APP
Proposal:	Formation of new access, construction of two storey rear extension and alternative roof, including 3 front dormer windows to No 11 Thame Road, construction of two detached dwellings to rear of No 11 and Clematis Cottage
Site Location:	11 Thame Road, Long Crendon, Buckinghamshire, HP18 9AS
Applicant:	Mr J Twitchen
Case Officer:	Helen Braine
Ward(s) affected:	Bernwood
Parish-Town Council:	Long Crendon Parish Council
Date valid application received:	18.01.2018
Statutory determination date:	15.03.2018
Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions

1.0 Summary & Recommendation/ Reason for Planning Committee Consideration

- 1.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 2no. detached dwellings to the rear of No. 11 Thame Road, the formation of a new access between No. 11 and Clematis Cottage, and extensions to No. 11 itself.
- 1.2 In summary, it is considered that it would represent housing development within the Long Crendon defined Settlement Boundary and respect the character and appearance of the area, an appropriate level of parking is provided and there would be no detrimental highway impact. It would preserve and not harm the appearance and character of the area. Furthermore it would not harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and provide a good standard of amenity for existing and proposed properties. It would accord with the policies set out in the Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan and AVDLP and emerging VALP.
- 1.3 This application is being reported to the Central Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee because the Cllr David Lyons has called the application to Committee; the reasons are set out in the appendix to this report.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the application be **DEFERRED AND DELEGATED** for approval subject to the satisfactory completion of a legal agreement to ensure that the proposed HMO is not implemented in the event that the permission for this development is implemented and subject to the appropriate conditions.

2.0 Description of Proposed Development

- 2.1 The application sites relates to a plot of land of about 0.14 hectares in size located on the eastern side of Thame Road in the village of Long Crendon. The site comprises the plot of No. 11 Thame Road, a detached brick bungalow situated about 16 metres from the highway. The site lies between Clematis Cottage (to the southeast) and Sherlocks, Morning Side and Finches (to the northwest). Frank's Paddock abuts the site to the northeast.
- 2.2 The site lies outside the Long Crendon Conservation Area but both the southeast and southwest boundaries abut it. The site also falls within an area of archaeological interest and the Brill-Winchendon Hills Area of Attractive Landscape (AAL).
- 2.3 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 2no. detached dwellings to the rear of No. 11 Thame Road, the formation of a new access between No. 11 and Clematis Cottage, and extensions to No. 11 itself.
- 2.4 Both new dwellings would be 4-bedroomed units. They would be one and a half storeys with accommodation in the roof, measuring approximately 5.9m to ridge height (2.3m high to eaves (2.8m high eaves on gable ends)), 11.1m wide and 13.3m deep. They will feature projecting gables, plinths, pitched roofs and spacious interiors. They will be finished in brick, timber cladding, plain concrete/slate roof tiles, and will have UPVC windows and aluminum doors.
- 2.5 Each dwelling will be served by a detached car port and one parking space. An additional rear parking space, adjacent the car port for Plot 2, will also be created for the occupiers of Clematis Cottage.
- 2.6 The land behind the two new dwellings will be subdivided to create private amenity space for each house.
- 2.7 In terms of the proposed extensions to No.11, permission is sought for alterations to change the existing hipped roof into a half hip style roof, the installation of 3no. front dormer windows and a two-storey extension to the rear. The rear extension will extend the width of the existing rear elevation, projecting 4.5m deep (maximum) and at a height of 5.9m. The existing access will be blocked off to facilitate hardstanding for 3 vehicles and a new access off the proposed shared drive.
- 2.8 The application is accompanied by:
 - a) 1475-P4B (received 30.04.2018)
 - b) 1475-P2B (received 18.01.2019)

- c) 1475-SP1K (received 18.01.2019)
- d) 1475-P3B (received 18.01.2019)

3.0 Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 19/03518/ACL - Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed house of multiple occupancy and construction of hardstanding – Certificate issued 2.12.2019
- 3.2 19/02696/ACL - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed single storey side extension and porch – Certificate issued 9.9.2019
- 3.3 19/02655/HPDE - The erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8m, for which the maximum height would be less than 4m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.6m - Approval 22.8.2019
- 3.4 18/04393/APP - Two storey rear extension, new dormers to front, removal of roof light and chimney and extension to roof to provide further first floor – Refusal 17.5.2019
- 3.5 17/01041/AOP - Residential development consisting of two chalet bungalows – Withdrawn 12.5.2017
- 3.6 05/02271/APP - Side extension and alterations to roof to form accommodation at first floor – approval 18.10.2005
- 3.7 96/01203/APP - Vehicular access – Approval 19.8.1996
- 3.8 87/01554/APP - Erection of bungalow – Refusal 29.10.1987
- 3.9 87/00028/APP - Erection of bungalow – Refusal 9.6.1987 (appeal T/APP/J0405/A/87/73134/P4 dismissed 9.12.1987)
- 3.10 86/00613/AOP - Proposed bungalow – Outline permission 14.8.1986

4.0 Representations

- 4.1 The Long Crendon Parish Council have raised objections to this planning application.
- 4.2 14 letters of objection have been received. The main issues relate to the principle of development, the form and extent development on the site, residential amenities, access, parking and highway impact, conflict with the neighbourhood plan, planting and lack of facilities.
- 4.3 6 letters of support raising the following issues: improved access and footpath, in keeping with the area, and the fall back of a house in multiple occupation.
- 4.4 Further detail is provided in the appendix to the report.

5.0 Policy Considerations and Evaluation

The overview report, appended to this report, sets out the background information to the policy framework when making a decision on this application.

Principle and Location of Development

Long Crendon Neighbourhood Development Plan (made on 5 October 2017): Policies LC1 (Long Crendon Settlement Boundary), LC4 (Housing for Older People), LC9 (General Design principles)

Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP 2004): RA13 (Development within settlements listed in Appendix 4) and RA14 (Development at the edge of Appendix 4 settlements)

Emerging Vale of Aylesbury District Local Plan (VALP): S1 (Sustainable development for Aylesbury Vale) carries *considerable weight*; S2 (Spatial strategy for growth), S3 (Settlement hierarchy and cohesive development) and D3 (Proposals for non-allocated sites at strategic settlements, larger villages and medium villages) all attract *moderate weight*.

- 5.1 Long Crendon is categorised as a 'larger village'. It is well connected to a large service centre (Thame, 2.5 miles away), has good employment and key services, but an infrequent bus service. The application site lies within the Settlement Boundary of Long Crendon designated by the LCNP where Policy LC1 (Long Crendon Settlement Boundary) supports development provided they accord with the design and development management policies of the development plan and other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 5.2 Therefore, in broad sustainability terms, the provision of two dwellings in this location within the built-up area is considered acceptable. The proposal would make a contribution to housing land supply which would be a significant benefit, tempered by the scale of the development and its limited contribution.
- 5.3 Policy LC4 states proposals should have regard to the need for homes suited to older households by way of their type, configuration and detailed design. The proposal is for two dwellings and would be suited to occupation by the older generation, including intergenerational living. Therefore, this would comply in principle with both LC1 and LC4 of the LCNP. However, this proposal has to be assessed against other policies in the development plan and material considerations.
- 5.4 There would be economic benefits in terms of the construction of the extensions to the host dwelling and the new houses, and the resultant increase in population contributing to the local economy. As such, this matter is attributed limited positive weight.

Transport matters and parking

LCNP Policy LC9 (General Design Principles)

AVDLP GP24 (Car parking guidelines), SPG1: Parking Guidelines.

Both emerging VALP policies T5 (Delivering transport in new development) and T6 (Vehicle parking), Appendix B (Parking Standards) carry *moderate weight*.

- 5.5 Starting with accessibility, the site is on the southern side of the village and is within walking distance of all its services. It is also within walking distance of bus services which run along Thame Road. Thus is considered to be sustainably located.
- 5.6 The access arrangements also are proposed to be altered from that which currently exists. A central access is proposed to serve Number 11, Clematis Cottage and the two proposed dwellings. The existing accesses to both dwellings will be blocked up with new 0.6m high brick/stone walls.
- 5.7 An area sufficient to accommodate the parking of three cars will be available in front of No. 11. Similarly, each new dwelling will have three spaces. No visitor spaces are proposed.
- 5.8 In respect of parking provision, it is considered there will be adequate off-street parking provision for both the host and proposed dwellings, and that sufficient space would be retained for turning and manoeuvring to meet the parking requirements.
- 5.9 The proposed access arrangement has been the subject of a sustained highways objection because the access would have substandard visibility which could lead to a danger and inconvenience to highway users. Moreover, as far as can be determined from the submitted plans, the applicant does not appear to control sufficient land to ever be able to achieve adequate visibility.
- 5.10 In considering this, regard must be paid to a 2019 (19/03518/ACL) lawful development certificate issued to use the host dwelling as a six-bedroom house of multiple occupation (HMO) with the provision of 9 parking spaces to the rear and south-east flank of the host.
- 5.11 The 2019 certificate remains extant and as such carries substantial weight in decision-making. It establishes that intensified residential use on the site would be acceptable in highways terms. On that basis, the Council undertook a TRICS assessment to compare the trip generation of the approved HMO and this proposed development. A 6-bedroom HMO would be expected to generate around 12.714 (two way) trips per 24 hour period. Whereas, three dwellings would by comparison be expected to generate around 14.544 (two way) trips per day.
- 5.12 Therefore, the proposed development would generate an additional increase of two (two way) trips per day in comparison to the HMO. This is not considered to be a material difference in vehicle movements from a highways perspective and as such, the problem of the access is not so serious as to justify refusal of this application.

- 5.13 However, in the interests of highway safety and to prevent displaced parking, a S106 would be required restricting the use of No 11 as an HMO in the event of the implementation of any permission for this development proposal.
- 5.14 For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposal accords with Policy LC9 of the Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan, saved policy GP24 of the AVDLP, policies T5 and T6 of the emerging VALP, and the advice contained within the NPPF. This matter is attributed neutral weight.

Raising the quality of place making and design

LCNP Policy LC9 (General Design Principles)

AVDLP 'saved' Policies GP35 (Design of new development proposals), GP38 (Landscaping of new development proposals) and RA8 (Development in Areas of Attractive Landscape and Local Landscape Areas)

Emerging VALP policy BE2 (Design of new development) and NE4 (Landscape character and locally important landscape) both carry *moderate weight*.

Design Guide: New Houses in Town and Villages

- 5.15 Policy LC9 of the LCNP requires that scale, density, height, landscape design, layout and materials have understood and reflected the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and of distinctive local landscape features. This reflects GP35 of AVDLP and BE2 of VALP.
- 5.16 The proposed development consists of the erection of two detached 4-bedroomed dwellings, positioned to mirror each other. They would be located to the rear of the frontage development on an area of undeveloped garden land to the rear of No. 11 Thame Road and Clematis Cottage. Whilst this would comprise a form of tandem development, there are examples of this type of in-depth development in the vicinity, including to the northwest and south east. As such, it is considered that this makes effective use of land, and would have regard for the pattern and character of development in the area. It would therefore comply with policies D3 of VALP and LC1 of the LCNP.
- 5.17 There is a mix of two-storey, single-storey and chalet/dormered dwellings in the area. For example, the track abutting the northern boundary serves Jericho Cottage (a two-storey property with wall dormers serving the first floor accommodation), Morning Side (a bungalow measuring 5.2m high approx.) and the Finches (another bungalow measuring approx. 4.9m high). To the south is Clematis Cottage, a period cottage with the first floor openings built immediately under the eaves; to its rear is a single-storey L-shaped building (approx. 3.7m high) which is a home studio. To the east is Frank's Paddock and the Conifers, both chalet bungalows measuring about 5.9m high.

- 5.18 Both new dwellings would be one and a half storeys with accommodation in the roof, measuring approximately 5.9m to ridge height (2.3m high to eaves (2.8m high eaves on gable ends)), 11.1m wide and 13.3m deep. Both will have projecting gables, plinths, pitched roofs and spacious interiors. They will be finished in brick, timber cladding, plain concrete/slate roof tiles, and will have UPVC windows and aluminum doors. In terms of the layout, there is adequate space about the buildings and between them reflective of the character of the surrounding area. The result will be a small-scale development which reflects the variety of form, scale and design in the area and it is considered that it would not be regarded as an overdevelopment of the site.
- 5.19 In terms of the proposed extensions to No.11, permission is sought for alterations to change the existing hipped roof into a half hip style roof, the installation of 3no. front dormer windows and a two-storey extension to the rear. The rear extension will extend the width of the existing rear elevation, projecting 4.5m deep (maximum) and at a height of 5.9m. This is similar to the proposal that was refused in May 2019. Since that time, it is acknowledged that a number of similar additions have been agreed as falling within permitted development under the previous certificate of lawful development for a side extension and porch reference 19/02696/ACL and the permitted development for a 8m deep single storey extension under reference 19/02655/HPDE. Having regard to these as a fall-back position that could be implemented, it is considered that it would be difficult to argue the proposed extensions would not be appropriate and out of keeping with the immediate streetscene and would also respect the character and proportions of the host dwelling much better compared to the fall-back position. Subject to the materials matching the existing, the detailed design is considered acceptable.
- 5.20 Whilst the site lies within the Brill-Winchendon Hills AAL, it is surrounded by built development within the settlement. This site will be mainly glimpsed from the main highway and does not in the Officers view contribute significantly to the views along Thame Road. Garden areas and landscaping of neighbouring properties will be the back drop to the new built form and the development it will appear as an integral piece of the settlement landscape. It is also noted that landscaping buffers will be retained along the site boundaries.
- 5.21 Overall, given the layout, existing mix of dwelling types and designs in the area, the development proposals would be an infill reflective of the character and appearance of the area. It is considered that an acceptable standard of design has been achieved, and the proposal is considered to accord with LC9 of the LCNP, AVDLP policy RA8, GP35 and GP38 of the AVDLP, the New Houses in Town and Villages Design Guide, policy BE2 and NE4 of the emerging VALP, and the advice in the NPPF. It is therefore considered that in assessment of good design, the proposals should be accorded neutral weight.
- 5.22 Trees and hedgerows

LCNP Policy LC9 (General Design Principles)

AVDLP policies GP39 (Existing trees and hedgerows) and GP40 (Retention of existing trees and hedgerows)

Emerging VALP policy NE8 (Trees, hedgerows and woodlands) attracts *moderate weight*.

5.23 Most of the existing rear garden is lawned. There are a few trees on site and the northwest, northeast and southeast boundaries are defined by established hedgerow.

5.24 Through the layout of the proposed dwellings, the majority of the existing landscaping can be retained and some additional planting appears to be indicated too but this is not comprehensive. To ensure implementation of these improvements, and potentially extra, a landscaping condition will be imposed to any approval.

5.25 It is therefore considered the development would preserve existing trees and hedgerows in accordance with AVDLP policies GP39 and GP40, NE8 of emerging VALP and with the advice in the NPPF. This factor should be afforded neutral weight in the planning balance.

5.26 Biodiversity

LCNP Policy LC14 (Green infrastructure and biodiversity)

Emerging VALP policy NE1 (Biodiversity and geodiversity) carries *moderate weight*.

5.27 Policy LC14 of the LNCP states that developments must deliver no net loss to biodiversity and wherever possible a net gain. This is reflected in VALP policy NE1.

5.28 Officers are satisfied that through the implementation of a landscaping scheme, secured by condition, there could be an increase in trees and habitat creation. It is likely that, overall, the scheme would result in some limited net gains in biodiversity, in accordance with LC14 of the LCNP, emerging VALP policy NE1 and relevant NPPF advice and as such should be accorded neutral weight in the planning balance.

Historic environment

LCNP Policies LC9 (General Design Principles) and LC10 (Design in the Conservation Area and their setting)

AVDLP policy GP53 (New development in and adjacent to Conservation Areas)

Emerging VALP policies BE1 (Heritage Assets) carries *moderate weight*.

5.29 LC10 of the LCNP seeks that development in the conservation area or their locality is supported where due consideration is given to design principles. Planning applications in the conservation areas should be sympathetic to surrounding buildings, enhance the historic character and appearance of the conservation area, explain the design approach and the design of development should reflect the style of existing buildings and the character of the street landscape in terms of materials,

be of a scale, size, colour and proportions to complement the character of traditional buildings with material to complement. AVDLP policy GP53 seeks to preserve or enhance the conservation area. Policy BE1 (Heritage Assets) of VALP seeks to conserve heritage asset in a manner appropriate to their significance, including their setting and seeking enhancement wherever possible.

- 5.30 In terms of the application site, it does not lie within but abuts the Long Crendon Conservation Area along its southwest and southeast boundaries.
- 5.31 The extension to the existing property would not adversely affect the setting of the conservation area.
- 5.32 In terms of the new dwellings to the rear, the current open garden area is not considered to be of particular importance in the conservation area or critical to its character, including its setting. Therefore, the principle of development in this area raises no heritage objections.
- 5.33 In terms of layout and design, given the existing adjacent development (Morning Side and Finches and Nappins Close) there is no strong building pattern or style in this area. Therefore, the proposed layout would preserve and not harm the setting of the conservation area.
- 5.34 Overall, the proposal is not considered to cause harm to the character of the conservation area, including its setting, and therefore the tests of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are met. The proposal also complies with policies LC9 and LC10 of the LCNP, policy GP53 of the AVDLP and policy BE1 of the emerging VALP and the NPPF. This factor should therefore be afforded neutral weight.

Flooding and drainage

LCNP Policy LC9 (General Design Principles)

Emerging VALP policy I4 (Flooding) carries *moderate weight*.

- 5.35 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the development would therefore be at low risk of flooding. Drainage matters relating to the development can be dealt with by condition. Therefore, the proposed development would be resilient to climate change and flooding and it would not increase flood risk elsewhere in accordance with policy LC9 of the LCNP, policy I4 of the emerging VALP and the NPPF. This factor should therefore be afforded neutral weight.

Amenity of existing and future residents

AVDLP policies GP8 (Protection of the amenity of residents) and GP95 (Unneighbourly uses)

Emerging VALP policy BE3 (Protection of the amenity of residents) attracts *considerable weight*.

- 5.36 The proposed dwellings would be located in the rear garden of No. 11 Thame Road, an existing detached house. There would be a separation distance of 16.3m between the proposed garage for Plot 1 (23.9m to the front elevation) and the rear of No. 11.
- 5.37 The access road to Jericho Cottage, Morning Side and the Finches abuts the north west site boundary. There would be a separation distance of 15.7m between the proposed garage for Plot 1 and the front elevation of Morning Side. The separation distance between the northwest elevation of Plot 1 and the Finches would also be 16.5m.
- 5.38 To the north east is the garden of Frank's Paddock. At the shortest distance, the rear elevations of this neighbour and Plot 1 would be 21.7m away. The applicant intends to retain the existing boundary hedge.
- 5.39 The proposed garage serving Plot 2 will be 12.1m away from the home studio of Clematis Cottage and 27.4m away from the cottage itself. In terms of Plot 2, there will be separation distances of 10m from the neighbouring properties accessed from Nappins Close. The applicant intends to retain the existing boundary hedge.
- 5.40 With respect to neighbouring properties, it is considered that the separation distances, existing boundary treatment, the scale of the new houses and the fact a condition will be attached which will encompass new boundary treatment means the proposal would not have an overbearing appearance for the occupiers of those other properties.
- 5.41 It is also considered that the siting and scale of the new dwellings relative to all of the neighbouring properties would mean that there would be no unacceptable effects on privacy or light for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
- 5.42 With regard to future occupier amenity, light, privacy and outlook will be provided together with private outdoor space for each new unit. Provided new adequate boundary treatment is installed, Officers are satisfied the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of future occupiers.
- 5.43 Local residents have objected to the proposals, amongst other things, on the grounds of noise and disturbance from construction. It is acknowledged that during construction, heavier vehicles would likely visit the site and there could be some additional noise associated with building operations. This is common to most building developments and is temporary. Conditions can therefore be imposed to restrict the hours of working to ensure that construction is effectively managed to keep any disturbance to a minimum.
- 5.44 It is therefore concluded that the residential amenities of nearby dwellings would not be significantly adversely affected and the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for potential future occupiers. It would accord with policy GP8 of AVDLP,

policy BE3 of the emerging VALP and the NPPF. This factor should therefore be afforded neutral weight.

6.0 Weighing and balancing of issues / Overall Assessment

- 6.1 This section brings together the assessment that has so far been set out in order to weigh and balance relevant planning considerations in order to reach a conclusion on the application.
- 6.2 The proposal falls within the Long Crendon settlement boundary where the principle of housing development is supported by policy LC1 and LC3, provided they provided they accord with the other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is considered that the proposal complies with this policy and is considered to be a sustainable location for new dwellings.
- 6.3 In terms of the benefits of the scheme, the development would make a limited contribution to the housing land supply and economic benefits in terms of the construction of the development itself and those associated with the resultant increase in population on the site to which limited positive weight should be attached.
- 6.4 The proposal would not have an adverse impact on sustainable transport, highway safety or capacity and adequate parking is provided, nor would there be any adverse impact on biodiversity, trees, landscape, design, heritage, residential amenity and flood risk. However, these matters do not represent benefits to the wider area but demonstrate an absence of harm to which weight should be attributed neutrally.
- 6.5 In determining the planning application, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, Section 143 of the Localism Act amends Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act relating to the determination of planning applications and states that in dealing with planning applications, the authority shall have regard to:
 - a. Provision of the development plan insofar as they are material,
 - b. Any local finance considerations, so far as they are material to the application (such as CIL if applicable), and,
 - c. Any other material considerations
- 6.6 As set out above it is considered that the proposed development would accord with the development plan policies, and there are no material planning considerations of such weight as to indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

7.0 Working with the applicant / agent

- 7.1 In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF (2019) the Council approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way taking a proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments.
- 7.2 The Council work with the applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.
- 7.3 In this instance, the agent was informed of the issues arising from the proposal and given the opportunity to submit amendments in order to address those issues prior to determination. The agent responded by submitting amended plans/additional information which the local planning authority considers, which were found to be acceptable and therefore it is recommended permission is granted.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1 That the application be **DEFERRED AND DELEGATED** to officers for Approval, subject to the satisfactory completion of a S106 Agreement to ensure that the proposed HMO is not implemented in the event that the permission for this development is implemented and subject to those conditions as considered appropriate by officers, or if this is not achieved for the application to be refused for reasons as considered appropriate by officers.

Appendix A: Consultation Responses and Representations

Appendix B: Site Location plan

APPENDIX A: Consultation Responses and Representations

Councillor Comments – Cllr David Lyon (dated 08.06.2020)

“I believe this application would benefit from consideration by the planning committee and wish to call it in.

The application as submitted (and subsequently revised) is over-development of a poorly accessible site/rear gardens and over enlargement of an existing modest home (No 11 itself).

The 2 new proposed houses are too big as a proposal for an existing rear garden.

There continues to be poor vehicular and pedestrian access and turning arrangements from the Main Thame to Bicester Road and the application appears to continue to fail to meet the minimum highway standards/vision splay. The applicant has personally verbally addressed the Parish Council on this point and indicated that the revised application proposal would be an improvement to the existing access/egress arrangements of No11 and Clematis Cottage.

The application continues to have over-optimistic turning areas in front of the 2 new proposed houses and realistically will rely almost totally on no vehicle being parked on-site other than in proposed garages.”

Parish/Town Council Comments – Long Crendon Parish Council (dated 03.10.2018)

“The Parish council discussed the new information available at a full Council meeting held 1st October 2018.

The Parish Council continues to object to the application and re-iterate that in their opinion the application as submitted (and subsequently revised) is over-development of a poorly accessible site/rear gardens and over enlargement of an existing modest home (No 11 itself).

The 2 new proposed houses are too big as a proposal for an existing rear garden.

There continues to be poor vehicular and pedestrian access and turning arrangements from the Main Thame to Bicester Road and the application appears to continue to fail to meet the minimum highway standards/vision splay. The applicant has personally verbally addressed the Parish Council on this point and indicated that the revised application proposal would be an improvement to the existing access/egress arrangements of No11 and Clematis Cottage. The Parish Council is not convinced of this point in light of the increase in vehicular traffic that the 2 new properties and the expanded No11 would bring overall and the failure of the application proposals to meet the minimum highway standards.

The application continues to have over-optimistic turning areas in front of the 2 new proposed houses and realistically will rely almost totally on no vehicle being parked on-site other than in proposed garages.

The application site is partially in the Long Crendon Conservation Area and although the stone wall proposed to be demolished to create a new road access on Thame Road is not listed it is hoped that

the developer would build the new enclosing wall in a similar style to help maintain the character of the street scene.

The Parish Council notes that there have been several objections from neighbours and limited support from other neighbours.

The Parish Council will attend any AVDC Planning Committee meeting if scheduled.”

Consultation Responses

BCC Transportation: Following the issuing of a Lawful Development Certificate for a HMO/area of hardstanding on the site (19/03518/ACL), the number of trips generated by the proposal and those of the HMO are not considered to be materially different. Therefore, a highways objection can no longer be substantiated.

Heritage Officer: No objection.

Representations

Other Representations

6 comments have been received supporting the proposal:

- New footpath introduced
- Improved entrance/exit for residents of Jericho Cottage and Clematis Cottage
- Renovation of existing property and redevelopment of vacant site
- No loss of light
- In-keeping design
- Fallback position is a house of multiple occupation
- Boundary fencing to be installed

14 comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

- Overdevelopment
- Unsafe vehicular access
- Poor footpath provided; management of it unclear
- Insufficient parking provision
- Loss of light
- Potential overlooking

- Contrary to Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan which states infill housing should include affordable housing and one storey bungalows
- Devaluation of neighbouring properties and potential loss of rental income
- Inadequate planting provision along south-east site boundary
- No permission given to use the private driveway of Morningside and The Finches for construction traffic or as a means of access
- Construction noise and traffic
- Insufficient key services and facilities to serve proposed development

APPENDIX B: Site Location Plan

