

PLANNING, HIGHWAYS & CONSULTATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MONDAY 12th NOVEMBER 2018

Comments & Observations

Meeting Ref.	Vale / South reference	Applicant and application address	Summary of Proposed development as worded in the application	Application Type
1	P18/V1741/HH	Mr John Allen 84A Spring Road Abingdon OX14 1AX	<p>Amendment No.1 – dated 23rd October 2018</p> <p>Roof raise, to enable loft conversion with mono pitched dormer to the rear, pitched roof dormer and roof window to the front elevation.</p> <p><i>No objection to original application discussed at meeting of 28th August 2018.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u> <i>The Committee recommends that the application is refused:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The Council considers that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of the site in terms of scale, mass and height resulting in contravention of Core Policy 37 (Design and Distinctiveness) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1) and Saved Policy DC1 (Design) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.</i> <i>2. The Council considers that the development would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties due it its overbearing nature, dominance and visual intrusion, in contravention of Saved Policy DC9 (Impact of Development on</i> 	Other

			<i>Neighbouring Uses) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.</i>	
2	P18/V2226/FUL	Willow Spring Homes Ltd 18 North Avenue Abingdon OX14 1QN	<p>Amendment No. 1 – dated 17th October 2018</p> <p>Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings. Erection of 2x4 Bed semi-detached houses with off-street parking and additional vehicle access. (Amended car parking plans submitted 17-10-2018.)</p> <p><i>No objection to original application discussed at meeting of 17th September 2018.</i></p> <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <p>The Committee recommends that the application is refused:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Council considers that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of the site in terms of size, scale, bulk and massing, and one which is also out of character with the surrounding area. North Avenue predominately consists of red brick facades. The previous application had a facade to the street which blended with the predominately red brick street scene of North Avenue. The frontage has now been changed to the white-rendered design which is unsympathetic in appearance and character, fragmenting and dominating the street scene.</i> <p><i>The proposal includes a 2-storey rear section which dominates over existing single storey extensions in the area.</i></p> <p><i>The footprint now extends further to the rear, to the east and especially to the west compared with the</i></p>	Minor

			<p><i>previous application. This means that the side of the main building will be only 8.3m from the side of no. 20. Given the scale of the proposed building this will be overbearing.</i></p> <p><i>Core policy 37 Local plan 2031 part 1 states a development should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>respond positively to the site and its surroundings</i> • <i>physically and visually integrate with its surroundings</i> • <i>must be visually attractive</i> • <i>scale mass, height, massing and materials should be appropriate to the site and its surrounding context.</i> <p><i>The Council considers that the application does not meet the above criteria and consequently is in contravention of Core Policy 37 (Design and Distinctiveness) of the VWH Local Plan 2031, Part 1) and Saved Policy DC1 (Design) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.</i></p> <p><i>The National Planning Policy Framework states “permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.” The proposals do not meet these criteria.</i></p> <p><i>2. The Council is concerned that the proposed development will have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and in particular loss of daylight to Nos 16 and 20. Consequently the application is deemed to be in contravention of Saved Policy DC9 (Impact of Development on Neighbouring</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>Uses) of the VWH Local Plan 2011.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The proposals widen the existing access to this site and requires the construction of a second access point. This will remove at least three of the available on road parking spaces, further compounding the traffic and parking problems we have in North Avenue. The proposals also allow for future occupiers to drive onto and reverse off the site. Consequently the Council considers that the proposals do not allow for safe and convenient access to the site and do not make adequate provision for car parking and are therefore in contravention of Saved Policy DC 5 (Access) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. With regard to reversing vehicles the Council considers that this potential hazard should be addressed in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations 2015.</i></p>	
3	P18/V2302/HH	Mr Mark Norris 9 Langley Road Abingdon OX14 1YB	<p>Two storey side extension, amendments to agreed planning permission P15/V2425/HH.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections.</i></p>	Other
4	P18/V2584/HH	Mr Andrew Schwarz 24 Gardiner Close Abingdon OX14 3YA	<p>Two storey side extension.</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections.</i></p>	Other

5	P18/V2651/HH	Mr Glen Chapman 5 Park Crescent Abingdon OX14 1DF	Demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of a new rear extension featuring a two storey pitched roof extension and a single storey flat roof extension. <u>Comments:</u> <i>Recommend refusal. Comments at the end of this schedule. Cllr Chris Palmer to call in.</i>	Other
6	P18/V2704/FUL	Ms Emma Nicholas First Port Retirement Property Services Ltd Cygnet Court Caldecott Road Abingdon OX14 5ET	Replace existing steel balustrade and timber handrail to main entrance access ramp, with glazed balustrade / guarding and stainless steel handrail and posts. Replace existing brown, single glazed timber main entrance double-doors, with thermally broken, automated, brown aluminium single-leaf door and associated sidelights in a colour to match existing. Replace existing timber cladding, fascia and soffit boards, with PVC-u cladding, fascia and soffit boards in a colour and style to match existing. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections.</i>	Minor
7	P18/V2728/HH	Mr & Mrs Tim Koeman 2 Byron Close Abingdon Ox14 5PA	Two storey extension to rear. Single storey extension to side. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other

P18/V2651/HH – 5 Park Crescent

Recommend refusal. Reasons delegated to the Town Clerk.

In considering this matter the Committee considered representations from residents at neighbouring properties, as attached to the minutes of the meeting and from local ward councillor Jeanette Halliday. The Committee concurred with the comments made in these representations.

The Town Council’s objections focus on the following three representations:

1. The harm which the proposal would cause to the Albert Park Conservation Area, within the area of which the application is located.

The proposed development, demolishing existing outbuildings and erection of a new three storey rear extension would result in a development which is out of keeping with the conservation area. The Council considers that the design is unattractive and if approved would set an unwelcome precedent. As a result the Council considers that the proposed development would cause substantial harm to the conservation area.

Retained policy HE1 (Conservation Areas – preservation and enhancement: implications for development) of the VWH Local Plan 2011 states that “proposals for development or other works within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will not be established unless they can be shown to preserve or enhance the established character or appearance of the area.” The Council considers that the proposals not meet the test of preserving or enhancing the conservation area. Whilst the policy then goes on to detail a number of circumstances in which development will be permitted the Council considers that these criteria are not met.

5 Park Crescent is also in the setting of an historic park included within the Historic England “National Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest,” attracting a Grade 2 listing. Retained policy HE8 (Historic Parks and Gardens) states that: “Proposals for development within or in the setting of an historic park or garden included in the national register will only be permitted where they conserve and cause no significant harm to the historic character of the site and the features of special interest it possesses.” The Council considers that the criteria for permitting the proposed development are not met and that the application contravenes this policy.

Core Policy 39 (The Historic Environment) of the VWH Local Plan 2031 Pt 1 requires that “new development conserves, and where possible enhances, designated heritage assets...in accordance with national guidance and legislation.” Conservation areas are within the definition of designated assets. The Plan also states that “new development and conservation areas should make a positive contribution to, or better reveal, the significance of the setting within the conservation area, using an

up to date conservation area character appraisal, where one is available.” The Council does not consider that the application is in accordance with this policy.

The Council believes that the application, if approved, would result in substantial harm to the conservation area. However it is noted that National Policy Planning Framework, paragraph 196 states “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.” If a view is taken that the application would not result in substantial harm to the conservation area, it is nonetheless noted that the view of the District Council Conservation and Design Officer, as set out in her response to the application, is that the public benefits do not mitigate the proposed harm identified, on the basis that there appear to be no public benefits.

2. The Council considers that the proposals represent an overdevelopment of the site in terms of size, scale, bulk and massing; in particular the three storey extension would over-dominate surrounding property. The design results in an unattractive development which is out of character with the surrounding area.

Core policy 37 Local plan 2031 part 1 states a development should:

- respond positively to the site and its surroundings;
- physically and visually integrate with its surroundings;
- must be visually attractive;
- scale mass, height, massing and materials should be appropriate to the site and its surrounding context.

The Council considers that the application does not meet the above criteria and consequently is in contravention of Core Policy 37 (Design and Distinctiveness) of the VWH Local Plan 2031, Part 1) and Saved Policy DC1 (Design) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.

The National Planning Policy Framework states “permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.”

3. The Council is concerned that the proposed development will have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and in particular loss of daylight/ sunlight to the neighbouring property at 6 Park Crescent. The height of the three-storey extension will result in an oppressive effect on the neighbouring property. Consequently the application is deemed to be in contravention of Saved Policy DC9 (Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses) of the VWH Local Plan 2011.