

PLANNING, HIGHWAYS & CONSULTATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING MONDAY 28th AUGUST 2018

Comments & Observations

Meeting Ref.	Vale reference	Applicant and application address	Summary of Proposed development	Application Type
1	P18/V1680/HH	Mr Daryl Rose 38 Lammas Close Abingdon OX14 1PB	Residential annexe to rear Garden <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i> <i>Cllr Mike Badcock declared a non-pecuniary interest in this application as he knew the applicant. Cllr Badcock considered that potentially he had a conflict of interest in this matter and took no part in the consideration of this application.</i>	Other
2	P18/V1741/HH	Mr John Allen 84A Spring Road Abingdon OX14 1AX	Proposed Loft Extension <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other
3	P18/V1772/FUL	Mr Andrew and Mr Mervin Knight 13 Spring Road Abingdon OX14 1AH	Demolish Vacant retail unit and build four flats <u>Comments:</u> <i>Recommend refusal.</i> 1. The Council considers that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the	Minor

			<p>site and the style/ design of the proposed development does not respond positively to the site and its surroundings and is out of character with the locality. The size and bulk of the proposed development, an increase from a single storey property to one of 2/ 2.5 storeys, would adversely affect the character of the locality at this part of the street. Consequently it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to retained policy DC1 (Quality of New Development – Design) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and core policy 37 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p> <p>2. The proposal does not provide for any vehicular parking spaces for the 4 flats. According to the application this is a “car parking free proposal.”</p> <p>The Council is supportive of Core Policy 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, which states that the District Council will work with the County Council and others to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and notes that the proposal includes 10 cycle parking spaces, which is welcomed.</p> <p>However this is not a town centre site as such, it is a distance of a mile to and town and back and it is likely that many residents would require a car for work.</p> <p>Therefore it is likely that residents will own cars and the proposed development could lead to between 4 and 8 additional cars in the vicinity. It is noted that there is already a lack of parking spaces for</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>properties in the area, causing significant problems for local residents; the proposed development would exacerbate this.</p> <p>The application states that there is “spare capacity” of 6 to 10% parking in the vicinity. This was based on a survey undertaken at 12.30am on one evening (Tuesday 5th December 2017). This does not include 4 vans which the Transport Statement says would be removed as part of the development and no provision was made for vehicles owned by the residents which would inevitably need to be parked locally. The experience of residents and local councillors over many years is that there is no or virtually no spare parking capacity and therefore the Council considers that the application is contrary to retained Policy DC5 (Access) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and Core Policy 37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) which requires “a sufficient level of well-integrated car and bicycle parking.”</p> <p>3. An important part of the justification within the application for not providing parking for the flats is that the site is well-served by public transport. However the Transport Statement makes incorrect assertions regarding the availability of public transport serving the proposed development. It is stated “<i>Car-free’ residential developments should be considered in dense urban areas where residents are well served by public transport. This is the case with both these development sites.</i>” (Page 14).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The statement provides further detail on Page 19: <i>“This stop (110 metres from the application site) has the benefit of a bus lay-by, shelter and timetable and currently has the route numbers 4, BB1A, X2, Stagecoach Gold S8, BB1 and NS8. The bus stop on the nearside of Ock Street with the same route numbers is approximately 110m from 43 Edward Street proposed site and approximately 190m from the 13 Spring Road proposed site. These services provide extremely good and frequent connections to Oxford City Centre and to the town centre of Abingdon and to towns and villages beyond. They operate at around a 5 minute frequency on Mondays to Fridays and also on Saturdays and Sundays at a frequency of around 10 minutes.”</i></p> <p>On page 25 the statement goes on to say <i>“the residential standard is for bus stops to be within a 400m walk of a high daytime frequency (5-10 minutes) direct bus route to and from the town centre which is clearly the case.”</i> This is not the case. Of the buses cited in the statement: two buses serve the town centre, the X2 (Oxford – Abingdon – Didcot – Wallingford) runs twice an hour during its peak frequency; and the S8 (Oxford – Abingdon – Marcham – Grove – Wantage) once an hour. NS8 is the weekend night service following on from S8. BB1 and BB1a are Abingdon and Didcot School buses. Service 4 does not serve the bus stops in Ock Street. Therefore at peak hours there are only three buses per hour to the town centre/ Oxford, not the 6 to 12 implied by the Transport Statement. These errors in the statement undermine the application’s credentials as car free as the area is not particularly well-served by public</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>transport, at least not the extent claimed in the Transport Statement and the Statement is therefore misleading in this regard.</p> <p>4. The Council is concerned that there is a lack of amenity space in the proposals, only space for a bin store and the cycle sheds. Members do not consider that this is the “high quality public realm” which includes “mixed uses” which is required by Core Policy 37 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>5. The Council is concerned regarding the impact on the highway and road users of the proposed development. Members consider that the that the size and bulk of the proposed development, which would also, in comparison with the current building, be extended so that it was built almost right up to the edge of the pavement on both Edward Street and Spring Road, would lead to a reduction in sight lines when vehicles exit from Edward Street on to Spring Road, resulting in the creation of a more hazardous junction and the potential for an increase in accidents. Consequently the Council considers that the design of the proposed development, in particular in relation to its scale, density and massing, are not appropriate for the site and surrounding area, in contravention of Core Policy 37 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031.</p> <p><i>Cllr Mike Badcock declared a non-pecuniary interest in this application as he knew the applicants Mr Andrew and Mr Mervin Knight. Cllr Badcock considered that potentially he</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<i>had a conflict of interest in this matter and took no part in the consideration of this application.</i>	
4	P18/V1832/FUL	Scott Mclachlan 11A Stenton Close Abingdon OX14 1NH	Retrospective planning application for the subdivision of the property to form a new two-bedroom house <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Minor
5	P18/V1889/HH	Mr & Mrs D Gouws 55 Inkerman Close Abingdon OX14 1NH	Two storey extension at the rear. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other
6	P18/V1866/FUL	Mr Vince Woods 225 South Avenue, Abingdon OX14 1QT	Construct 1. No 3-bedroom Semi-detached dwelling, connected to the existing property on the site. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No Objections</i>	Minor
7	P18/V1898/HH	Mr Rob Allan 8 Preston Road, Abingdon OX14 5LB	Single Storey Extension to side <u>Comments:</u> <i>No Objections</i>	Other
8	P18/V1837/FUL	Mr Andrew and Mervin Knight 43 Edward Street Abingdon OX14 1DJ	Demolish existing warehouse buildings, change of use from Class B1 to create a flat, internal works to existing first floor flat, and develop 2 X Two-bedroom dwellings at the rear. <u>Comments:</u> <i>Recommend refusal</i> 1. The Council considers that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the	Minor

			<p>site, with the creation at 43 Edward Street of a new ground floor flat to replace an existing business use and the building of two semi-detached 2 bed properties to replace the warehouse buildings and part of the rear projection of the existing house. It is noted that this is in addition to the existing first floor flat, which would be retained. The Council considers that the style/ design of the proposed two semi-detached properties is out of character with the area and does not respond positively to the site and its surroundings, being of a more modern design than the surrounding properties which are Victorian in terms of architecture. Consequently it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to retained policy DC1 (Quality of New Development – Design) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and Core Policy 37 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1.</p> <p>2. The proposal does not provide for any vehicular parking spaces for the three new dwellings. According to the application form vehicle parking is not relevant to the application and this is a “car parking free proposal.”</p> <p>The Council is supportive of Core Policy 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, which states that the District Council will work with the County Council and others to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and notes that appropriate cycle parking will be provided in a safe, secure and sheltered location , which is welcomed.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>However this is not a town centre site as such, it is a distance of a mile to the town centre and back and it is likely that residents would require a car for work. Therefore it is likely that residents will own cars and the proposed development could lead to the requirement for between 3 and 6 additional car parking spaces in the vicinity. It is noted that there already is a lack of parking spaces for properties in the area, causing significant problems for local residents; the proposed development would exacerbate this.</p> <p>The application states that there is “spare capacity” of 6 to 10% parking in the vicinity. This was based on a survey undertaken at 12.30am on one evening (Tuesday 5th December 2017). This does not include 4 vans which the Transport Statement says would be removed as part of the development and no provision was made for vehicles owned by the new residents which would inevitably need to be parked locally. The experience of residents and local councillors over many years is that there is no or virtually no spare parking capacity and therefore the Council considers that the application is contrary to retained Policy DC5 (Access) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and Core Policy 37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) which requires “a sufficient level of well-integrated car and bicycle parking.”</p> <p>3. An important part of the justification within the application for not providing parking for the proposed development is that the site is well-served by public transport. However the Transport Statement makes incorrect assertions regarding</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>the availability of public transport serving the proposed development. It is stated “<i>Car-free’ residential developments should be considered in dense urban areas where residents are well served by public transport. This is the case with both these development sites.</i>” (Page 14).</p> <p>The statement provides further detail on Page 19: “<i>This stop (110 metres from the application site) has the benefit of a bus lay-by, shelter and timetable and currently has the route numbers 4, BB1A, X2, Stagecoach Gold S8, BB1 and NS8. The bus stop on the nearside of Ock Street with the same route numbers is approximately 110m from 43 Edward Street proposed site and approximately 190m from the 13 Spring Road proposed site. These services provide extremely good and frequent connections to Oxford City Centre and to the town centre of Abingdon and to towns and villages beyond. They operate at around a 5 minute frequency on Mondays to Fridays and also on Saturdays and Sundays at a frequency of around 10 minutes.</i>”</p> <p>On page 25 the statement goes on to say “<i>the residential standard is for bus stops to be within a 400m walk of a high daytime frequency (5-10 minutes) direct bus route to and from the town centre which is clearly the case.</i>” This is not the case. Of the buses cited in the statement: two buses serve the town centre, the X2 (Oxford – Abingdon – Didcot – Wallingford) runs twice an hour during its peak frequency; and the S8 (Oxford – Abingdon – Marcham – Grove – Wantage) once an hour. NS8 is the weekend night service following on from S8. BB1 and BB1a are Abingdon and Didcot</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>School buses. Service 4 does not serve the bus stops in Ock Street. Therefore at peak hours there are only three buses per hour to the town centre/Oxford, not the 6 to 12 implied by the Transport Statement. These errors in the statement undermine the application's credentials as a car free development as the area is not particularly well-served by public transport, at least not the extent claimed in the Transport Statement, and therefore is misleading in this regard.</p> <p>4. The Council is concerned that the proposed development of the two-storey semi-detached dwellings would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties through loss of privacy/daylight/sunlight dominance/ visual intrusion and noise, contrary to retained policy DC9 (Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses) of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.</p> <p><i>Cllr Mike Badcock declared a non-pecuniary interest in this application as he knew the applicants Mr Andrew and Mr Mervin Knight. Cllr Badcock considered that potentially he had a conflict of interest in this matter and took no part in the consideration of this application.</i></p>	
9	P18/V1925/HH	Mr Gennaro Montone 70 Spring Road Abingdon Ox14 1AN	<p>Proposed rear extension to extend existing kitchen with second storey extension for new study/storage area</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i></p>	Minor

10	P18/V1993/PDH	Mr Colin Steel 9 Minchins Close Abingdon OX14 3XS	Removal of existing conservatory. Single storey rear extension. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other
11	P18/V1847/HH	Mr Bruce Bosley 3 Hendred Way Abingdon OX14 2AN	Single Storey extension to side and rear <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other
12	P18/V1907/LB	Mr Michael Terry 4 East St. Helen Street Abingdon OX14 3HG	I intend to remedy the existing damage to the exterior of the building and repaint the building (with consent) from an existing shade of green to a pale cream that is in keeping with Heritage colors (if at all possible). I also intend to erect signage as per my application for advertisement. <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objections</i>	Other
13	P18/V1908/A	Mr Michael Terry 4 East St. Helen Street Abingdon OX14 3HG	The addition applied signage on the shop front (likely to be in gold fascia), contact information and window decals for our logo and contact information. In addition we intend to have an A-board outside the front of the shop. (Note this is the wording of the application) <u>Comments:</u> <i>No objection subject to the following condition:</i> <i>Any permission for the placing of an A Board outside of the shop would have to be subject to permission being granted by Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority. It is</i>	Advertisement Consent

			<i>understood that the County Council deems the proposed A Board as an unnecessary obstruction of the highway under the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 and therefore planning permission should be denied for the A Board.</i>	
--	--	--	---	--