

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V1304/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	10.6.2013
PARISH	LONGWORTH
WARD MEMBER(S)	Anthony Hayward
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs D Walton
SITE	Manor Lodge Church Lane Longworth Abingdon, OX13 5DY
PROPOSAL	Erection of a new dwelling on land to the east of Manor Lodge
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	438512/199414
OFFICER	Katie Rooke

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This application comes to committee as Longworth Parish Council fully supports it.

1.2 The site is located towards the west side of Longworth within the conservation area, and on land within the North Vale Corallian Ridge. Existing dwellings lie to the east and west of the site, with agricultural fields to the south. Church Lane adjoins the north boundary of the site. A copy of the site plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached four bedroom dwelling adjacent to the west boundary of the site. The main body of the house measures 10.9 metres wide by 6.4 metres deep with an eaves height of 3.8 metres and a ridge height of 6.8 metres. Projecting off the rear elevation of the dwelling is a two storey gabled extension measuring 4.5 metres wide by 4.9 metres deep, with an eaves height of 4 metres and ridge height of 6.1 metres. A copy of the application drawings is **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Longworth Parish Council** “fully supports this application”.

3.2 **Conservation Officer** recommends refusal of the application, stating;

“The scheme involves the erection of a new dwelling within the Longworth Conservation Area, close to the Church and other listed buildings. The character of this part of Longworth is very loose knit with large spaces between buildings. The undeveloped nature of the site contributes to the loose knit semi-rural character of this part of the village.

The development of the site in the way proposed will not preserve or enhance the special loose knit semi rural character of this part of the conservation area contrary to para.132 of the NPPF and policy HE1 of the Council’s adopted Local Plan.

Furthermore the proposal does not meet the requirement for enabling development set out in English Heritage’s ‘Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places’.”

3.3 **Countryside Officer** is “satisfied that there will be no significant ecological impacts provided the recommendations of the Ecological Appraisal are followed”.

- 3.4 **Tree Officer** raises no objections subject to conditions, making the following points;
- The condition of the Poplar is such that the inherent stem weakness will lead to its decline and therefore its removal at this time is not contested.
 - There is a dead Acacia that will also be removed and is only noteworthy in terms of the type of replacement trees that the site could accommodate within new landscaping.
- 3.5 **Waste Management Team** has provided details in respect to bin storage requirements for the property and the time they must be presented for collection.
- 3.6 **Neighbours** Five letters of support have been received, which make the following points;
- The proposal will not be detrimental to the appearance of Church Lane as it has a sympathetic design.
 - The architectural design and build quality proposed are entirely in keeping with the best Longworth has to offer.
 - The property will add attraction to the lane, and compliments the conservation area.
 - The new dwelling will fit in well with the surrounding area.
 - The dwelling will be a welcome and beneficial addition to the conservation landscape of Longworth.
- 3.7 One letter of concern has been received, which makes the following points;
- Although smaller than the previously proposed dwelling, it is still too large for the site.
 - The proposal is too high and any building in this location should be at the same ground level as Church Cottage.
 - There will be light pollution towards Haugh House.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 [P12/V2397/FUL](#) - Withdrawn (23/01/2013)
Erection of a new dwelling on land to the east of Manor Lodge.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

National Planning Policy Framework

- 5.1 The NPPF replaces all previous PPG's and PPS's and also indicates the weight to be given to existing local plan policies. The adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan was not adopted in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, so paragraph 215 of the NPPF applies. The local plan policies that are relevant to this application are considered to have a high degree of consistency with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight, except for Policy H12 which has less weight because the council does not currently have a five year supply of housing land.
- 5.2 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paras. 14 and 49). Paragraphs 34 and 37 encourage minimised journey lengths to work, shopping, leisure and education, and paragraphs 56 – 66 seek to promote good design and local distinctiveness and integrate development into the natural, built and historic environment. Paragraphs 126 – 141 refer to the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment, including conservation areas.
- 5.3 Paragraphs 47 – 49 require local planning authorities to identify a five year supply of housing land. Where this cannot be demonstrated, relevant local plan policies for the

development of new housing should not be considered up-to-date until the shortfall is rectified.

Vale of White Horse Local Plan (adopted July 2006)

- 5.4 Policy H12 states that residential development within the built up areas of defined settlements (including Longworth) will be permitted provided the scale, layout, mass and design of new dwellings would not harm the form, structure or character of the settlement.
- 5.5 Policy DC1 refers to the design of new development, and seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality design and takes into account local distinctiveness and character.
- 5.6 Policy DC5 seeks to ensure that a safe and convenient access can be provided to and from the highway network.
- 5.7 Policy DC9 refers to the impact of new development on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment in terms of, among other things, loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, and dominance or visual intrusion.
- 5.8 Policy HE1 relates to development within or affecting the setting of a conservation area, and seeks to ensure that development preserves or enhances the established character and appearance of the area.
- 5.9 Policy NE7 seeks to ensure that development which would harm the prevailing character and landscape of the North Vale Corallian Ridge is not permitted.

English Heritage - Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places

- 5.10 Section 1.1.1 (p.10) of the guidance defines enabling development as “development that would be unacceptable in planning terms but for the fact it would bring public benefits sufficient to justify it being carried out, and which could not otherwise be achieved”.
- 5.11 Specifically the policy outlined by English Heritage in respect to enabling development (p.5) states;

“Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless:

- a. it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting
- b. it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place
- c. it will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose
- d. it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid
- e. sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source
- f. it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises

harm to other public interests

- g. the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies”.

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues to consider in determining this application are whether the principle of the proposal in this location is acceptable, the impact on the visual amenity of the area, and particularly whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area, the impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, and the impact on highway safety.

Principle of development

6.2 This part of Longworth is loose-knit with large open spaces between buildings. The site is currently used as garden land and, although enclosed by vegetation and fences, the area maintains an undeveloped appearance. Whilst the site is considered to be within the built-up area of the village for the purpose of policy H12, it is considered that the development of the site would harm the semi-rural character of the area contrary to policies H12 and DC1 of the local plan and paragraph 132 of the NPPF. As such, the proposal is considered unacceptable in principle. The lack of a five year supply of housing land is not considered sufficient reason to grant planning permission, particularly as the proposal would make a negligible contribution to housing land supply and the identified harm is considered to be significant.

Impact on visual amenity

6.3 Whilst the overall scale and design of the proposed dwelling is considered to be sympathetic to the immediate locality, and notwithstanding the existing vegetation on the boundary of the site, it is considered that the proposal would be visually intrusive and harmful to the semi-rural character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

6.4 Although there are no long, open views across the site, its undeveloped nature is considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal, therefore, is considered to harm the established character of the area and so fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Impact on neighbours

6.5 Given the position and orientation of neighbouring properties it is not considered that the amenities of these dwellings would be harmed by the proposal in terms of overshadowing, dominance or overlooking. In order to prevent potential overlooking from the first floor west facing window, which serves an en-suite, this could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.

Impact on highway safety

6.6 The proposed parking and turning are considered adequate for the new dwelling. The new access, which allows good visibility onto Church Lane across the wide verge, is considered acceptable.

Future conservation of Longworth Manor

6.7 The argument has been put forward as part of the application that the “delivery of the plot would enable the Applicant to secure funding towards essential repair, maintenance and enhancement of Longworth Manor, a Grade II Listed Building of

national importance” (p.11 Planning Statement).

- 6.8 The proposed development is considered to be contrary to policy, and is not felt to be acceptable enabling development, as outlined by English Heritage, as it is considered to materially harm the heritage values of the place. Whilst it is acknowledged that work is required to be undertaken to Longworth Manor, it has not been demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of Longworth Manor, or that it is necessary to resolve the problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner.
- 6.9 The development is therefore not considered to accord with paragraph 140 of the NPPF, as the benefits of the proposal for enabling development are not considered to outweigh the disbenefits of departing from planning policies.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 The site is considered to contribute to the semi-rural loose-knit character of this part of Longworth Conservation Area. It is considered that the proposed dwelling on the site fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the conservation area contrary to policies DC1, HE1 and H12 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 **It is recommended that planning permission be refused for the following reason:**

1. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the undeveloped nature of the site contributes to the loose-knit semi-rural character of the area, and it is considered that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the conservation area. As such the proposal is contrary to policies DC1, HE1 and H12 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Author: Katie Rooke
Contact number: 01235 540507
Email: katie.rooke@southandvale.gov.uk