APPLICATION NO. P18/V2651/HH
SITE 5 Park Crescent Abingdon, OX14 1DF
PARISH ABINGDON
PROPOSAL Erection of single storey side and rear extensions (Description as amended by email received from agent dated 21 January 2019 and submission of amended plans and revised supporting information) (As updated by a revised Statement of Significance & Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the agent dated 16 May 2019).
WARD MEMBER(S) Eric de la Harpe
Robert Maddison
APPLICANT Mr Glen Chapman
OFFICER Kerry Street

RECOMMENDATION
That planning permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:

Standard
1. Commencement 3 years
2. Approved plans

Pre-Commencement
3. Samples of materials by photo panel to be submitted
4. Submission of details - vents, flues, extracts, metres and rainwater goods
5. Submission of details - windows and doors

Compliance
6. Tree protection in accordance with application details

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL
1.1 This application is referred to planning committee at the discretion of the Development Manager.

1.2 The application site, No.5 Park Crescent, is a non-designated heritage asset situated within the Abingdon (Albert Park) Conservation Area and within the setting of the grade II Registered Park and Garden of Albert Park. The application has therefore been publicised in line with statutory government publicity requirements for planning and heritage applications.
1.3 A site location plan is included overleaf.

1.4 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of single storey side and rear extensions. It was also proposed to demolish the existing garage and shed, however, this has since been completed prior to a decision being issued.

1.5 During the course of the application, a number of amendments and additional information has been submitted. The amended plans include the removal of the originally proposed three-storey rear extension and the wrap-around element of the proposed single storey extension. In addition, the originally proposed flat roof to the side extension has been re-designed and a lean-to style roof is now proposed. The additional information included a Design and Access Statement which was not submitted as part of the initial application and a further revision of this. The local planning authority under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), must demonstrate that it has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner, based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with proposals. The NPPF also requires local planning authorities to accept amendments to proposed schemes and allow for additional time extensions where appropriate.

1.6 Extracts of the original plans are attached at Appendix 1 and extracts of the latest amended plans are attached at Appendix 2. The revised Statement of Significance and Heritage Impact Assessment is attached at Appendix 3. Heritage objections submitted on behalf of the neighbours and a letter from DAC Beachcroft are attached at Appendix 4. The councils Conservation Officers final comments are attached at Appendix 5.

2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 A summary of the consultations and representations received in response to the application is provided below. The full comments are available on the council’s website. There were four re-consultations during the application
process. The responses received to all of the amendments have been grouped together for ease under one heading below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abingdon Town Council</th>
<th>Original plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposal would cause substantial harm to the conservation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unattractive design and if permitted, would set an unwelcome precedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overdevelopment of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Three-storey element will result in an oppressive effect on the neighbouring property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended plans</td>
<td>• The proposal would cause substantial harm to the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No public benefits have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overdevelopment of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oppressive effect on the neighbouring property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Although a revised Statement of Significance and Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted, plans have not changed so earlier objections remain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbour objections</th>
<th>Responses from 20 households and 1 agent acting on behalf of a resident.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original plans</td>
<td>• Inaccurate description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of Design and Access statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposal is not compliant with NPPF or Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Detrimental to and will cause harm to the non-designated heritage assets, the character of the Conservation Area and the Grade II Registered Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No public benefit has been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Closes an important gap in the street scene and would cause a terracing effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will affect views in and out of the Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Over dominant and prominent within the street scene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conservation Officer Vale | Overdevelopment of the site  
| Depth, bulk and scale of proposals are inappropriate  
| Not in keeping or sympathetic to the existing dwelling  
| Un-neighbourly and unacceptable in terms of impact  
| Overbearing and will reduce natural light to no.6 Park Crescent  
| Contravenes the Councils 40-degree rule  
| Side extension will create a ‘tunnel’ effect between no.5 and no.6 |
| Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society | Amended plans  
| Amendments removing 3-storey extension and wrap-around element are welcomed  
| Amendments have not fully addressed original comments  
| Does not preserve or enhance the Conservation area- no public benefit demonstrated  
| Un-neighbourly development  
| Side extension will detract from the street scene and character of the area and will close an important gap between the properties  
| Size and scale of porch/side extension are excessive |
| The Gardens Trust | Original plans  
| Lack of Heritage Statement  
<p>| Urge officers to consider cumulative effect extensions in the area are having on the setting of Albert Park |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Gardens Foundation</td>
<td>Original plans</td>
<td>• The proposed works would have a harmful effect on the historic Victorian Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Abingdon Civic Society</td>
<td>Original plans</td>
<td>• Application should be refused- agree with VoWHDC Conservation Officers comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amended plans</td>
<td>• In light of comments received by Conservation Officer, now happy with the revised scheme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Albert Park Residents Association               | Amended plans   | • The proposals do not preserve or enhance the conservation area  
• The proposal fails to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness  
• The proposal does not enhance or better reveal the significance of the heritage assets in their setting  
• Lack of Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment |
| The Betjeman Society                            | Amended plans   | • Scale and proportion of the proposal would be harmful to the Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Park  
• If permitted, would set a precedent of inappropriate development  
• Proposals are not in keeping with the neighbouring properties |
| Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) | No objections | • No objections subject to condition maintaining parking provision of 3 spaces within the curtilage                                                                                                     |
| Forestry Team Vale                             | No objections   | • No objections subject to a condition requiring compliance with the submitted Tree Report                                                                                                             |
| Contaminated Land Vale                         | No objections   |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 P64/V0422 - Approved (09/03/1964)
Erection of dwelling and garage.

P48/V0011 - Approved (08/02/1949)
Garage Planning Application History

3.2 Pre-application History
None

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Householder development does not fall within the defined scope for potential EIA development.

5.0 MAIN ISSUES

5.1 The relevant planning considerations are the following:
- Heritage assets and design
- Residential amenity
- Parking and highway safety
- Trees

5.2 Heritage assets and design
The application site is a non-designated heritage asset situated within the Abingdon (Albert Park) Conservation Area. It also lies within the setting of the grade II Registered Park and Garden of Albert Park. The design and scale of the development is therefore important in conserving the setting of these heritage assets and the character of the area.

5.3 The NPPF deals with the historic environment in paragraphs 184 to 202. The local planning authority also has specific legal duties with regard to this. The below policies and NPPF paragraphs are considered to be of particular importance in the assessment of this proposal.

5.4 Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states “Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations”

5.5 Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of
whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance”.

5.6 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF 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”.

5.7 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.

5.8 Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this case considerable importance and weight is given to the desirability of protecting or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.9 Saved policy HE1 of the Local Plan 2011 seeks to protect the character and appearance of a conservation area. Policy CP39 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seeks to ensure that new development conserves, and where possible enhances, designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national guidance and legislation. Policy CP37 seeks to ensure good quality design and reflect local distinctiveness. In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.

5.10 Emerging Policy DP36 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 supports the principles set out within CP39 of Part 1 and emerging Policy DP37 seeks to ensure that new development conserves, and where possible enhances the special interest and character and appearance of a Conservation Area.

5.11 Saved Policy HE8 from the adopted Local Plan 2011 states that development within or in the setting of an historic park or garden, will only be permitted where they conserve and cause no harm to the historic character of the site and the features of special interest it possesses.

5.12 The application site, No.5, forms part of an imposing pair of brick Gothic villas, together with No.4 to the south. This villa pair are part of a consciously designed formal layout comprising Park Crescent and share subservient single storey rear service extensions which are of architectural/historic and visual significance. The dwelling is set back from the road within a large rectangular plot with a parking area to the front.

5.13 There is a hierarchy of design significance along Park Crescent, in that the front elevations of the pairs of villas are symmetrical show elevations, clearly
designed to impress, as they front on to Park Crescent and are visible from the public domain. The rear elevations are also symmetrical, but are clearly subsidiary in terms of plainer form, character and materials. The side elevations are lesser in terms of hierarchy of significance being side or flank elevations leading to the rear/service buildings and gardens of the properties, albeit the mock timber-framing to the front gables wraps around that part of the flank walls and is glimpsed from the public domain.

5.14 Albert Park is a Victorian park of compact symmetrical design, laid out in the 1860s along a north/south axis with a central open lawn enclosed by a perimeter shelter belt containing many mature deciduous and coniferous trees. The D shaped Park is bounded by an estate road beyond which lie substantial individually designed houses in their own spacious plots on the north and east and pairs of villas on the west. Spaces between the buildings allow glimpsed views of flank walls between pairs of houses and of the garden plots to the rear. The staggered layout and siting of the pairs of villas on the south west of the crescent is part of the conscious design with the flank entrance to No 5 forward of that of No 6 of the neighbouring pair Nos 6 and 7 to the north.

5.15 The conservation officer in her original response commented that the proposal, which included the 3-storey rear extension and wrap around extension, would harm the special quality of the conservation area, including the built environment and landscape setting. In addition, it would harm the significance of the villa and detract from the overall design aesthetic. In response to the conservation officer comments and concerns raised by the officer, the scheme was amended.

5.16 The latest set of plans show that the proposal has been substantially reduced in size and scale with the 3-storey element being completely removed from the scheme. In addition, the single storey wrap around extension has also been removed and the originally proposed flat roof to the side extension has been replaced with a more traditional lean to style roof.

5.17 The proposed single storey rear extension, which will project to the side of the existing rear service extension, will measure 8.8m at its longest point. This is an increase of 1.1metres in length of the existing extension when measured at its longest point. It is proposed to remove the mono pitch roof part of the existing rear service extension which appears to be a later addition of modest form and significance. The proposed single storey side extension, which will replace the existing side door canopy, will run along the boundary with the neighbouring property no.6, to the north. It will have a length of 6.4m with an additional canopy area projecting a further 1.2m. Overall, this will be set back from the front of the property by 4.4m. In terms of height, the rear extension, which has a contemporary design, with a flat roof, will measure 3.3m. The proposed side extension, with a more traditional lean-to style roof, will measure 3.45m from natural ground level. The proposal will predominantly be built using red facing brickwork and plain clay tile roofing to match the existing dwelling, with crittall glazing proposed for the rear extension to complement its contemporary design.
5.18 The form of the design follows the advice outlined with the council’s adopted Design Guide at DG105. This states that the original building should remain the dominant element of the property whether there has been one extension or several. The effect of any extension should not overwhelm the house from any given viewpoint and that they should use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. Principle DG109 advises that side extensions should generally be set back from the front of the house to retain the proportions of the original building and reduce the visual impact of the join between the existing and new. Point 10.7.4 goes on to explain that this can be particularly important on symmetrical properties or identical semi-detached properties. As the proposed extensions are single storey in height, the side extension has been set back from the front elevation ensuring spaces and views between the properties are maintained avoiding the terracing affect and given that the rear extension projects only 1.1m further than the existing rear service building, the proposed works are subordinate in scale and acceptable in design terms.

5.19 The guide also advocates contemporary additions to existing dwellings. This approach requires high quality design that respects the context of the main dwelling. This proposal is considered to achieve this.

5.20 Concerns have been raised with regards to the proposal causing harm to heritage assets. However, the council’s conservation officer concludes that the proposal causes no harm to heritage assets. Her full comments are contained in appendix 5.

5.21 Concerns have also been raised with regards to the size of the proposed extensions and that a precedent could be set if this application were to be allowed. However, members will be aware that each application is to be considered on its own merits.

5.22 In conclusion, officers consider that the proposal does not cause harm to the non-designated heritage asset, the character and appearance of the conservation area, or the setting of the Grade II Registered Park, and is considered to comply with national and local policy. As no harm has been identified, there is no requirement for public benefit to be demonstrated in accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF. Conditions are recommended for the submission of material samples and various design details prior to commencement development, in order to ensure that high-quality, appropriate materials and finishes would be utilised.

5.23 **Residential Amenity**
Saved policy DC9 of the adopted Local Plan 2011, seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment.

5.24 Emerging Policy DP23 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, states that development proposals should not result in significant adverse impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring uses when considering both individual and cumulative impacts.
5.25 The proposed rear extension will have a relatively low overall height of 3.3m. It will be set 2.4m away from the boundary with the neighbouring property no.6 to the north. It is also important to note, that there is a difference in levels between the application site and the neighbouring property no.6 with no.5 being set approximately 0.5m lower. Given the relatively low overall height of the rear extension and due to this difference in ground levels which will reduce the impact of this element of the proposal, officers are satisfied that no.6 will not be harmed in terms of loss of light or dominance. As the flat roof proposal is lower than the existing pitched roof of the rear service extension, there will be minimal impact upon the adjoining property, no.4.

5.26 The proposed side extension, which will have a modest eaves height of 2.5m and an overall height of 3.5m, will have a width of 2.15m leaving a gap of approximately 0.10m from the shared boundary wall between no.5 and no.6. Given the staggered nature of the plots, the application site no.5, is set further forward than no.6 by approximately 2.2m. As such, the existing door sits further forward than that of the neighbouring property no.5 which has previously had permission for an enclosed porch. The proposed extension will project 1.8m in front of the porch extension at no.6, with an additional canopy measuring 1.2m. Overall, the proposed extension is considered to be subordinate in scale and due to the relative low height of the proposal it will not cause harm to neighbours through either loss of light or dominance.

5.27 **Parking and highway safety**
The proposal does not increase the number of bedrooms within the property, therefore the proposal does not impact on the existing off-street parking provision for the dwelling within the site. The proposal does not alter the existing access. The Highways Liaison Officer has suggested a condition for the provision of 3 car parking spaces, to standard, to be maintained within the curtilage of the site. As the proposal does not increase the number of bedrooms within the property and given that there is sufficient space within the frontage of the site to provide adequate parking provision, it is not considered to be reasonable or necessary to condition this application as such.

5.28 **Trees**
The application is accompanied by a tree survey report prepared by Venners Arboriculture (dated October 2018) that includes an assessment of the arboricultural implications and a tree protection plan. The tree data demonstrates that the proposed extension can be built without adversely affecting any of the existing trees and the tree protection plan provides confirmation that the retained trees will be adequately safeguarded during the construction process. To ensure compliance, it is considered to be reasonable and necessary to condition the implementation of this plan.

5.29 **Community Infrastructure Levy**
The council’s CIL charging schedule was adopted on 1 November 2017. CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area and is primarily
calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. In this case, the proposal contains less than 100 square metres of extra floor space, and therefore the proposal will not be CIL liable.

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 The proposal has been considered with regards to its impact on the character and appearance of the area and the conservation area and the setting of the grade II Registered Park and Garden of Albert Park. The amended scale and design of the scheme has reduced its impact and is now considered to be subordinate in scale and acceptable in design terms. The proposal is also considered acceptable to the conservation officer. The proposal therefore complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policies CP37 and CP39 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Plan 2031, Part 1, emerging policies DP23, DP36 and DP37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2, and saved policies DC5, DC9, HE1 and HE8 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Plan 2011. The works are considered to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and the council’s adopted Design Guide SPD 2015.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:
Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 policies;

CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
CP39 - The Historic Environment
CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction
CP44 - Landscape

Saved Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;

DC5 - Access
DC6 - Landscaping
DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
HE1 - Preservation and Enhancement: Implications for Development
HE8 - Historic Parks and Gardens

A publication draft of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 has been subject to public consultation and Examination and the Inspector’s final report (received 25 June 2019) has found the plan sound. Its policies therefore carry significant weight in decision making and the following policies are material to the consideration of this application:

DP16 – Access
DP23 – Impact of Development on Amenity
DP36 – Heritage Assets
DP37 – Conservation Areas

Other material considerations include government guidance, in particular:

- The National Planning Policy Guidance (March 2014) (NPPG)
- Vale of White Horse Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (March 2015)
- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other Relevant Legislation and guidance

Human Rights Act 1998
The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equality Act 2010
In determining this planning application, the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

Author: Kerry Street
Email: kerry.street@southandvale.gov.uk
Telephone: 01235 422600