

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V1388/EX
APPLICATION TYPE	EXTENSION OF TIME
REGISTERED	19.6.2013
PARISH	ABINGDON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Jeanette Halliday Jim Halliday
APPLICANT	Leafield Care Home
SITE	Leafield Care Home, 32A Springfield Drive, Abingdon, OX14 1JF
PROPOSAL	Extension of time limit to planning permission P10/V0927.
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	449205/198007
OFFICER	Mr Peter Brampton

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Leafield Care Home is a privately run care home located within a built up residential area of Abingdon. The building spans the end of a small cul-de-sac and faces onto the street. Amenity space is found to the eastern side and rear of the building. Parking is located on the western side. A location plan is **attached** at appendix 1.

The building is two-storeys and is of brick and concrete tile construction. It has previously been extended, with additional land sought in the mid 2000s to extend the curtilage of the site

- 1.3 The application comes to committee as Abingdon Town Council objects to the proposal.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks an extension of time of a planning permission originally granted in 2007 and renewed in 2010, for extensions to the care home (P07/V0510 and P10/V0927). These extensions consist of three single storey extensions at the eastern end of the care home, to provide ensuite bathrooms to five existing rooms, a two-storey side extension at the western end to provide four new rooms, and a single storey rear extension to provide a laundry. The extensions will be of a simple pitched roof design, to match the existing care home, and constructed in matching materials.
- 2.2 Extracts from the applications plans are **attached** at appendix 2. Documents submitted in support of the application, included the design and access statement are available on the council's website.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 **Abingdon Town Council** – Recommend refusal – *“The committee considered that since the original planning permission had been granted, there had been new development to a neighbouring property which materially altered the planning context of this application, and in particular meant the implementation of the proposals would result in over-development of the site, particularly in relation to the massing of the proposed development. Consequently, the development would be in contravention of Policy DC1...of the saved policy of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Therefore, members objected to the application to extend the time limit for planning permission.”*

Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) - No objections, subject to previously recommended condition relating to parking being carried over to any new consent.

Neighbour Representations – None received

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 [P10/V0927](#) - Approved (13/07/2010)

Extensions to existing building to provide new accommodation, laundry room and en-suite toilet facilities

[P07/V0510](#) - Approved (02/06/2007)

Erection of a two storey extension and a single storey laundry extension with associated parking.

[P04/V1844](#) - Approved (11/01/2005)

Proposed en-suite facilities.

Also of relevance to this application is a planning permission granted in January 2013 for the erection of a new dwelling on land adjacent to 32 Springfield Drive (P12/V2536/FUL).

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;

GS1 - Developments in Existing Settlements

DC1 - Design

DC5 - Access

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Issues

6.1 When considering an application to extend the time to commence works on a previously approved scheme, the only considerations can be whether there has been a material change in planning policy, or in the circumstances of the site and its surroundings, that would change the overall recommendation.

Planning policy

6.2 The 2010 application was considered under the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. The relevant policies, referenced in Section 5 above, were valid at the time of that application and remain valid today. They are all saved policies and have been found consistent with the NPPF.

6.3 The major change in national planning policy since the grant of the previous application has been the publication of the NPPF. However, the relevant local plan policies are consistent with the NPPF, and so this has not changed the assessment made in 2010.

6.4 Overall, there has been no significant change in the policies used to assess this proposal that would warrant a change in stance on the merits of this application.

Site circumstances

6.5 Abingdon Town Council has objected to this application. Their view is that the recent granting of planning permission for a semi-detached house on land to the side of no.32

Springfield Drive constitutes a material change in site circumstances. They contend this house, combined with the extensions proposed for the care home; represent an overdevelopment that warrants a refusal of this application. Officers do not agree with this assessment.

- 6.6 The new dwelling is currently under construction. It replaces a wall and detached garage that previously served no.32. The garage immediately abutted the northern side boundary of the site, which is the shared boundary with the care home. By contrast, the new house is set marginally further away from this boundary.
- 6.7 This new house was permitted in 2013 and appears as a natural extension to the terrace. It sits a comparable distance from the care home as the end-terrace house on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac. It does not appear as an over-development of the site, or out of keeping with the area.
- 6.8 In terms of the relationship between the care home and the new dwelling, it is important to highlight that the proposed extensions on this western end of the building are relatively minor additions. They only provide small cloakrooms for the five rooms in this end of the building. The largest of these extensions will provide less than four square metres of additional footprint. This is to a building with a ground floor footprint of nearly 400 square metres. Thus, the increase in footprint from these extensions closest to the new house at No.32 is extremely minor.
- 6.9 Similarly, the increase in massing at this end of the building is very small. The extensions will be subservient to the care home and will not compete with views of the new house on the adjacent site. The gap between the new extensions at the care home and the new house will be approximately 3.5 – 4 metres, not untypical in this part of Abingdon. Given the single storey nature of the extensions, a reasonable gap between the end of the terrace and the care home will remain and the definition between the two buildings will remain.
- 6.10 The two larger extensions are located on the far eastern side of the building, well away from the site of the new house. There will be no visual relationship between these extensions and the new house. There is ample space for both these extensions within the site, without harming the character of the area.
- 6.11 Overall, officers are satisfied the erection of the new house on land at No.32 has no material impact on the ability of this scheme to be implemented effectively. The application site remains as it was at the time of the initial consent, and the overall gaps between the care home and its neighbours will remain largely as before. The overall impact of this proposal on the character of the area will be acceptable, in accordance with policy DC1 of the adopted local plan.
- 6.12 There is no indication that works on this scheme have started, or are likely to start soon. Thus, it is appropriate to grant an extension of time, allowing the applicants three further years to implement the proposal. All the conditions attached to the previous consent are carried across to this new permission. These are summarised in Section 8 and cover materials, the provision of adequate parking and restrictions on new windows in the two-storey side extension and the operating hours of the laundry room. These conditions remain necessary to make this scheme acceptable.
- 7.0 **CONCLUSION**
- 7.1 There has been no material change in planning policy, or in the circumstances of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, an extension of time for the planning permission is

acceptable.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

To grant planning permission subject to:

- 1 : Commencement three years
- 2 : Approved plans
- 3 : Materials to match existing
- 4 : Permitted development restriction - first floor windows
- 5 : Parking as per approved plans
- 6 : Laundry opening hours - not between 22:00 and 07:00

Author: Peter Brampton
Contact Number: 01491 823751
Email: peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk