

Supplementary Papers

Planning Committee

held in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY
on Wednesday, 11 November 2015 at 6.30 pm

Open to the public including the press

5. **Urgent business** (Pages 2 - 7)

To receive the addendum report as an update since publication of the agenda for the planning committee on 11 November 2015.



Planning Committee
Wednesday 11 November 2015

Addendum Report

Item 9

Planning application P15/V2043/FUL – Land at Hill Farm, Didcot

No Update.

Item 10

Planning application P15/V1860/FUL – White Horse Leisure Centre, Abingdon

No Update

Item 11

Planning application P15/V0554/FUL – 52 Sellwood Road, Abingdon

Application update

Email communication received from the objectors to the application, making the following points;

- Building preparatory works have been undertaken, with site safety fencing and metallic storage container installed
- The original 1-3 Beech Lane sign was removed and replaced in early May with a new official Vale sign for 1-6 Beech Lane. Subsequently, following representations and discussions with the Vale, this sign had a no.3 sticker placed over the no.6.
- At the time of the alteration to the Beech Lane sign another application was being processed to separate the annexe at Lanes End into a separate residence. However, the annexe change was on permitted in June.
- Originally only four properties were notified of the application. The planners were advised that residents at 1-3 Beech Lane should have consulted, along with residents of South Avenue and Sovereign Vale as land owners. To date neither residents of South Avenue or Sovereign have been consulted.
- The case officer's report quite clearly omits any mention of numerous applications made in this small back garden enclave to the rear of 50-54 Sellwood Road.
- This particular back garden environ has experienced controversial multi-faceted planning history involving inter alia, retrospective planning approval. It is apparent from the history that a certain amount of prejudging appears to have been taken place.
- Concerns that planners are acting outside their current planning remit and responsibilities and their failure to fully address our detailed material planning concerns is a real worry and concerns to local residents.

- There seems to be a worrying lack of transparency and due process in this matter and an underlying council policy of approving back garden development however tentative, overbearing and residentially sensitive to noise and lack of privacy, etc., under the mantra of housing pressure due to “absence of a new Adopted Local Plan”.
- It is apparent from the minor amendments to the application that the planners attempt to address local resident’s cogent and detailed material objections is at best half-hearted and in reality flawed and outside their remit under the current local plan guidelines.
- In our opinion it is clear that the council should comprehensively reject the application.

Officer response

In response to the points raised by the objectors, the following comments are made;

- The installation of safety fencing and a storage container, and the undertaking of any works prior to the determination of the application, is undertaken at the applicant’s risk. Such work is not illegal, but may need to be reversed if planning permission is refused.
- The change to the Beech Lane sign is not material to the determination of this application. Such a change is not facilitated through the planning department.
- Further to being advised that 1-3 Beech Lane had not been consulted, consultations were sent to these properties. After the scheme had been formally amended, all those originally consulted, together with those who had commented on the original proposal, and 1-3 Beech Lane were re-consulted. The residents of South Avenue which back onto the parking area were not consulted as they do not adjoin the red line of the application site. Sovereign Vale, as land owners of Beech Lane, have not been consulted as formal notice has been served on them by the applicant.
- As regards surrounding development the following dwellings have been permitted;

Application no.	Current address	Date of decision
P15/V0306/FUL	The Annexe, Lanes End, Sellwood Road, Abingdon	10 June 2015
P10/V2214	1-3 Willow Court, Abingdon	24 February 2010
P05/V0249	1-3 Beech Lane, Abingdon	14 July 2005
P02/V0762/RM	Lanes End, Sellwood Road, Abingdon	8 July 2002

- All the comments received as part of the consultation process have been taken into consideration when assessing the application and making the recommendation. For the reasons outlined in the report it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Application update

Planning Committee members' attention is drawn to the fact that a letter of support from the agent has been circulated directly to them.

Item 12

Planning Reference P15/V1865/HH – 75 Lower Radley

No Update

Item 13

Planning Reference P15/V2020/FUL – 19 Church Street, Wantage

No Update

Item 14

Planning Reference P15/V2078/HH – 2 Norfolk Cottages, Radley, Abingdon, Oxon

Application Update

A further letter of objection has been received from Mr Platts of no.8 Norfolk Close on 10/11/2015. The objection lists concerns over:

- Over development
- Building design
- Layout and siting
- Un-neighbourly development
- Light
- Solar panels

The objection also suggests errors in the Planning Officer's report, stating that the measurement between no.2 Norfolk Cottages and no.8 Norfolk Close are incorrect. He also states that in paragraph 1.1 of the Officer's report it lists the height of the proposed building as 7.9 metres, and in 6.3 it is reported as 7.7 metres.

Officer's Response

The initial bullet point objections have been addressed in the Officer's report.

As relayed to Mr Platts:

- 1) The distance between the rear of number 2 Norfolk Cottages and the rear of 8 Norfolk Close (at their closest points) has been measured multiple times. Mr Platts initial comment regarding distance is acknowledged, however having measured it on both the application plans submitted and the Council's internal

software systems, the measurement is as reflected in the report and the distance deemed sufficient.

- 2) With regard to the height of the proposed extension. In paragraph 1.1 the report states that the overall height of the **existing** property is not exceeding 7.9 metres. In paragraph 6.3 the report states that the **proposed** first floor extension will have an overall height of 7.7 metres.

Application Update

The following additional condition is proposed in order to safeguard the privacy of no.8 Norfolk Close and neighbouring dwellings.

“Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, the new first-floor window on the east elevation shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall be fixed shut, apart from a top-hung opening vent only. Thereafter, the window(s) shall remain obscure glazed with top-hung opening vents only. Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or the equivalent provisions of any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no additional first-floor windows shall be inserted in the east elevation of the dwelling without the prior grant of planning permission.

Reason: To protect the privacy of adjacent dwellings (Policy DC9 of the adopted Local Plan).”

Item 15

Planning Reference P15/V1673/FUL – Blandy’s Farm, Bassett Road, Letcombe Regis

No Update

Item 16

Planning Reference P15/V2165/HH – 5a The Glebe, West Challow

No Update

Item 17

Planning Reference P15/V2094/HH – Pear Tree Cottage, Fawler Road, Kingston Lisle

No Update

Item 18

Planning Reference P15/V1636/FUL – Matrix Arts Centre, 15-17 The Nursery, Sutton Courtenay

No Update

Item 19

Planning Reference P15/V2176/FUL – Land to the rear of 28 Ormond Road, Wantage

Report Clarifications

1. Site is not used as a taxi rank as referred to in the report, but as a taxi depot/storage.
2. The site is therefore not classified as a brownfield site as referred to in the report but would be classified as garden land.
3. The site will not create a new access as referred to in the report but improvements to the existing access are proposed.

Officers Comments

These corrections do not change the assessment of this application, given the sustainable town centre location and therefore the recommendation remains to approve.

Item 20

Planning Reference P15/V1938/FUL – 219 Saxton Road, Abingdon

No Update

Item 21

Planning Reference P15/V1721/HH – The House, All Saints Lane, Sutton Courtenay

No Update