

Supplementary Papers

Planning Committee

held in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY
on Wednesday, 27 July 2016 at 6.30 pm

Open to the public including the press

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

To receive notification of any updates since publication of the agenda in the addendum report.



Planning Committee
Wednesday 27 July 2016

Addendum Report

Item 9 – P15/V1304/O – Land at former Didcot A Power Station, Purchase Road, Didcot

Correction to S106 contribution table

The table at paragraph 6.69 is missing the legal agreement monitoring fees for SODC and Vale which should be as follows:

	Vale	South	Amount
Monitoring/Admin	£6,995	£5,662	£12,657
South CIL charge 190 units x 90m2 x £85 (32% AH)	-	£1,453,500	£1,453,500
District Totals	£329,051	£1,509,780	£1,838,831
Overall Total			£5,952,141

Item 10 – P15/V2887/FUL – Land off School Road, West Hanney

Correction to Recommendation

At Paragraph 8.1, the recommendation to approve is subject to *“A S106 agreement being entered into with both the county council and the district council...”*

For this application, officers have decided to use a bipartite Section 106 between the Vale of White Horse and the applicant, securing financial contributions on behalf of the County Council. The County Council will not be a signatory to the Section 106 agreement.

Impact of proposal on West Hanney Conservation Area

The committee report does not specifically reference the impact of the proposal on the West Hanney Conservation Area, nor the setting of listed buildings both within the Conservation Area and, in the case of Lamb Cottage, outside the Conservation Area.

Policy HE1 of the Local Plan 2011 seeks to resist development that affects the setting of a conservation area unless they can be shown to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that area. Policy HE4 seeks to protect the setting of listed buildings on a similar basis.

At the closest point, the application site is around 85 metres from the Conservation Area, separated by the more modern housing in the Croft. Intervisibility between the site and the Conservation Area will be extremely limited due to the intervening housing. When looking towards the Conservation Area from the north and east, the site will be seen in the wider context of the village and again will have only a minor affect.

As such, officers are satisfied that the proposal will not materially affect the character of the Conservation Area, nor the setting of any listed building.

Update on Affordable Housing Provision

At Paras 6.13-6.14, the committee report confirms the original affordable housing provision of 6 units (Plots 1-6) represents 40% of the total number of units but confirms that now only 35% will be sought from the scheme as per the emerging Local Plan. This equates to 5.25 units, with 5 units sought on site and a commuted sum sought for the remaining 0.25 of a unit.

The Council's housing officer has confirmed that Plots 1-4 will remain affordable rented and Plot 5 will be a 3-bed shared ownership property. Plot 6 will be made available on the open market.

Using current market data, the Housing Officer has calculated that the commuted sum for 0.25 of a unit will be £32,175 and this forms part of the draft Section 106 agreement being negotiated with the applicant.

Updated consultation response from drainage engineer

The drainage engineer has formally confirmed in writing that, following the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment, he has no objections to the proposal subject to conditions relating to strategies for surface and foul drainage being required by pre-commencement condition.

Officer Response: Noted, see condition 10 of report which relates to surface water drainage. Thames Water have confirmed no objections to this scheme on foul drainage as capacity exists to accommodate additional flows from this development and, as they are the statutory undertaker for foul drainage, a condition relating to foul drainage is not considered necessary. The connection to the foul sewer network from this development will need to be agreed between Thames Water and the applicant at the appropriate time.

Letter from Mr Dancey circulated to committee members

Committee members will have received an email from Mr Dancey, a neighbour, on Monday evening. The email use comments from the council's urban design officer made on the original application to make a number of criticisms of the amended proposal. The main points were:

- Proposal encroaches on gap between East and West Hanney
- Application represents over-development and the dwellings should have deeper rear gardens
- Principle DG78 of the Design Guide indicates over-intensive housing should be avoided and plot sizes should reflect the prevailing context
- The density of this development is greater than School Road and The Croft
- Limited natural surveillance of the footpath
- Development should be moved northeast to allow more space for gardens.

Officer Response: It should be reiterated that the quotes from the council's urban design officer used by Mr Dancey were made in response to the original proposal for 16 units. Since these comments were made, the amended proposal in front of members tonight has been submitted and the urban design officer has confirmed no objections to it.

Whilst officers accept that the garden sizes are smaller than adjacent housing, they all meet the Design Guide standards of 50 square metres for 2-bed units and 100 square metres for larger 3/4- bed units.

The net density of this proposal (ignoring the access road and public open space) is around 24 dwellings per hectare. This is higher than adjacent developments but lower than the 30 dwellings per hectare required by current and emerging Local Plan policy. Officers consider there is a balance between considerations of character and efficient use of land and that this development strikes an acceptable compromise.

Surveillance of the footpath has been increased in this amendment by providing the public open space immediately adjacent and orientating houses to face this area.

To move the development northeast would result in further encroachment on the gap between East and West Hanney, increasing landscape impact.

Item 11 – P16/V0635/FUL – Land adjacent to Church Farm, West Hanney

Update

As the scheme is within the setting St James Church which is grade II* listed, Historic England are required to be consulted. They have no comments to make on the scheme.

Item 12 – P16/V0637/FUL – Land adjacent to Church Farm, West Hanney

Update

Further to ongoing discussions between the applicant's consultant and the council's housing development officer, a commuted sum of £400,000 towards off-site affordable housing is now offered as part of this application instead of the £300,000 quoted in the main report. This level of sum would be acceptable for a site of this size. This does not alter the recommendation for the proposal, which is for refusal due to the lack of on-site affordable housing.

As the scheme is within the setting St James Church which is grade II* listed, Historic England are required to be consulted. They have no comments to make on the scheme

Item 13 – P16/V0531/FUL – Land to the south of Longcot Road and east of Silver Street, Fernham

Update

Two further conditions are recommended in addition to those listed at section 8.0 of the committee report:

Condition 16 pertains to waste collection from the highway. The condition requests the applicant indicates where the bins will be stored on collection day. This will enable officers to ascertain the implications of additional waste bins left for collection adjacent to the highway.

Condition 17 relates to the management and maintenance of the land. The condition requests that, prior to the commencement of development, the applicant provides details of:

- The design and layout of the public open space, allotments and community orchard;
- The management of the land and who will undertake this; and
- Maintenance arrangements for the future.

Item 14 – P16/V0117/FUL – 76 West Way, Botley

Correction to report

In the introduction at paragraph 1.1 it is stated that the application is referred to planning committee as the recommendation conflicts with the views of the parish council.

In fact, the application is referred to planning committee as more than four letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents (six in total).

The parish council's formal response to the application is one of no objections, but asked that the Vale's planning officers considered whether the on-site parking was sufficient and would allow safe movements from and onto the on-site parking areas.

The County Council highways liaison officer has raised no objections to the amended plans submitted.

The full comments of both the parish council and the County Council highways liaison officer can be viewed on the council's website at: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

Paragraph 2.2 also makes reference to documentation being available to view online, the correct address is: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

Item 15 – P16/V1171/FUL – Old Yeomany House, 27 Wallingford Street, Wantage

No updates.

Item 16 – P16/V0955/HH - Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course, Carswell

No updates.

Item 17 – P16/V0922/HH and P16/V0923/LB - Beaulieu Court Cottage, Sunningwell

Update

Subsequent amended plans have been received which show that a larger section of the existing chimney stack will be retained.

The Conservation officer has commented to confirm that the amended plans are acceptable.