

Supplementary Papers

Planning Committee

held in The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY
on Wednesday 28 September 2016 at 6.30 pm

Open to the public including the press

5. Urgent business (Pages 2 - 8)

To consider the addendum report, which sets out updates to the officers' reports on planning applications being considered at this meeting.



Planning Committee
Wednesday 28 September 2016

Addendum Report

Item 8 – P15/V2560/FUL – Land to the east of Portway Cottages, Reading Road, East Hendred

Additional Condition

Paragraph 6.57 of the report states, *“Thames Water have identified that there is a lack of capacity within the network to accommodate the additional flows from this development. Thus, a Grampian condition is necessary to secure details of sewer upgrades prior to work commencing on site and for those agreed upgrades to be implemented prior to occupation of the first dwelling”*

Due to an officer oversight, this condition is not included at Section 8 as part of the recommendation but it should be. The full wording of the condition will be:

“Development shall not commence above slab level until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by, the local planning authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the drainage works referred to in the strategy have been completed

Reason: To ensure the effective and sustainable drainage of the site in the interests of public health and the avoidance of flooding (Policies DC9 and DC14 of the adopted Local Plan).”

Policy Update

Members should note that the consultation on the modifications to the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part One recently ended. 178 consultation responses were received and these are available to view on our website and have been passed to the Local Plan Inspector to inform his work on his Final Report, which is due in November.

Core Policy 4 of the emerging Plan – “Meeting our housing needs” outlines the spatial strategy for new housing development across the settlement hierarchy of the district.

Main Modification 5 proposes to insert the following wording at the end of Core Policy 4: *“Development in open countryside will not be appropriate unless specifically supported by other relevant policies as set out in the development plan or national policy.”*

This is an important clarification to the assessment of this proposal. In relation to the supply of housing, it is Officer’s opinion that once the emerging local plan is adopted the council will be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land (7.2 years).

Therefore, at this stage, this application is recommended for approval

Further Consultation Responses

Neighbours - Since the publication of committee papers, two further consultation responses from neighbours have been received. These reiterate concerns about increased traffic on local roads making turning onto the A417 difficult, the detached location of the site north of the A417 encouraging private car use and the achievability of the pedestrian crossing.

Officer Response: These comments are noted, and the issues raised assessed in the report.

Drainage Engineer

Foul Drainage - Thames Water has requested a negatively-worded condition to cover off-site improvements.

Surface Water - Further to my comments of 29 April, drawing CV8140983/102C now indicates the full extent of the ditch works to the north of the site. Access to, and future maintenance arrangements for this, should be included with management proposals to be submitted.

RECOMMENDED CONDITION

The detailed Flood Risk Assessment should include:

- a) Full details of a sustainable surface water drainage system based on ground permeability tests and a full consideration of groundwater flooding issues, including historic events.
- b) Design calculations related to greenfield and developed site runoff with appropriate climate change allowance, storage I attenuation areas sizing, and suitable off-site drainage outfalls;
- c) Full Suds proposals based on the above;
- d) Exceedance flood flow routing;
- e) Timescale for the works including phasing;
- f) A full future management and maintenance plan for the Suds features, including arrangements for any off-site watercourses which are required to ensure the efficient functioning of the on-site Suds.

Officer Response: Noted. The recommended surface water drainage condition will be and agreed as part of condition 11 of recommendation.

As per Para. 6.57 of the report, but not included in Section 8, a Grampian condition is necessary to cover foul drainage and is referenced above.

Item 9 – P16/V1234/O – Land north of Manor Close, Chilton

Tree Preservation Order

Members should be aware that, following consideration of the amendment to the application, the council's Forestry Officer has served a Tree Preservation Order on all of the trees within the site.

Further Consultation Responses

Chilton Parish Council – Objection received to amendment. Main concerns summarised thus:

- Circa 5% increase in housing stock, “*to the historic village of Chilton to the east of the A34*”, is comparable to other appeal decisions nationally where the proposal has been considered “major” development in the AONB and been rejected. This application should be considered in this context, not incorporating the Chilton Fields development on the western side of the A34.
- Proposed development would remove an important landscape feature that separates the village from the A34 slip roads
- Greater weight should be applied to the emerging Local Plan following completion of the consultation into the modifications. This was the argument presented by the council at the Lower Road appeal (P16/V0660/O – 40 units) and the officers report is inconsistent with that
- Removal of trees on site will increase light pollution from car headlights for new residents
- Increased pressure on sewerage system

Officer Response – Objections noted.

- In terms of the proportionate increase this development would represent, the report outlines this figures based on the parish-wide housing stock to be consistent with the methodology of the 2011 census. As outlined in the report, what constitutes “major” development in the AONB is a balanced assessment of a number of factors on a case-by-case basis. Officers remain satisfied this is not “major” development in the AONB.
- There are no objections from the councils Landscape Architect to the loss of the field.
- At the Lower Road appeal, a scheme of 40 houses, the council argued that the application represented “major” development and so the council's case was made under this scenario, which effects the weight the council applied to emerging Local Plan policies in the planning balancing exercise. The decision on this appeal is still pending. Officers remain satisfied this application is not “major” development on the AONB.
- There have been no objections from the council's environmental health team to light pollution affecting residential amenity from this proposal.
- Condition 14 of the recommendation requires a foul drainage strategy to be agreed, in line with the consultation response of Thames Water.

Oxfordshire County Council Highways – Holding objection removed

- Site Plan confirms access bell mouth is acceptable

- Tracking plans showing vehicular manoeuvrability within site are acceptable, including for refuse vehicles
- Amended site plan shows pedestrian/cycle connectivity is maintained alongside work on slip roads
- Parking provision is acceptable
- Speed calming remains necessary due to straight alignment of access road.
- Conditions and Section 106 financial contributions remain as before

Officer Response – Noted. Holding objection from Waste Management team remains about refuse vehicle manoeuvrability and is covered by condition 9 of the recommendation. Speed calming measures are covered by condition 7 of the recommendation.

Waste Management Officer – Manoeuvrability for refuse vehicles needs to be demonstrated for the larger 11.6 metre long vehicles the council now uses to collect waste. Requests confirmation trees will not conflict with the refuse vehicle.

Officer Response – Noted. OCC Highways use an 11.4 metre long vehicle for the purposes of vehicle tracking plans, but the council now uses 11.6 metre long vehicles. Whilst the increase in length is minimal, Condition 9 of the recommendation will require updated manoeuvrability plans to show the larger vehicle can turn within the site. There are no concerns that trees will significantly affect refuse vehicles using the site.

Forestry Officer – *“The application now demonstrates that the layout can be achieved without compromising the belt of trees to the northern boundary. The amended layout indicates that the internal road has been moved to the south with sufficient room to be able to accommodate the existing tree belt. There is a discrepancy between the layout plan and the arboricultural data concerning the groups of trees to the eastern boundary. In my previous memorandum (22 June 2016) I set out the case for the retention of this group of trees within any amendments.”*

This appears to have been accepted by the applicant as the trees are shown on the layout as being retained but this changed position has not been updated within the arboricultural information. Confirmation has been sought with the applicant as regards the satisfactory retention and I welcome the position that the trees are to be retained.”

Officer Response – Noted. The agent has confirmed that the eastern boundary trees will be retained and this will be covered as part of condition 5 of the recommendation and any subsequent reserved matters application for the landscaping of the site.

Landscape Architect – *“Amendments address drainage, highways and trees. No additional landscape comments.”*

Officer Response – Noted.

Neighbour Representations – Three further consultation responses from neighbours have been received since publication of papers, reiterating concerns

about major development within the AONB, the loss of a greenfield site, harm to the character of the village, sewer capacity, increased traffic, noise pollution and loss of trees

Officer Response: These comments are noted, and the issues raised assessed in the report.

Item 10 – P16/V0446/FUL – Crossroads Garage, Faringdon Road, Southmoor

Correction to report

Paragraph 6.9 of the report should read.... each side elevation of the building would be around 12.2 metres deep at two storey level... not 12.2 metres high.

Item 11 – P16/V1101/FUL – Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course, Carswell

No updates.

Item 12 – P16/V1101/FUL – Horseshoe Cottage, Bourton

Further Consultation Responses

Bourton Parish Council – “*In view of the concerns about parking in the centre of the village and the issues experienced with emergency services access, the Parish Council would like to keep their objection on file please.*”

Also, there is some disagreement with the statement by the agent that “the parking to the rear of Horseshoe Cottage is an informal arrangement, and historically the cottage has never had any off street parking”. The previous two owners of Horseshoe Cottage have certainly used this space to park their vehicles so it is not really accurate to state that Horseshoe Cottage has never had any off-street parking”.

Officer Response: These comments are noted, and the issues raised assessed in the report.

Ward Councillors - Councillor Simon Howell & Councillor Elaine Ware Have provided the following joint statement;

“A number of residents have raised concerns regarding this application. The proposal to convert the existing structure into a two storey holiday let does indeed raise a number of issues. The prime concerns being the increase in height and the overshadowing that this will cause particularly to No.6 of the Alms Houses.”

The officer’s report and submitted plans do not make it clear that the existing building will see the back wall completely replaced and the side wall increased in height as well as the main roof. It is the side wall that will have a considerable impact on No.6.

From the proposed plans the front of the existing building will be replaced with large fully glazed windows/doors which is certainly not in keeping with the surrounding properties.

Parking has been raised as a significant issue. Bourton is a small village with no bus service or local infrastructure. Residents rely on the use of cars to access basic facilities such as the doctors surgery and shops with the nearest located in Shrivenham. Additional cars albeit one or two will only add to the ongoing parking problems in the centre of the village.

It is appreciated that the proposal includes parking for one vehicle but the allocated area is tight and in our opinion would only be suitable for a relatively small vehicle. The current informal parking arrangement for the residents of Horseshoe Cottage will obviously cease should planning permission be granted.

We ask that you consider very carefully the points raised above and those of local residents and Bourton Parish Council before finalising your decision”.