

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber, Abbey House,
Abingdon on Wednesday, 1 February, 2012
at 6.30pm



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chair), John Woodford, Roger Cox, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Eric Batts, Sandy Lovatt, Helen Pighills, John Amys and Kate Precious.

Substitute Members: Councillor John Amys

Other Members: Councillors Ron Mansfield and Charlotte Dickson.

Officers: Susan Harbour, Martin Deans, Laura Hudson, Sarah Commins and Mike Gilbert.

Number of members of the public: 60

PI.142 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman explained the committee's procedures and protocols to the visitors; in particular, he asked the public to remain quiet during the proceedings and not to talk to members or offices whilst the committee was in session. He requested that mobile phones were switched off and explained the fire evacuation procedure.

PI.143 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Bill Jones sent his apologies and Councillor John Amys attended as his substitute.

PI.144 MINUTES

RESOLVED

To adopt the minutes of the committee meeting held on 4 January 2012 and agree that the chairman sign them.

PI.145 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In addition to the table below, all members of the committee declared a personal interest in that they knew Councillors Fiona Roper and Charlotte Dickson who were both speaking in objection to item 8, Newbury Street, in a personal capacity

Item	Councillor/s	Nature of interest	Reason
8	Roger Cox	Personal	Knows Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent
	Jerry Patterson	Personal	Knows Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent
	Jenny Hannaby	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council but took no part in discussions on this item
	John Amys	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council, but not member of its planning committee
	John Morgan	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council and of its planning committee but took no part in discussion on this item
	Robert Sharp	Personal	Knows owners of this site
	Fiona Roper	Personal and prejudicial	Neighbour of application site
	Charlotte Dickson	Personal and prejudicial	Neighbour of application site
9	Jenny Hannaby	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council but took no part in discussions on this item. Lives near to this site.
	John Amys	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council, but not member of its planning committee
	John Morgan	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council and of its planning committee but took no part in discussion on this item
10	Roger Cox	Personal	Knows Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent
	Jerry Patterson	Personal	Knows Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent
	Jenny Hannaby	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council, was present at the discussion of this item.

	John Amys	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council, but not member of its planning committee
	John Morgan	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council and of its planning committee but took no part in discussion on this item
	Margaret Turner	Personal	Knows objector, Terry Randall
11	Roger Cox	Personal	Knows Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent
	Jerry Patterson	Personal	Knows Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent
12	Jerry Patterson	Personal	Member of Kennington Parish Council, but not a member of its planning committee
	Bob Johnston	Personal	Member of Kennington Parish Council but not a member of its planning committee
	Eric Batts	Personal	Knows neighbour of the applicant
14	Helen Pighills	Personal	Member of Abingdon Town Council, but not member of its planning committee
	Sandy Lovatt	Personal	Member of Abingdon Town Council, but not member of its planning committee

PI.146 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A list of speakers for the agenda items was tabled at the meeting.

PI.147 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS

None

PI.148 MATERIALS

Chilton Fields Development

Resolved: (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

To agree the use of the Pennine concrete interlocking tile (which gives an appearance of smaller plain tiles once laid on the roofs) in both the cottage red colour and the slate grey

colour. The planning committee would like a mix of other colours to be made available as part of the scheme.

The submitted Galloway (Double Roman) style concrete interlocking tile was not acceptable to the planning committee.

**PI.149 LAND TO THE REAR OF 46 NEWBURY STREET, WANTAGE.
DEMOLITION OF 46 NEWBURY STREET AND ERECTION OF 23
UNITS COMPRISING 19 HOUSES AND FOUR FLATS WITH 40%
AFFORDABLE HOUSING. 11/01520/FUL & 11/01521/CON**

The officer introduced her report on this item which had been deferred from the last meeting, to enable the applicant and the county highways engineer to give further consideration to the proposed access arrangements.

Rachel Nixon, from Oxfordshire County Council highways, spoke about the highways issues relating to this proposed development. She said that it was acceptable with appropriate conditions relating to vision splays and a minimum 1 metre wide rumble strip.

Doug Jackson from Wantage Town Council spoke in opposition to this proposed development. The town council considers that the highways issues are more problematic than have been given credit.

Councillors Fiona Roper and Charlotte Dickson both declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as neighbours of the application site. In accordance with the provisions in the councillors' code of conduct they addressed the committee as objectors to the application and withdrew from the room during the committee's consideration of, and voting on, this item.

- They considered that there is a surplus of housing in Wantage and Grove. They thought that the Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP) is anomalous and should be amended; the proposed site is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- There are traffic issues which could create a hazard for pedestrians and, in particular, for children coming to and from school.
- The amendments to the vision splays do not address pedestrian visibility.
- They were concerned about three yew trees which are protected and which are being removed as part of the scheme.

Steven Sensecall (Kemp & Kemp), the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. He outlined the benefits of the scheme and how it had been amended to take into consideration local concerns.

John Morgan, a ward councillor, then spoke in opposition to this application. He raised the issue that the IHSP is not actually a policy and is not currently agreed. There will be 450 children going to school and having to walk across the site entrance, where members still had concerns about the vision splays. The proposed access to, and egress from, the site were not suitable.

The committee had a detailed discussion on this proposed development with input, where appropriate from officers. The main points covered were as follows:

- The draft ISHP is not being discussed in relation to this application

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

- The yew trees with the protection orders are being removed: they are of poor quality and the tree officer is content with their removal
- There is no expert highways advice which provides justification for a refusal on highways grounds available at the present time, although this could be sought from an independent highways consultant
- There maybe other ways to improve safety on this road which could be considered by the appropriate bodies such as introducing a 20 mph speed limit
- Whether the leisure centre next door would cause a light and noise problem for the residents of the proposed development.

A motion moved and seconded to further defer this application to get an independent highways report commissioned, on being put, was declared lost. **(For 3; Against 8; Abstentions 4)**

RESOLVED (For 7; Against 6; Abstentions 2)

To authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman and vice chairman, to grant planning permission and conservation area consent to the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman and vice chairman. subject to the prior completion of a section 106 agreement with both the county council and district council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure the affordable housing, and also subject to the following conditions:

1. TL1 – Time limit
2. MC2 – Material samples – (panels on site and to match Stiles Court on plots 15 – 23)
3. MC9 – Building details – windows, doors, rainwater goods, etc
4. Restriction on permitted development (plots 15 –19 only)
5. RE28 – Obscure glazing (upper floor windows to north elevation of plot 14)
6. MC24 – Drainage details
7. MC29 – Sustainable drainage
8. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted floor risk assessment ref: HH4100197/HBG/006 issue 3 prepared by Glanville Consultants dated 8 September 2011.
9. LS1 – Landscaping scheme (Submission)
10. LS2 – Landscaping scheme (Implementation)
11. LS4 – Tree protection
12. Details of construction of the roadway around the Beech Tree.
13. Prior to the commencement of the development full details of the proposed method of removal of the existing parking area around the mature beech tree shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
14. RE6 – Submission of boundary details (including alterations to the front wall of the site).
15. RE17 – Slab levels
16. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the scheme of mitigation outlined in the Bat Survey Report dated June 2011 and the additional amended bat and bird mitigation strategy in all respects. Any variation to the mitigation shall first be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once the works are complete a letter confirming that they have been carried out in accordance with the approved details shall be submitted by the project ecologist.
17. HY1 – Access details (submission including visibility splays)
18. HY7 – Car parking in accordance with approved plan.

19. HY11 – Turning space in accordance with approve plan.
20. HY12 – New Estate Roads (works in accordance with County Specification)
21. Submission of construction traffic management plan.
22. Prior to the commencement of the development, including demolition, a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare an archaeological written scheme of investigation relating to the application site which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
23. Prior to the commencement of the development and following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 22, a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
24. Single communal satellite dish only on plots 15 –23 (details to be submitted)

Conservation Area Consent

RESOLVED (For 9; Against 1; Abstentions 5)

To grant conservation area consent subject to the following condition:

1. TL4 – Time Limit

PI.150 "BROADWATER", MANOR ROAD, WANTAGE. OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE MAXIMUM OF 18 UNITS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS INCLUDING DEMOLITION, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS ROAD AND LANDSCAPING (RE-SUBMISSION OF REFUSED APPLICATION 11/01453/OUT). 11/02935/OUT

The officer's report was introduced and described the outline application. The proposal was the same as a previous application considered by the planning committee in September 2011, which had been refused. The committee was advised that an appeal hearing was scheduled for 21 February 2012 regarding that decision and that the committee was being asked to consider the proposal again ahead of the hearing.

The committee was advised that the officer's report partly relied on the draft Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP). However, the IHSP should not be taken into consideration by the committee when reaching their decision as it was to be informal supplementary planning guidance and had not yet been approved. However, the committee should still consider the issues raised by the IHSP: councils are required to maintain a supply of deliverable sites which are sufficient to deliver their housing targets for the next five years (Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing (PPS3)). If a council has less than five years supply of deliverable housing sites, they should take steps to improve housing supply, including considering planning applications for housing more favourably. The Vale of White Horse District Council is currently short of the required five-year housing land supply. The IHSP (draft) gives a clear indication of the council's "direction of travel" and is intended to inform decision making in the short term. Therefore, the officer's recommendation should not be seen as reliant on the IHSP (draft) as outlined in several paragraphs of the report but, instead, is made due to the current lack of a five year supply of housing land.

Doug Jackson, a Wantage Town Council councillor, spoke in objection to the application. He was concerned that, put together with the proposed development in Newbury Street, there would be 41 new residential units in this area of Wantage, which would put stress on the local infrastructure; he was particularly concerned about potential drainage problems with this site.

Simon Leech also spoke in objection to this application. Notwithstanding the draft IHSP and need for a five year housing land supply, the grounds on which the previous application had been refused still remained. Nothing had changed since the previous presentation to planning committee.

The proposed development was in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which was afforded the highest level of landscape protection. He felt that there was a good chance that a planning committee refusal would be upheld on appeal. The Grove airfield site would deliver at least 500 houses within the next five years and therefore this site was not required. The Local Plan did not suggest any AONB sites for potential development, and should still be the key document in decision making.

Councillor Charlotte Dickson, ward councillor, spoke in objection to this proposed development. She felt that developers were “taking advantage” of the requirement to provide additional housing and she was concerned about parking, road safety and schools in the area.

The applicant’s agent Peter Lawson (Turley Associates) spoke in favour of the application. He said that there was no evidence that the Grove airfield site would deliver 500 houses in the timeframe required. The situation has changed since the last refusal due to the IHSP (draft) and the reasons which have given rise to it. This site satisfies the selection criteria for the IHSP and he felt that it should be considered favourably as it is not on green belt land. He considered that the proposed development would have no material impact on the AONB.

The committee then went on to debate this application at length. Issues which were debated included the following:

- The Council has proactively solicited submissions from developers in light of the IHSP (draft)
- There is a shortfall of currently identified housing land within the Vale (excluding the Grove airfield site).
- The AONB was last reviewed in 1972
- The Grove airfield site is allocated for development in the Local Plan and the outline planning application is expected to be submitted any day.
- There is already too much street parking in relation to the nearby school.
- Use of the all weather pitch at the sports centre would create a loss of amenity for people who live in the proposed houses
- There is a holding objection on drainage
- There are infrastructure issues associated with this development
- There are concerns about the habitats of bats which a previous report confirmed are in this area
- This proposed development would need 22 conditions attached to it, which demonstrates some of the complexities and controversies associated with it.
- The local school is already oversubscribed

Overall, the committee decided that the situation had not materially changed since the last time the application was refused (see below). The IHSP was a draft document and was only to be guidance. There was a general belief that the Grove airfield site would come on stream within the next two years. The proposed development is in an AONB and there are significant environmental concerns. This area of Wantage is already struggling in terms of infrastructure, including traffic and schools.

On 14 September 2011, the committee had refused this application on the following basis:

The majority of the application site sits outside the Wantage development boundary and the proposal is considered to be unjustified development in the open countryside. Given the resultant change in the character of the landscape and the scale and siting of the buildings, the proposal is considered to be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area and would not preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies DC1, GS2, H13 and NE6 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.

A motion, moved and seconded, to grant planning permission in accordance with the officer's recommendation, on being put, was declared lost. **(For 4; Against 11; Abstentions 0).**

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the outline planning permission for this site, for the reasons described above, on being put, was declared carried.

RESOLVED (For 12; Against 3; Abstentions 0)

To refuse outline planning permission for this site for the following reasons:

The majority of the application site sits outside the Wantage development boundary and the proposal is considered to be unjustified development in the open countryside. Given the resultant change in the character of the landscape and the scale and siting of the buildings, the proposal is considered to be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area and would not preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies DC1, GS2, H13 and NE6 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.

PI.151 21-23 WALLINGFORD STREET, WANTAGE. DEMOLITION OF 21-23 WALLINGFORD STREET, AND REPLACEMENT WITH SIMILAR BUILDING CONTAINING TWO SHOPS AND TWO FLATS. (AMENDMENT TO APPLICATIONS REF: 10/01284/FUL AND 10/01366/CON). 11/01758/FUL & 11/01759/CON

The officer introduced the report, including the information that the proposed ridge height was 1.4 metres higher than the original building and that it is in the Wantage conservation area.

Doug Jackson, a Wantage Town Council councillor, spoke in objection to the application.

Terry Randall spoke in objection to the applications. He said that the developers had originally agreed to restore the front part of the building when they bought the site. He also said that it was a matter of opinion whether or not the building was unsafe.

Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the applications. He stated that on commencing the development of the scheme it had become clear just how unsafe the front parts of the building were. It was not in the applicant's interest to redevelop the buildings unnecessarily as they were not gaining any further retail or residential space by doing so. The applicants were happy to accept conditions about retaining existing features.

John Morgan, a ward councillor, spoke in objection to the applications. He considered that the applicants had compromised the safety of the entire building by ripping out the back and not renovating it as originally agreed. He also pointed out that there was very little space for servicing the retail units.

The committee went on to discuss the applications.

- There is no building which cannot be retrieved
- The front building was supposed to be preserved when the original planning permission was granted
- The applicant has compounded the structural and safety problems by their activities at the rear of the building
- Raising the ridge and eaves will affect the street scene which needs to be preserved.

Officers confirmed that the applications were only seeking permission to demolish the front of the units and that the servicing of the retail units was not a material planning consideration, and the highways officer had no objections.

The raised ridge and eaves height was necessary to meet current building regulations for a new building.

RESOLVED (For 12; Against 3; Abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions

1. TL1 – Time limit
2. MC2 – Material samples
3. MC9 – Building details (windows, window sills and lintels, external doors and rainwater goods, treatment of all verges and eaves of new building)
4. CN8 – Submission of details (new shop fronts)
5. CN8 – Submission of details (chimneys)
6. No development shall commence on site until the applicant has secured a staged programme of archaeological investigation in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
7. RE17 – Slab level
8. To retain as many features as are salvageable from the original building to include the fascia, the iron pillars and the "dentures"

RESOLVED (For 14; Against 1; Abstentions 0)

To grant conservation area consent subject to the following conditions:

1. TL4 – Time limit
2. CN1 – Demolition in conservation area.

PI.152 LAND AT FERMI AVENUE, HARWELL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION CAMPUS, HARWELL. FULL APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF A 5,165 SQ M B1 BUILDING WITH 125 PARKING SPACES. OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR 0.20 HECTARES OF LAND FOR B1 USE (LAYOUT, SCALE AND APPEARANCE RESERVED). 11/02835/FUL

The officer introduced the report on this item. The changes to the written report are that the conditions need to be looked at carefully as the applicant considers that they are too nebulous as they stand. Since the report was submitted, Diamond Synchrotron have withdrawn their objection to the application and are now support it.

Steven Sensecall (Kemp & Kemp), the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application

Margaret Turner, ward councillor, spoke in favour of the application.

RESOLVED (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

To authorise to the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman and vice chairman, to grant planning permission subject to the prior completion of a section 106 agreement and also subject to conditions.

PI.153 6 LIDDIARD CLOSE, KENNINGTON. PROPOSED SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS. 11/01991/FUL

The officer introduced the report. Very little in this application is not permitted: only 400mm on the ridge height of the rear extension.

Mrs Amy Jones, the neighbour at no. 8, spoke in objection to this application. She considered that the proposed extension would lead to a loss of light to her property; that it would overlook her property; that it was over development; cause overshadowing; that it would invade her privacy; be unneighbourly and bring night time light into her property.

Julia Kidd, the applicant's agent spoke in favour of the application. The applicant had not wanted to have hipped roofs as there were no other hipped roofs on the estate: all were gables and a hipped roof would make the extension darker and more difficult to construct. The applicant had taken planning advice and had only applied for planning permission because they wanted to retain the existing ridge height.

Councillor Ron Mansfield, ward councillor, spoke in objection to this application. He considered that the velux windows would give the appearance of a chalet bungalow and that they could be seen from the road and would be out of character with the local area. He was concerned that the difference in the ground levels between nos. 6 and 8 would mean that the proposed extension would be six metres high on no. 8's side of the fence and create shadow for most of the year. He considered that the refusal to amend the plans was unneighbourly.

The committee considered this application and felt that there were no grounds on which it could reasonably be refused.

RESOLVED (For 12; Against 0; Abstentions 1)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

- 1 TL1 – Time limit
- 2 RE1 – Matching materials

**PI.154 ASHDOWN HOUSE, BESSELS WAY, BLEWBURY.
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR TWO LIGHTING COLUMNS
TO ENTRANCE. 11/02765/FUL**

The officer introduced the report on this item.

Mike Shred, a parish councillor, spoke in objection to this application as the light effect was over dominant and distracting to drivers. He argued that, if the committee did agree the application, then the maximum wattage should be stipulated and the lights should be turned off at 22:00 and a passive infra-red sensor used.

Mary Jarvis, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. She considered that the light created a distracting dazzle when driving and that it also caused a disturbance all night.

Lisa Woods, the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. She said that her household needed the lighting for security and safety reasons, especially as they had been broken into twice at night. They had reduced the lux levels significantly below the recommended levels and had installed black out fittings to limit the light pool to their own property.

RESOLVED (For 13; Against 2; Abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following condition:

1. Lighting installation (blackout lenses to be retained and maintained)

**PI.155 NEWSAGENT, 24 HIGH STREET, ABINGDON. CHANGE OF
USE TO EXISTING SHOP TO A2 USE. 11/02719/COU**

The officer introduced the report.

The committee established that even though they were being asked to consider a change of use from a class A1 retail outlet, it could be changed back to a retail outlet at a later date without the need for further planning permission. The shop had been vacant for an extended period and the committee considered that the need to increase activity in the town centre would be better achieved by allowing more flexibility in appropriate circumstances such as this.

RESOLVED (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

That planning permission is granted subject to the following condition:

1. TL1 – Time limit

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm