

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber, Abbey House,  
Abingdon on Wednesday, 12 September  
and Monday 17 September, 2012 at 6.30pm



**Open to the public, including the press**

### Present:

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

Substitute Members: Councillor Mike Badcock (In place of Margaret Turner).

Other Members: Councillor Melinda Tilley.

Officers: Susan Harbour, David Rothery, Laura Hudson, Mike Gilbert and Carolyn Organ.

Number of members of the public: 45 & 40

### PI.68 URGENT BUSINESS

None.

### PI.69 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman gave housekeeping announcements, outlined the procedure and explained the remit of the committee.

He stated that the agenda would be heard in the order of the speakers' list.

He advised the committee that items 10 to 13 would be heard, and that items 9 and 14 to 19 would be adjourned to Monday 17 September at 6.30.

### PI.70 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Margaret Turner had sent her apologies and Councillor Mike Badcock attended as her substitute.

## PI.71 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 15 August were approved as an accurate record and the chairman signed them.

## PI.72 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS

### Declarations of pecuniary interest

None

### Other declarations by councillors

Agenda item	Councillor/s	Declaration
9	Mike Badcock	Knows some of the local people including objectors, and John Ashton, the applicant's agent
10	Robert Sharp, John Morgan, John Woodford, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Mike Badcock, Eric Batts, Bill Jones, Sandy Lovatt Mike Badcock	Know Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent. Knows John Ashton, an objector
11	Roger Cox Roger Cox, Robert Sharp, John Woodford Eric Batts	Knows Councillor Roly Paterson of Buscot Parish Council Members of the National Trust, objectors A relative lives close to the site
12	Robert Sharp, John Morgan, John Woodford, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Mike Badcock, Eric Batts, Bill Jones, Sandy Lovatt	Know Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent.
14	Sue Marchant	Knows Councillor June Stock from Grove Parish Council
18	John Morgan	On Wantage Town Council, but has not taken any part in the discussion of this item.

## PI.73 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The speakers' list was tabled at the meeting.

## **PI.74 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS**

None.

## **PI.75 MATERIALS**

None.

## **PI.76 SPORTS GROUND AND PAVILION, ABINGDON ROAD, KINGSTON BAGPUIZE. P12/V1125**

*Agenda item 10*

The officer introduced his report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. Since the report had been published, a further 32 letters had been received reiterating comments made in support of the application in earlier letters. A 50 signature petition had also been received in support of the proposal.

Brian Forster, Chairman of Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council, spoke in favour of the application.

John Ashton, West Waddy ADP, spoke in objection to the application.

Ken Dijkstra, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The letter from Matthew Barber, one of the ward councillors, was read in support of the application.

Melinda Tilley, one of the ward councillors, spoke in favour of the application.

The committee discussed the application. They considered the issues raised in the officer's report, and those raised by the speakers.

**RESOLVED: (For 9; Against 4; Abstentions 1)**

**To refuse to grant planning permission for the following reasons:**

1. The proposed residential development of 47 dwelling units is contrary to the Council's general planning policy which requires:
  - i) that so far as possible future development should in the main be concentrated in established settlements as this is considered in the best interests of the public from the point of view of economy in the provision of services of all kinds and in land use, the preservation of rural amenities and the conservation of agricultural land and because it is only in this way that balanced communities can be achieved.
  - ii) that in rural areas development is only likely to be permitted within the approved limits of development of specified villages and within the village envelope of other villages where such envelope is limited and well defined and where there is no valid planning objection.

- iii) no overriding local need or special circumstances exist, including the present shortfall in housing land allocation provision, to warrant any departure from the planning policies of the Local Planning Authority.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GS1, GS2, H11, H13, DC1, of the local plan and paragraphs 14, 34, 37, 47, 49, 50, 60, 61 and 111 of the NPPF.

2. The site lies within a countryside area and having regard to the unsatisfactory nature of the proposal would lead to a progressive detracting in the rural character of the area and be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, the rural landscape and to amenities of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies GS1, GS2, H11, NE4, and NE7 of the local plan and paragraphs 57, 60, 61, 109, 111 and 115 of the NPPF.
3. The site and the existing cricket pavilion roof void have been identified as a roosting area for soprano pipistrelle bats. The application has not provided suitable survey work or a mitigation methodology or strategy to address the change to the protected species habitat as would be necessary as part of the demolition and replacement of the sports pavilion. In the absence of this required information the proposal is contrary to the provisions of wildlife and countryside legislations which require the protection of species, habitats and foraging areas in such circumstances. The proposal is also contrary to policy NE4 of the local plan and paragraphs 118, 119 and of the NPPF.
4. The siting of the proposed 47 dwellings within close proximity to the Kingston Business Park would be likely to give rise to concerns related to noise and disturbance originating from the business park which could result in the need for investigation and monitoring that could result in the cessation of certain business activities should remedial measures not be effective. The absence of a noise and disturbance survey report and levels of mitigation within the residential development give rise to the proposal being contrary to policy DC10 of the local plan and paragraph 123 of the NPPF.
5. As part of the rejuvenation of the sports ground facilities on the site the proposed development results in formalising an access road into a car parking area which lies to the southern boundary of Kingston Bagpuize House, a grade II star listed building. This work is considered to harmfully impact on the character and setting of this important listed building and would detract from the appearance and setting of the building and its associated grounds. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy HE4 of the local plan and paragraphs 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, and 134 of the NPPF.
6. The proposed development would generate the requirement for contributions both on site for affordable housing and off-site for highway works, education, social service, leisure and arts, waste management and towards police services, which have not been entered into. Without such provision the proposal would be unacceptable. The lack of this requirement is contrary to policy DC8 of the local plan and paragraphs 203 to 206 of the NPPF.

*The applicant's agent withdrew this application immediately after the decision to refuse was made.*

## **PI.77 BUSCOT MILL, BUSCOT. P12/V1083/FUL**

### *Agenda item 11*

The officer introduced her report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

She made the following amendments to the original report, which relate to paragraph 2.3:

- There would be 10 seasonal private moorings and seven hire holiday moorings.
- There would be 14 landing platforms in total.
- There would be a small scale platform for fishing by people with disabilities.
- Visits to the site would be by appointment only.
- The applicant had requested that evening closure should be at 19:00, not 18:00, to fit in with the lock-keeper's hours.

The following updates had been received since the report was published:

- Council ecologist requested a further condition in relation to water voles which may be present on the site
- Receipt of a further letter of support from the council's economic development officer.
- Receipt of a petition of 169 signatures objecting the commercial development of this area (also known as "Brandy Island").

Additional letters had been sent to members of the committee, by objectors, including a copy of counsel's opinion raising alleged failures in the committee report. The concerns related largely to highway safety and to comments from the county engineer: particularly with regard to the established use of the site. The officer's report in paragraph 6.12 refers to the site having an established use which could be re-instated at any time. The officers agreed that, given the time that had lapsed since the works closure and the loss of associated equipment, it is unlikely that the site's use as a pumping station would be re-instated. Clarification on this issue had been sought from the county highway engineer who had confirmed that the acceptability of the scheme in highway terms was not dependant on re-instating the pumping station, but that the low level of traffic movements proposed was considered on its own merits.

Additional clarification from officers on the use of the building was provided as follows: whilst it may be argued that it is highly unlikely that the use may be reinstated, this could not be considered a certainty. Abandonment can be deemed to occur in certain circumstances, but a distinction should be drawn between a use being dormant and a use being abandoned: for the latter to apply there would more usually be a change in the planning unit, the grant of an inconsistent planning permission, or a major change in the identity of the site. It is by no means certain that any of these apply in this instance, and so it cannot be said that the site now has a "nil use".

The county highways engineer's report was updated as follows:

The number of people already visiting the village and the speed limit on the A417, amongst other factors, was taken into account in assessing the acceptability of the proposal. A view was taken that, whilst the sight lines at the A417 junction are below desirable in one direction, it would be unreasonable to recommend refusal on these

grounds bearing in mind the relatively low numbers of extra vehicles likely to be generated by the site.

Roly Paterson, from Buscot Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

- He made reference to Counsel's opinion concerning the building's use as a waterworks.
- He raised concerns about the potential increase in traffic given the large pedestrian use of the road onto the "Brandy Island".

Michael Stubbs, from the National Trust, spoke in objection to the application. He, too, referenced Counsel's opinion on the building's use as a waterworks.

Kerry Pflieger, the applicants' agent, spoke in favour of the application and confirmed the following:

- Access to the boat yard will be by prior agreement with the owners.
- Boats will not be transported through the village of Buscot.
- There will be no external boat storage or lighting.
- The existing building will be improved and maintained.

Roger Cox, one of the ward councillors, spoke in favour of the application. He had visited the site a number of times and had attended the parish council meeting where it had been discussed. He considered the planning officer's report to be accurate and fair. The county highways engineer has no objections.

The committee discussed this item at length. Many of the members of the planning committee had visited this site. The committee discussed, in particular, vehicular movements and highway considerations.

### **RESOLVED (For 13; Against 0; Abstentions 1)**

#### **To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions;**

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved full details of the proposed materials, construction method, and means of securing to the river bank of the mooring platforms 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.
4. LS1 – Landscaping details
5. LS2 – Landscaping implementation
6. HY6 – Access, parking and turning in accordance with specified plan
7. No boats shall be stored on the site outside the building at any time unless moored on the river.
8. The boat yard hereby permitted shall not operate before 08:00 nor after 19:00 on any day and the gates shall be locked outside these hours to prevent entry unless in an emergency.
9. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the delivery of supplies to the site and a scheme for the disposal of waste from the site including refuse and sewerage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The use of the site shall operate in accordance with the approved scheme.

10. Delivery or removal of boats to and from the site shall be carried out by river only and not by road unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
11. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the scheme of mitigation contained Chapter 5 and Table 1 of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report by Eco consult dated April 2012 submitted with the application in all respects. Any variation shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before such change is made. This condition will be discharged on receipt of a letter from the project ecologist providing evidence to demonstrate that the mitigation has been completed according to the approved report.
12. A habitat management plan for the ecological restoration area shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development. The plan shall include:
  - (i) Description and evaluation of the features to be managed;
  - (ii) Ecological trends and constraints on site that may influence management;
  - (iii) Aims and objectives of management;
  - (iv) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
  - (v) Prescriptions for management actions for a 20 year period;
  - (vi) Preparation of a work schedule (including a 5 yr project register, an annual work plan and the means by which the plan will be rolled forward annually);
  - (vii) Personnel responsible for implementation of the plan;
  - (viii) Monitoring and remedial / contingencies measures triggered by monitoring.
  - (ix) A plan showing the management areas and the location and design of the fence separating the operational part of the site from the restoration zone. The plan shall be carried out as approved, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
13. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the Reptile Survey Report carried out by Ecoconsult dated July 2012 submitted with the application in all respects. Any variation shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before such change is made. This condition will be discharged on receipt of a letter from the project ecologist providing evidence to demonstrate that the mitigation has been completed according to the approved report.
14. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved full details of any boundary treatment within the site and around the perimeter 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.
15. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of the proposed new doors to the pump house building and any signage required for the proposed business 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.
16. At the beginning and end of the boating season the boats shall be placed in the water and removed from the water by fork lift truck only as specified in the application and no crane shall be used on site at any time.
17. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details of any proposed external lighting to be used on the building and around the site 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.
18. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment undertaken by Cole Easdon reference 3418 dated April 2012.
19. Contaminated Land Survey.
20. Water voles survey prior to commencement.
21. No smaller hourly rental boats.

## **PI.78 NALDER ESTATE & THE OLD CANAL BUILDING, MAIN STREET, EAST CHALLOW. P12/V1261/FUL.**

### *Agenda item 12*

The officer introduced his report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report. Andrew Crawford, the ward councillor, had written his concerns in a letter which formed part of the agenda pack.

Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of this application. In particular, he requested a 24 month time limit in order to decontaminate the site and to introduce traffic calming measures.

The committee discussed this item, and in particular:

- It provides affordable housing units.
- This should be an s106 exception site with social housing priority going to those with a local parish connection and in housing need.
- The two year time limit would be acceptable as long as the applicant signs the s106 agreement quickly.

### **RESOLVED (For 10; Against 3; Abstentions 1)**

**To authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman, vice chairman, opposition spokesman and the ward member to grant planning permission subject to:**

1. The prior completion of a section 106 agreement within a deadline of three months to complete for on-site affordable housing provision, and refurbishment of the listed building Old Canal Building as well as contributions toward off-site facilities and services including highway works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health care, fire and rescue, police equipment, village recreational and community facility improvements;
2. The following conditions, including the requirement to commence development within 24 months to help address the immediate housing land shortfall;
3. Receipt of additional plans to adequately show the relationship of the listed building to Main Street, the junction and access road into the site in respect of final land levels together with amended plans relating to the external setting within the site surrounding the listed building.
  1. TL1 - Time limit (24 months)
  2. Listing the approved drawings
  3. MC2 - Materials (Samples)
  4. MC9 - Building Details
  5. RE6 - Boundary Details
  6. Protection of the ecological bund to the noether edges of the site
  7. RE17 - Slab levels and dwelling heights
  8. LS1 - Landscaping Scheme implementation and maintenance



9. LS4 trees
10. Drainage details including SUDS
11. Flood risk assessment
12. Contamination survey remediation scheme
13. Contamination verification report
14. HY2 Access according with specified plan
15. Communal TV and satellite dishes on flats and terraced buildings
16. HY8 car parking spaces
17. HY12 new estate roads
18. HY13 estate roads prior to occupation of dwellings
19. HY20 bicycle parking
20. MC29 sustainable drainage scheme
21. MC32 construction method statement
22. UNI refuse bin storage
23. Travel info packs
24. Listed building works trigger
25. Canal re-alignment
26. s106 exception site, priority given to people in housing need with a local parish connection

## **PI.79 LAND OPPOSITE SHRIVENHAM HUNDRED BUSINESS PARK, MAJORS ROAD, WATCHFIELD. P12/V1329/FUL**

### *Agenda item 13*

The officer introduced his report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

Kenton Bush spoke in objection to this application. He was particularly concerned about the potential flood and drainage issues in connection with this site and the safety of the proposed SUDS basin.

The officer referred the committee to conditions 9 and 10 which address the drainage issues and the responses from professional officers (drainage engineer, Environment Agency) contained within the report.

Nick Groves of Boyer Planning, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The committee discussed the item, including those issues raised by the objector.

### **RESOLVED (For 14; Against 0; Abstentions01)**

**To authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman, vice chairman and opposition spokesman, to grant planning permission subject to the following:**

The prior completion of a section 106 agreement within a deadline of three months to complete for on-site affordable housing provision, contributions toward off-site facilities and services including highway works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health

care, fire and rescue, police equipment, village recreational and community facility improvements;

The following conditions, including the requirement to commence development within 12 months to help address the immediate housing land shortfall:

1. TL1 - Time limit (12 months)
2. Listing the approved drawings
3. MC2 - Materials (Samples)
4. MC9 - Building Details
5. RE6 - Boundary Details
6. RE17 - Slab levels and dwelling heights
7. LS1 - Landscaping Scheme implementation and maintenance
8. LS4 trees
9. Drainage details including SUDS
10. Flood risk assessment
11. Contamination survey remediation scheme
12. Contamination verification report
13. HY2 Access according with specified plan
14. HY17 closure of existing access
15. HY8 car parking spaces
16. HY12 new estate roads
17. HY13 estate roads prior to occupation of dwellings
18. HY20 bicycle parking
19. MC29 sustainable drainage scheme
20. MC32 construction method statement
21. UNI refuse bin storage
22. Travel info packs

*The meeting was adjourned at 10.00 pm*

*Councillor Kate Precious left the meeting.*

*The meeting was reconvened. At 6.30 on Monday 17 September 2012*

## **PI.80 LAND SOUTH OF FARINGDON ROAD, SOUTHMOOR. P12/V1302/0**

### *Agenda item 9*

The officer introduced his report: he explained that it had come to committee for outline consent. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

- The applicant had indicated that adjacent land would be made available to the south of the site for informal recreational use, as well as the formal open space which formed part of the application site. The applicant had also suggested that they could provide a further recreational area further away from the site as part of s106 discussions, but that this did not form part of the planning application.
- The planning officer had now received nine letters of support for this application.
- Appendix 3a of the report was incorrect and should be disregarded.

- Paragraph 3.10. The Thames Valley Police liaison officer has no objections, subject to an informative to ensure that the new dwellings achieve “secured by design” accreditation.

Councillor Brian Forster, chairman of Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

David Hancox and Kevin Hadley spoke in objection to the application.

John Ashton (West Waddy ADP), the applicant’s agent, spoke in support of the application. He stressed that he, and the applicant, wished to work with local villagers to provide leisure facilities.

The committee debated this item; *inter alia*

- This is an outline application for 50 houses and it is expected that no more than 50 houses would be built on the site.
- There was, unfortunately, little evidence of dialogue between the developer and the villagers.

### **RESOLVED (For 11; Against 1; Abstentions 1)**

**To authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman, vice chairman, ward member and opposition spokesman, to grant planning permission subject to the following:**

The prior completion of a section 106 agreement within a deadline of three months to complete for on-site affordable housing provision, as well as contributions toward off-site facilities and services including highway works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health care, fire and rescue, police equipment, village recreational and community facility improvements, as well as securing access to and the use for informal recreational purposes of the field to the south of the site (edged in blue)

The following conditions including, the requirements for receipt of a reserved matters application or a detailed scheme within three months and that scheme to be available for implementation within 12 months from the date of the outline permission to help address the immediate housing land shortfall:

1. TL2 altered outline timing (12 months) reserved matters within 3 month
2. UNI plot curtilage boundaries
3. MC2 materials
4. UNI landscape
5. LS4 trees
6. UNI boundaries
7. MC24 drainage
8. UNI plot restriction to southern boundary
9. UNI ecology
10. UNI access visibility
11. UNI parking
12. UNI construction traffic
13. UNI travel info packs
14. UNI refuse bin storage

15. UNI footpath routes
16. UNI drainage Thames Water
17. UNI build height
18. UNI TW plc
19. Communal satellite dishes
20. Stone/brick boundaries

## **PI.81 DALLAS, WESTBROOK STREET, BLEWBURY. P12/V1134/FUL**

### *Agenda item 16*

The officer introduced her report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

Patricia Newman spoke in objection to the application. She highlighted the concerns of the neighbours and the potential impact of the proposed development on them.

Colin McAndrew, McAndrew Associates Ltd, the applicant's agent spoke in favour of the application.

The committee discussed this application.

### **RECOMMENDED (For 10; Against 3; Abstentions 0)**

#### **To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. HY1 - Access
4. HY8 - Car parking spaces
5. HY10 - Turning space
6. HY19 - No drainage to highway
7. LS4 - Tree protection
8. MC3 - Materials in accordance with application
9. RE6 – Boundary details
10. RE29 - Refuse storage
11. Slab height

## **PI.82 LAND ADJACENT TO GREEN VIEW, GINGE ROAD, WEST HENDRED. P12/V1259/FUL**

### *Agenda item 15*

The officer introduced the report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

Sarah Lloyd, from West Hendred Parish Council, spoke in favour of the application.

Richard Pill, the applicant spoke in favour of the application.

The committee discussed the item.

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 12th September, 2012

## **RECOMMENDED (For 8; Against 5; Abstentions 1)**

### **To refuse planning permission for the following reasons:**

1. The site lies outside the settlement of Ginge and the village of West Hendred and the proposal does not constitute infilling development. In addition, there is no overriding essential need to warrant any departure from the planning policies of the Local Planning Authority. The proposal, therefore, is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the rural area and contrary to policies GS2, GS6, GS7, DC1 and NE6 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan.
2. The site lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and having regard to:
  - a the unsatisfactory nature of the additional proposed residential use, and
  - b the size, scale and massing of the proposed dwelling

the proposal would harm the rural character and natural beauty of the area. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to policies GS7 NE6 of the vale of White Horse Local Plan and the aims and intend of the NPPF as covered in paragraph 57, 60 and 61.

3. Due to the isolated rural location of the application site beyond the confines of an existing settlement, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development which is remote from public transport, local services and facilities and, therefore, is contrary to established sustainability policy and national advice which seeks to locate development where the need to travel by private car can be minimised. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to policies GS2 and GS6 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan and the aims and intend of the NPPF as covered in paragraph 34 and 37.
4. That the proposal lacks adequate sight lines at its junction with Ginge Road. Furthermore the proposed development would result in the potential detriment to the safety and convenience of users of the public footpath (public right of way) located along the western boundary of the site. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to policy DC5 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan.

## **PI.83 THE FIRS, MAIN STREET, GROVE. P12/V1400/FUL**

*Councillor Kate Precious, re-entered the meeting.*

### *Agenda item 14.*

The officer introduced her report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There had been one additional letter of support raising concerns over drainage, but Thames Water, the Environment Agency and the county drainage engineer are content.

June Stock, from Grove Parish Council, spoke to the application. The parish council's concerns about the application were with the ingress and egress from the site and visitor parking.

Kate Precious, a ward member, spoke to the application. She shared the concerns of the parish council.

Sue Marchant, a ward member, spoke to the application. She also shared the concerns of the parish council.

The committee discussed this application. In order to counteract potential problems with visitor parking and road safety in an area near a school, it was agreed to request the county council to consider double yellow lines as the parish council had requested: *“Double yellow lines would be required in front of the properties facing Main Street and on both sides of School Lane to prohibit car parking on already busy and congested roads”*.

**RECOMMENDED (For 13; Against 0; Abstentions 1)**

**To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. MC2 - Materials (samples)
4. MC9 - Building details
5. RE4 - PD restriction on single dwelling (extensions only)
6. HY6 - Access, parking & turning in accordance with plan
7. HY17 - Closure of existing access
8. LS1 - Landscaping scheme (submission)
9. LS2 - Landscaping scheme (implement)
10. LS4 - Tree protection
11. MC24 - Drainage details (surface and foul)
12. MC29 - Sustainable drainage scheme
13. The development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment carried out by MJA consulting reference 11/0098/4536.
14. RE6 - Boundary details.
15. Remove permitted development rights for garage conversions.

**PI.84 WEST VIEW, COTSWOLD ROAD, CUMNOR HILL. P12/V1663/HH**

*Agenda item 17.*

The officer introduced her report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

John Woodford, a ward councillor, spoke to this application

**RECOMMENDED (For 14; Against 0; Abstentions 0)**

**To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. MC3 - Materials in accordance with the application
4. RE11 - Garage Accommodation

**PI.85 5-7 NEWBURY STREET, WANTAGE. P12/V0747**

*Agenda item 18.*

The officer introduced the report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

John Woodford, a ward councillor, spoke in favour of the application.

**RECOMMENDED (For 14; Against 0; Abstentions 0)**

**To grant advertisement consent, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Condition listing the approved drawings.
2. AD1 - Intensity of Illumination.
3. AD2 - Period of illumination: only during hours of business.
4. Notwithstanding the 'Standard Sign Colours' text shown on approved drawing number 4759-SF13 (Adverts 1) rev.D, the materials used in the fascia sign shall be as stated under the 'Externally Illuminated Fascia Sign' details, and the materials used in the projecting sign shall be as stated under the 'Projecting Sign – Double Sided' details on this plan.

**PI.86 CHURCH COTTAGE, CHURCH LANE, DRAYTON. P12/V1303/HH**

*Agenda item 19.*

The officer introduced her report. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and planning history are detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. There were no updates to the original report.

The committee discussed this item.

**RECOMMENDED (For 14; Against 0; Abstentions 0)**

**To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. MC3 - Materials in accordance with application

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm