

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber, The Abbey House, Abingdon on Wednesday 22 May 2013 at 6.30pm



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

### Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Janet Shelley, Margaret Turner and John Woodford.

Substitute Members: Councillor Mike Badcock (In place of Fiona Roper), Gervase Duffield (In place of Eric Batts) and Angela Lawrence (In place of Aidan Melville).

Other Members: Councillors Yvonne Constance .

Officers: Mark Doodes, Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Susan Harbour and Stuart Walker.

Number of members of the public: 80

### **PI.274 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The vice-chairman took the chair for this meeting. He explained that the chairman was only able to attend for a short part of the meeting.

He gave housekeeping announcements, outlined the procedure and explained the remit of the committee. The business would be heard in the order presented on the speakers' list. *(The minutes reflect the order in which business was heard to provide a continuous narrative of the meeting, rather than the agenda order).*

Councillor Janet Shelley had been appointed to the committee, and the vice-chairman welcomed her to the meeting.

### **PI.275 URGENT BUSINESS**

None notified.

### **PI.276 CUMULATIVE HOUSING FIGURES**

The cumulative housing figures were received by the committee, members were asked to send any status updates they were aware of, in their areas, to the planning department.

## **PI.277 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies and substitutions.

<b>Apologies received from Councillor:</b>	<b>Substitute Councillor:</b>
Robert Sharp (part of meeting)	N/A
Eric Batts	Gervase Duffield
Aidan Melville	Angela Lawrence
Fiona Roper	Mike Badcock
Helen Pighills	N/A

## **PI.278 MINUTES**

There were no minutes for ratification at this meeting.

## **PI.279 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS**

### **Disclosable pecuniary interests.**

Councillor Robert Sharp declared that he had a potential pecuniary interest in item 15 as the applicant is a business associate. He left the room for the duration of this item.

### **Other declarations**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Councillor/s</b>	<b>Declaration</b>
10	Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Roger Cox, John Woodford, Robert Sharp, Angela Lawrence, Bob Johnston  Anthony Hayward  Mike Badcock	Know Ken Dijkstra, the applicant's agent  Knows Peter Lewis from the parish council  Knows some of the objectors
14	Angela Lawrence	Is a volunteer at the food bank which will be displaced by the loss of the former Habitat retail unit
15	Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Roger Cox, John Woodford, Robert Sharp,	Know Ken Dijkstra, the applicant's agent

	Angela Lawrence, Bob Johnston	
16	Anthony Hayward, Roger Cox, Jerry Patterson, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Margaret Turner	Know Terry Gashe, the applicant's supporter

## **PI.280 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

None.

## **PI.281 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS**

Peter Lewis, from Stanford in the Vale Parish Council, made a statement that the Western Vale had already delivered more than enough commitments to meet the Housing Targets outlined in the Draft Local Plan for the next 16 years.

## **PI.282 MATERIALS**

### **Planning permission P12/V1721/RM Land south of Faringdon Road, Southmoor.**

- Bricks: Ibstock Laybrook multi orange.
- Stone: Bekstone golden buff artificial stone.
- Tiles: Sandtoft 2020clay tile in Tuscan and SVK Glenstone artificial slate.

### **Planning permission P11/V1453/O land at Broadwater, Manor Road, Wantage.**

- Bricks: Desimpel orange soft mud stock and Desimple heritage soft mud stock.
- Tiles: Eternit Marley plain concrete tile in natural red and Eternit mineral fibre artificial tile.

**Materials on both sites fully approved with 12 (all) in favour.**

## **PI.283 LAND AT SOUTH DRIVE, HARWELL. P13/V90129/O**

The officer presented the report on an outline application for demolition of existing 13 dwellings and erection of up to 120 dwellings with associated infrastructure. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

### **Updates from the report**

Two further letters had been received, referring to the historic merit of the existing buildings, not addressed in the report. The land had been laid out by gardeners from Kew, and No 1, had been the home of Sir John Cockcroft, the first commanding officer of RAF Harwell. However, the officer reported that the site was not subject to a national designation, as an historic site.

Nicky Brock (Kemp and Kemp), the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Margaret Turner, one of the ward councillors, spoke about the application. The points she raised included the following:

- No objection to the application in principle but wished to see s106 contributions in line with the letter drawn up by the parish council
- Concerns about the water supply and waste water and whether it impacts on timescales.
- Concerns about school capacity in Harwell.

The committee considered this application.

- Committee asked for an informative reminding the applicant of the need to distribute social housing throughout the site.
- If granted there would be a subsequent reserved matters application coming back to committee within six months.
- The density would be 20 units per hectare not 31 as stated in paragraph 2.4.
- It is not possible to relocate orchids.

### **RESOLVED (for 12; against 0; abstentions 0)**

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

1. Completion within the agreed PPA period of a section 106 agreement 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, local and area hub recreational and community facility improvements;
2. The following conditions including, the requirements for receipt of a reserved matters application or a detailed scheme within six months and that scheme to be available for the commencement of development within 12 months from the date of the issue of planning permission to help address the immediate housing land shortfall:
  - i. TL1 - Time limit (12 months).
  - ii. MC2 – materials.
  - iii. LS1 – landscape.
  - iv. LS4 - tree protection details.
  - v. RE6 - boundary walls and fences – including walls to open frontages.
  - vi. Plot curtilage boundaries.
  - vii. Ecology.
  - viii. MC24 - drainage requirements.
  - ix. Construction traffic management plan.
  - x. Travel information packs
  - xi. Access visibility.
  - xii. Parking provision.
  - xiii. Building height parameters.
  - xiv. Refuse bin storage.
  - xv. Roof top aerials.
  - xvi. Maintenance of open space areas.

**xvii.** Protect and maintain hedges during development operations.

**xviii.** Approve drawings.

3. If the required section 106 agreements are not completed in a timely manner and so planning permission cannot be granted by the determination deadline of 18 June 2013, in accordance with the agreed PPA, the head of planning, in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman, is authorised to refuse planning permission.

#### **Informative**

Social housing needs to be properly distributed throughout the site.

### **PI.284 LAND TO EAST OF A338 CROWN MEADOW, EAST HANNEY. P13/V0381/FUL**

The officer presented the report on an application to erect 25 dwellings with associated access roads, garages/car ports and open space. (As clarified by Hydrock surface water pumping drainage strategy, Focus Ecology letter dated 12 April 2013, Drawing No: P887/101B and Banners Gate letter dated 5 April 2013 accompanying agent's email of 18 April 2013 and Focus Ecology habitat survey accompanying agent's email of 10 May 2013). Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

#### **Updates from the report**

- None.

Stewart Scott from East Hanney Parish Council spoke, objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Recent flooding in the area and that this site is in flood zone 1.

David Blomley, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Potential flood risk.
- Sight lines on highways.
- Local school almost at capacity.
- Limited facilities in village make site unsustainable.
- S106 monies should be directed towards school and shop.
- Proposed development is not within the village envelope.

Andrew Boughton, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. His speech included the following:

- There was a proposed hybrid solution to drainage and flooding which, due to the low permeability of the ground, included a pump. The drainage measures would make the site sustainable.

The committee considered this application.

- The highways and drainage consultees are content.
- The conditions should be expanded to clarify the Grampian condition
- There are fewer two bed properties than the 50% sited in the local plan, but it was explained by officers that this is an aspirational target.
- Concerns were raised about the access point to the development.

#### **RESOLVED (for 12; against 0; abstentions 0)**

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 22nd May, 2013

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

1. A S106 agreement with both the County Council and District Council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure the affordable housing.
2. Conditions as follows:
  - i. Time limit - 1 year.
  - ii. Approved plans.
  - iii. Sample materials to be agreed.
  - iv. Position and visibility splays to be agreed for pedestrian crossing and vehicular access.
  - v. Access, Parking & Turning in accordance with plan.
  - vi. New Estate Roads.
  - vii. No Drainage to Highway.
  - viii. Submission of Landscaping Scheme.
  - ix. Implementation of Landscaping Scheme.
  - x. Drainage Details (Surface and Foul) to be agreed.
  - xi. Sustainable Drainage Scheme to be agreed.
  - xii. Details of sewer connections to be agreed and implemented prior to first occupation.
  - xiii. Boundary Details to be agreed.
  - xiv. Refuse Storage to be agreed.
  - xv. Ecology mitigation to be implemented as per report.
  - xvi. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
  - xvii. Slab levels to be agreed.
  - xviii. Works in accordance with Flood Risk Assessment.
  - xix. Crime prevention design measures to be agreed.
  - xx. New dwellings to achieve Level 4 against Code for Sustainable Homes.
  - xxi. Tree protection to be agreed.
3. If the required section 106 agreements are not completed, and planning permission cannot be granted by the determination deadline of 23 May 2013, the head of planning, in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman, is authorised to refuse planning permission.

**PI.285 LAND OFF FARINGDON ROAD, STANFORD IN THE VALE.  
P13/V0146/FUL**

*Councillor Robert Sharp entered the meeting.*

The officer presented the report on an application to erect 76 dwellings (comprising 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings) with associated works (re-submission of application P12/V2075/FUL). Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The technical grounds on which an application on this site had previously been refused had now been overcome.

Stanford in the Vale is one of the larger settlements in the Vale of White Horse district.

## Updates from the report

Seven further objections had raised issues about the accuracy of some of the information in the officer's report.

The aboricultural officer had further commented: regretting the loss of an ash tree and other trees and raising issues on the management of existing vegetation.

Peter Lewis, from Stanford in the Vale Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The site is unsuitable: a previous application had been turned down on this site.
- Possible negative affect on the Horse and Jockey's bed and breakfast business.
- Contrary to localism and working with the parish council.
- Outside the village envelope.

Amanda Bailey, on behalf of a group of Stanford residents and businesses, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- Not a sustainable location, particularly in terms of education provision.
- Outside the village envelope.
- Inadequate drainage and sewerage provision.
- Highways issues.
- Negative impact on the environment.

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

Councillor Robert Sharp, the ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. The points he raised included the following:

- The application site was outside the village envelope.
- The density per hectare would be too high: likely to be between 29 and 30 dph if the wood is taken out of the equation.
- The proposed access to and exit from the site was poorly sited next to the pub and was likely to have a detrimental effect on business, particularly as the puffin crossing would be likely to cause noise and pollution to the clientele in the pub garden.
- Some of the "studies" in the proposed dwellings are bigger than typical third bedrooms, meaning that there are effectively fewer two bedroom properties than stated.
- There is a potential flooding risk.
- The quality of the design.

The committee considered this application and made the following points:

- Outside the village envelope.
- Lack of five year housing land supply does not always supersede making decisions based on the suitability/appropriateness of a development.
- The housing density is too high.
- The development would be on the wrong side of a major road.
- The two bedroom houses with studies are really three bedroom houses.
- Lack of affordable housing.
- Concerns about the sustainability of the location: particularly public transport and primary schooling.
- The A417 is a major road with heavy traffic; this development would turn into an internal village road which would be dangerous and detract from the rural nature of the village.
- Inadequate recreational facilities.

Contrary to the officer's recommendation to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman and vice chairman, to grant planning permission subject to s106 agreements and conditions the majority of members of the committee supported refusal of the application for the reasons set out above.

**RESOLVED (for 12; against 0; abstentions 1)**

To refuse planning permission for the following reason/s:

1. The proposed residential development of 73 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.
  - 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) the site lies within a countryside area and having regard to the unsatisfactory nature of the proposal would lead to a progressive detraction in the rural character of the area, including the loss of trees, and be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, the rural landscape and to amenities of the locality.
  - iv) 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, NE4, and NE9, of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan, and paragraphs 14, 34, 37, 47, 49, 50, 57, 60, 61, 109, 111 and 115 of the NPPF.

2. The site lies within a countryside area, separated from the village by the busy A417 road, and, having regard to this unsatisfactory spatial relationship, would lead to a progressive detraction 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 adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, and paragraphs 57, 60, 61, 109, 111 and 115 of the NPPF.
3. There are no measures in place to secure the provision of 40% affordable housing and public open space on site, or to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on local facilities and services, including educational and sport and recreation facilities. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policies H17, H23 and DC8 of the adopted Vale of white Horse Local Plan 2011 and to paragraphs 203 and 206 of the NPPF.

**PI.286 THE APPLEFORD KITCHEN AND BAR, MAIN ROAD, APPLEFORD. P12/V2419/FUL**

The officer presented the report on an application to for a change of use of a public house (class A4) to a residential dwelling (class C3). Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.



## **Updates from the report**

None.

Andrew Guinn, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Loss of local facility.
- Contrary to local policies.
- It will be three miles to the nearest pub.

James Bowden, a representative of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. His speech included the following:

- The pub was not commercially viable as a business, despite significant investment being made.

Councillor Gervase Duffield, the ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. The points he raised included the following:

- Other facilities in the area, such as the shop, post office and the other pub have closed.
- There is additional housing which has been approved, or waiting for approval in the locality.

The committee considered this application.

- An additional condition of soft landscaping to the front of the property should be added.
- The committee were saddened by the closure of this pub.

## **RESOLVED (for 9; against 2; abstentions 2)**

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

1. TL1 – Time limit.
2. List of approved plans.
3. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of any proposed external alterations to the building 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. Prior to the use or occupation of the new development, a parking area for 4 cars shall be constructed, surfaced and drained on the site in accordance with a scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The parking area shall be constructed to prevent surface water discharging onto the highway. Thereafter, the area shall be kept permanently free of any obstruction to such use.
5. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, the site's internal and external boundaries shall be enclosed in accordance with a detailed scheme and programme of implementation which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The programme shall ensure that the approved boundary treatments are completed prior to the use or occupation of the new development.

## **PI.287 SEACOURT TOWER RETAIL PARK, WEST WAY, OXFORD. P13/V0294/FUL**

The officer presented the report on an application for part refurbishment and part redevelopment of existing retail park to allow for phased implementation including revised  
Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

access, car parking, landscaping and removal of existing petrol station. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

### **Updates from the report**

One further letter of objection has been received, reiterating concerns raised elsewhere. There has been a minor amendment to the plans, but it does not change the total floor space.

Julia Hammett from North Hinksey Parish Council, spoke, objecting to the application.

The applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. Their speech included the following:

- The petrol station is on a monthly licence. It is not a usual part of a retail park.

The committee considered this application.

### **RESOLVED (for 13; against 0; abstentions 0)**

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

1. TL1 – Time limit.
2. Approved plans.
3. MC2 – Materials.
4. The units hereby permitted as shown on the approved plans shall not be used for the retail sale of food or drink without the prior grant of planning permission.
5. At no time shall the site contain more than 10 retail units, of which none shall be smaller than 465 sq metres gross floor area.
6. Any mezzanine floor space inserted in the units hereby permitted shall not exceed a cumulative gross total floor space of 5,135 sq metres.
7. There shall be no open storage of goods or materials without the prior grant of planning permission.
8. Landscaping scheme in accordance with specified plan.
9. LS2 – Landscaping scheme (implementation).
10. LS4 – Tree protection.
11. HY6 – Access, parking and turning space in accordance with specified plans.
12. Cycle parking in accordance with specified plans.
13. The service yard hereby approved shall remain clear of obstruction and be available for servicing vehicle turning and manoeuvring at all times.
14. The management of the car parking areas shall be permanently administered in accordance with the management plan (as detailed in the transport statement) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
15. Prior to the commencement of development a Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the approved Framework Travel Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
16. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for external lighting shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved lighting shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development or to each unit to which it relates.
17. The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the approved drainage strategy and supplementary flood risk assessment rev A by PCS consulting engineers Ltd.

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

18. The development permitted shall not be commenced until such time as a scheme to dispose of surface water has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The drainage scheme shall be SUDS compliant and fully implemented prior to first occupation of any new building.
19. Prior to each phase of development hereby approved, no development (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall each been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority:
  - 1) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
    - all previous uses
    - potential contaminants associated with those uses
    - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
    - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
  - 2) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
  - 3) The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
  - 4) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.
20. No occupation of each phase of development shall take place until a verification report demonstrating completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan) for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action, as identified in the verification plan. The long term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.
21. If during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

**PI.288      PUSEY LODGE FARMHOUSE, PUSEY LODGE FARM, PUSEY.  
P13/V0556/FUL**

*Councillor Robert Sharp declared an interest and withdrew for this item.*

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 22nd May, 2013

**PI.11**

The officer presented his report on an application to erect a replacement dwelling, demolish an existing modern barn and the reversion of an existing sub-divided farmhouse to single dwelling. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

### **Updates from the report**

- None.

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

Councillor Anthony Hayward, the ward councillor, spoke to the application.

The committee considered this application.

### **RESOLVED (for 9; against 0; abstentions 3)**

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

1. New home in open countryside - The site is remote from any village boundary, and is also not "infill", with no frontage to extend. The arguments surrounding a "*replacement*" dwelling are not considered to be accurate or reasonable. Considering, at the very least that demolition is taking place the new unit is several times the size of the one it "*replaces*". Therefore the proposals constitute a new unit, and as such the intensification of residential development in this location is not considered acceptable, which is clearly "*creep*" in nature in open countryside. Contrary to local plan policies GS2, GS6 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 55.
2. Not like-for-like - Policy GS6 iv) states that outside built-up areas, redevelopment of existing buildings will only be permitted where on a one-for-one basis. This is further qualified by the new dwelling being no more than 50% larger by volume than the dwelling it replaces. Although figures are not provided, by crude calculations, the new unit is several multiples larger than the unit it "replaces" (see reason 1). Therefore the proposals are not considered to accord with policy GS6 of the local plan.
3. Does not add to a "mix" of homes – The large scale of the home proposed (404m<sup>2</sup>) will not add to "*...the choice and mix of homes available...*" in the area and no agricultural exception has been proposed. Policy H13's subtext, (Para 8.58) a list of smaller settlements is provided, the nearest of which is over one mile from the site. Therefore, it is considered that no allowance for new dwellings is allowed and that the application is contrary to local plan policies GS6 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 50.
4. Sustainability – There are no local facilities whatsoever in the area, including educational, leisure, medical, retail and employment. The nearest large village is over four miles away meaning that prospective occupants would lead a highly unsustainable lifestyle. Therefore the proposal is contrary to the principles of the NPPF, which supports "*sustainable development*" at paragraph 197.

*Councillor Robert Sharp left the meeting.*

## **PI.289 LAND AT MARFIELD, KINGSTON LISLE. P13/V0530/FUL.**

The officer presented his report on an application to construction two dwellings and to demolish one agricultural barn on the land at Marfield, Kingston Lisle. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

### **Updates from the report**

None.

Terry Gashe, a supporter of the application and Nick Shipp, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Yvonne Constance, the ward councillor, spoke in favour of the application. The points she raised included the following:

- The parish council are interested in growth and in bringing new families into the village.

The committee considered this application.

- This was "ribbon development"

### **RESOLVED (for 6; against 2; abstentions 4)**

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

5. Outside of the main village boundary – the proposal site does not form part of the main village proper, and is also not "infill", with no frontage to extend. Therefore the creep of ribbon development proposed is not considered acceptable in this location. Contrary to local plan policies H12 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 55.
6. Not a mix of accessible homes – The large scale of the homes proposed will not add to the choice and mix of homes available in the area and no agricultural exception has been proposed. Policy H12 (at Para 8.57) makes allowance for "...small dwellings...not overly large....three bedrooms...". This is not the case in this application, therefore it is contrary to local plan policies H12 and H13 and the NPPF at paragraph 50.
7. Not a sustainable location – Kingston Lisle has only a limited range of facilities and services available to prospective occupants, therefore the proposal is considered to be contrary to local plan policy H13 (at para 8.58) the NPPF, which supports only *sustainable* development at paragraph 197.

## **PI.290 CHURCH COTTAGE, CHURCH LANE, DRAYTON. P13/V0292/HH**

The officer presented the report on an application to raise the stone boundary wall to a maximum of 730mm. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history are detailed in the officer's report which forms part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

### **Updates from the report**

None.

The committee considered this application.

**RESOLVED (for 6; against 2; abstentions 4)**

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

1. TL1 - Time limit
2. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, all new work shall match the existing wall in all respects, including the type of stone, the coursing of the stone, the pointing and coping
3. Approved plans

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm