

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber, The Abbey House, Abingdon on Wednesday 19 June 2013 at 6.30pm



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

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

Substitute Members: Councillor Kate Precious (In place of Eric Batts) and Angela Lawrence (In place of Aidan Melville).

Other Members: Councillor Gervase Duffield, Catherine Webber.

Officers: Martin Deans, Mark Doodles, Adrian Duffield, Sandra Fryer, Susan Harbour and Stuart Walker.

Number of members of the public: 90

PI.304 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman gave housekeeping announcements, outlined the procedure and explained the remit of the committee. He reminded the public not to approach councillors or officers during the course of business.

The business would be heard in the order presented on the speakers' list.

Councillor Bill Jones had been appointed to the committee after a brief absence, and the chairman welcomed him to the meeting.

PI.305 URGENT BUSINESS

None notified.

PI.306 CUMULATIVE HOUSING FIGURES

The cumulative housing figures were received by the committee.

PI.307 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies and substitutions.

Apologies received from Councillor:	Substitute Councillor:
Aidan Melville	Angela Lawrence
Eric Batts	Kate Precious

Since the agenda had been issued, there had been a change of membership to the committee. Councillor Fiona Roper had resigned from the committee and Councillor Bill Jones had been appointed.

PI.308 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of 8 May 2013 were approved and signed by the chairman.

The minutes of the meeting of 22 May 2013 were approved and would be signed by the chairman, subject to the abstention numbers on the last item being amended from 0 to 4.

PI.309 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS

Disclosable pecuniary interests.

None declared.

Other declarations

Agenda Item	Councillor/s	Declaration
11	Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Roger Cox, John Woodford, Robert Sharp, Angela Lawrence, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, Bill Jones.	Know Ken Djiksman, the applicant's agent
14	Angela Lawrence, Anthony Hayward, Roger Cox, Sandy Lovatt, John Woodford, Jerry Patterson, Sue Marchant, Bob Johnston. Robert Sharp	Know Peter Saunders the Applicant's supporter. Knows Peter Saunders the applicant's supporter and Stuart Spencer the applicant and withdrew for this item.

PI.310 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The committee noted the list of public speakers that was tabled at the meeting.

PI.311 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS

None.

PI.312 MATERIALS

None.

PI.313 LAND TO THE NORTH OF 92-112 MILTON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY. P13/V0233/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to demolish 110 Milton Road and erect 34 dwelling houses with associated access. 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.

Sutton Courtenay scores fourth of approximately 80 villages in the Vale on grounds of sustainability and is therefore considered suitable for applications to be considered which fall outside of the Vale's policy on development in order to meet its five year housing land supply shortfall.

The application came back to committee as it had been deferred by the committee from the meeting on 8 May 2013. The grounds for deferral were for the following reasons:

1. A redesign of the layout to ensure that the affordable housing provision is better distributed through the site.
2. Additional information was requested by the planning committee as to the highway works that had been considered acceptable by the Oxfordshire County Council Highways Office to address the identified highway and access issues that this proposed development generates. Committee also wished to see an assessment of the locally sponsored traffic survey on behalf of the Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural action group.
3. Additional information relating to land drainage of the site. The planning committee wished to be advised of the details of solutions being considered by the appropriate drainage authorities to address the identified ground water drainage, and the foul water drainage infrastructure considered necessary for this proposal to take place.
4. Education provision requirements linked to this development proposal. The planning committee wished to be advised of the detailed solutions being considered by the county council education authority to address the identified lack of school places that would result should this development take place.

Additional information provided by the officer

- There had been over 100 local objections to this application.
- Design changes had been made to the layout of social housing and public space to meet concerns raised at 8 May committee meeting.
- Slab levels had been raised by 30 centimetres in response to drainage concerns.
- The drainage objections had been removed.
- Foul sewage: two possible solutions had been proposed by Thames Water, and officers were now satisfied on this issue.
- £250,000 had been put forward under s106 agreements for education, and this was considered satisfactory by the local education authority.
- The speed reduction measures proposed were acceptable to the county highways officer.

Michael Jenkins from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Cumulative growth from 1007 households to 1281 households with the agreed and proposed applications, representing a 27 percent increase in growth.
- This site previously considered unsuitable for development.
- Housing not adequately pepper potted throughout the site.
- Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural's independent highways survey had not yet been presented to the Vale.
- Flooding measures had not, in his opinion, been adequately addressed.
- Foul drainage works should be completed before commencement of building.

Dr Nicholas Richardson from Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Affordable housing not adequately pepper potted throughout the site.
- Results of the Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural independent traffic survey not yet submitted to the Vale.
- Safety of highways.

Kevin Nicholls, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Potential subsidence to his property.
- Possible decrease in the value of his property.

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

- The council's housing officer is content with the distribution of affordable housing as it is currently proposed.
- Highways: the traffic calming measures have now been clarified.
- Ground water: details are now in place. Officers are content.
- Foul drainage: officers now say the scheme proposed is acceptable.
- Education: s106 contributions have been offered which are acceptable to the local education authority.

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

- Sutton Courtenay parish comprised only 19 percent green fields.

- A letter had been submitted from Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural action group, suggesting problems with the application and he was not satisfied that they had been fully addressed.

The committee considered this application.

- Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural were in possession of their independent traffic survey but had not yet submitted it to officers.
- The county highways officer was now content.
- Urban sites have taken three quarters of the population growth in the Vale since 2001.
- This council has a 3.3 year land supply, rather than the 5 year supply required by government.
- The issues raised due to the deferral have been resolved to the satisfaction of officers.
- Consultation of technical matters to take place post decision making, the ward member had not been involved yet as the application had not yet been determined.
- The school would need places for an additional 30 pupils, and not all of the committee were content that the school had the potential capacity to absorb these numbers.
- Not all of the committee were content with the hydrology solutions proposed and considered that flooding and drainage were still potential problems.
- Committee members were concerned about the cumulative impact on local facilities which they were not convinced were sufficient to sustain the additional number of people likely to be living in the village if all approved applications were built.
- The bus service, as well as the road network was insufficient, given the increased numbers of people including young families, who were likely to be using it.
- The increase in population size (27 percent), together with the likely impact on facilities and infrastructure meant that were serious questions around the sustainability of this potential development.

The committee **RESOLVED** to defeat the officer's recommendation that the application be delegated to the head of planning to grant planning permission.

Councillors Jerry Patterson and John Woodford voted in favour of the officer's recommendation and requested that their votes be recorded.

The committee further **RESOLVED** (for 9: against 5; abstentions 0) the following. (The heads of terms were agreed at the meeting and the meeting also agreed that officers would add clarification to these headings outside of the meeting. The clarification is included in these minutes in italics for completeness).

To refuse the planning application as outlined for the following reasons:

1. **Sustainability of the development**
2. **Drainage impact.**
3. **Local transport impact.**
4. **Impact on local facilities.**

(These to be further detailed in the decision notice)

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 19th June, 2013

Councillors Jerry Patterson and John Woodford voted against this resolution and asked that their votes be recorded.

PI.314 LAND AT THE CAUSEWAY FARM, THE CAUSEWAY, STEVENTON. P13/V0692/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application for a residential development consisting of 31 houses (19 open market houses and 12 affordable) and public open space. 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

Councillors had received further letters of objection to the scheme from local residents.

Robert Green, from Steventon Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Highways and traffic safety.
- The cumulative impact of all recent applications on the capacity of the village school.
- Flooding risk
- This application, together with the one at Barnett Road, represented a 13 percent increase in the size of the village.
- The developer's traffic survey was undertaken in July when the school was closed and is not therefore a true representation of the traffic problems.
- This is not a suitable or sustainable site for new homes.

Sue Rees spoke on behalf of local residents, objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- Potential flooding and drainage problems.
- High water table.
- Proposals not sufficient to be effective.
- Run off water likely to affect existing houses.
- Open public area: no one is willing to manage it and it will be subject to high risk flooding, creating a particular risk to children playing on it.

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

- A management company owned by residents would be responsible for the open space.
- Technical solutions to the drainage problems could be provided and the drainage engineer was content.
- There would be minimal changes to the Causeway.
- Trenches had been dug to check archaeological concerns.
- The local education authority was content with the education plans.

Councillor Bill Jones, one of the ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application. The points he raised included the following:

- Councillor Murray, the other ward councillor had outlined his concerns in a letter which was on pp 53-54 of the agenda pack.
- There would likely be traffic chaos at school run times.

- If the school expands, due to increased numbers created by this and other proposed developments, the playing fields will have to expand too. However, the application site is on land adjacent to the existing playing field and therefore there will be nowhere to expand if the proposed development goes ahead.

The committee considered this application.

During the course of the discussion the committee considered the issues raised by the speakers including the potential impact on education provision, potential flooding risks and traffic and highways problems created by this and other developments.

RESOLVED (for 8; against 1; abstentions 5)

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

Completion within the agreed planning performance agreement (PPA) period of section 106 agreements for on-site affordable housing provision, on site open space provision, contributions towards off-site facilities and services including highways works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health care, police equipment, local and area hub recreational and community facility improvements.

The following conditions, including the requirement 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:

1. Time limit.
2. Approved plans.
3. MC2 - Materials (samples).
4. Access, parking / turning & off site works in accordance with plans.
5. Landscaping scheme.
6. Tree protection.
7. Retention of existing hedgerows.
8. Open space management plan.
9. Plot curtilages.
10. Removal of buildings.
11. Contamination.
12. Drainage details (surface and foul).
13. Sustainable drainage scheme.
14. Works in accordance with flood risk assessment.
15. Archaeology.
16. Boundary details .
17. Ecology.

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

PI.315 LAND OFF BEGGARS LANE, SOUTHMOOR. P13/V0692/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to erect 4 detached dwelling houses with associated access. 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.

John Mottram, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Outside of the village curtilage.
- In a 40 mph speed zone.
- Not sustainable, not within walking distance of the village.
- Access hazardous
- Cumulative impact: increase in Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor is already 27 percent.
- No facilities in the village, eg health services.
- School already at capacity.

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

- The density of this scheme would be 6.4 dwellings per hectare, as this is at the edge of the village.
- The parish council supports the application.
- Oxfordshire County Council has no highways concerns.
- The site is well screened.

The committee considered this application.

- Some members of the committee expressed disappointment that there were only four proposed dwellings for the site as the trigger point for affordable housing is five dwellings.
- Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor ranked highly on the council's assessment of sustainable villages.

RESOLVED (for 11; against 3; abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years.
2. Submission of details – plot one, garden paths, wall and fence treatments.
3. Approved plans (in accordance).
4. Surface water – drainage.
5. Landscaping – scheme and details.
6. Surface water drainage works.
7. Foul drainage works.
8. Visibility splays.
9. Access, parking and turning in accordance with plan
10. No Drainage to highway.
11. Garage accommodation.
12. Works within the highway.

PI.316 LAND TO THE NORTH OF PRIORY LANE, MARCHAM. P13/V0859/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to develop 18 dwellings with garages, access road, associated works and public open space and a detention basin. (Re-submission of withdrawn application P12/V2447/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.

Updates from the report

- The county highways engineer had withdrawn his holding objection due to improvements made to the application.
- There had been one further letter of objection in response to amendments made to plot 8: this objection had come from the neighbour.
- This will lead to a 16 percent increase in the population size in village, including this site and the two already given approval.

David Walton, from Marcham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Dangerous road access to site.
- Increased flooding risk to several existing properties.
- Proposed materials not suitable to site.
- Damage to "rural feel" of south side of the village.
- If approved, the zebra crossing by The Crown should be upgraded to a pelican crossing with s106 monies.
- Loss of amenity.
- Overshadowing of existing buildings.

Stuart Capel, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The A145 road is already very busy and the application, if granted, could make the highways more dangerous.
- Facilities are all north of the A415 road, whereas this development would be south of the road.
- Potential sewage problems.

Huw Mellor (Kemp & Kemp), the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. His speech included the following:

- The previous scheme had been withdrawn due to objections from the conservation officer, who was content with this new scheme.
- The scheme is deliverable within the time frame.

Councillor Catherine Webber, the ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. The points she raised included the following:

- She supported the parish council's objections.
- Traffic issues: the S bend on the A415 in Marcham is dangerous.
- There are air quality issues in Marcham which will be made worse by increased traffic.

The committee considered this application.

The area around the A415 in Marcham is not in an Air Quality Management Area.

- The committee was concerned about access to and from the site, but accepted the highways officer's advice that it would be adequate.
- The local member should be included in the delegation.
- There should be a materials panel on site. Materials to be determined by the committee and the local member.

RESOLVED (for 8; against 4; abstentions 2)

To delegate the authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning, in consultation with the chairman, vice-chairman and the local member, subject to the following:

Completion within the planning performance agreement (PPA) target of section 106 agreements for on-site affordable housing provision, on site open space provision, contributions towards off-site facilities and services including highways works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum service, social and health care, local and area hub recreational and community facility improvements.

The following conditions, including the requirement 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:

1. Time limit.
2. Approved plans.
3. MC2 - Materials (samples).
4. Access, parking / turning & off site works in accordance with plans.
5. HY12 New estate roads.
6. Landscaping scheme.
7. Open space management plan.
8. LS4 - tree protection.
9. Drainage details (surface and foul).
10. Sustainable drainage scheme.
11. Works in accordance with flood risk assessment.
12. Boundary details.
13. RE5 - Restriction on fences/walls.
14. RE11 - Garage accommodation.
15. Restriction on new openings.
16. Archaeology.
17. Materials: panel on site. To be determined by the committee plus the local member.

If the required section 106 agreements are not completed in a timely manner and so planning permission cannot be granted by the PPA determination deadline, to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the chairman and vice chairman to refuse planning permission.

PI.317 67 HIGH STREET, SHRIVENHAM. P13/V0505/FUL

Councillor Robert Sharp left the meeting and Councillor Sandy Lovatt took the chair.

The officer presented the report on an application to erect a new four bed, two storey dwelling and double garage on land adjacent to 67 High Street. 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

- Paragraph 6.8 of the report: the minimum distance from 3 and 4 Salop Close is 18 metres, not 24.5 metres.
- There have been two further letters of objection raising the above distance point, and other issues covered in the report.
- The windows will not look towards the nearest properties.

Peter Saunders, the applicant's supporter, spoke in favour of the application. 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. List of approved plans.
3. MC2 - Materials (samples).
4. Prior to the occupation of the new dwelling the grade II listed pound at the north side of the site shall be restored in accordance with a scheme of restoration which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should include a schedule of repairs and a method statement, and incorporate details of removal of ivy, stonework repairs and reinstatement of a gate which originally existed.
5. Prior to the commencement of the development full details of the materials to be used in the construction of the dividing boundary wall between the new dwelling and no.67 High Street, shown on drawing number A126/PO2 rev.A, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary wall shall only be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
6. HY1 – Access (details not shown).
7. HY7 – Car parking.
8. HY11[1] - Turn. Space in accor. Spec. Plan
9. HY19 – No drainage to highway.
10. HY16 – No access from specified road.
11. RE11 - Garage Accommodation.
12. LS1 - Landscaping scheme (submission).
13. LS2 – Landscaping scheme (implementation).
14. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, the new first-floor windows on the east and west elevations shall be glazed with obscured glass and shall be fixed shut, apart from a top-hung opening vent only. Thereafter, the windows shall remain obscure glazed with top-hung opening vents only. Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or the equivalent provisions of any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no additional first-floor windows shall be inserted in the east and west elevations of the dwelling without the prior grant of planning permission.
15. RE3 - PD Restriction Single Dwell Ext/Outblds.
16. RE18 – Slab levels (single dwellings).

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm