

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 21 May 2014 at
6.30 pm

in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon
Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Bill Jones, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Janet Shelley, Margaret Turner, Catherine Webber, Richard Webber (In place of Helen Pighills) and John Woodford

Officers: Peter Brampton, Mark Doodles, Susan Harbour, Laura Hudson and Derek McKenzie

Also present: Councillors Gervase Duffield, Debby Hallett and Melinda Tilley

Number of members of the public: 70

PI.1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

PI.2 URGENT BUSINESS

None.

PI.3 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Helen Pighills sent her apologies; Councillor Richard Webber was her substitute.

PI.4 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of 20 February and 26 March 2014 were circulated separately in advance of the meeting.

RESOLVED: to approve both sets of minutes as correct records and that the chairman sign them as such.

PI.5 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS

Councillor Anthony Hayward was the agent for application P14/V0133/FUL, Volunteer Inn, Station Road Grove. This is a disclosable pecuniary interest. He left the meeting for the duration of this item.

PI.6 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A list showing the members of the public wishing to address the committee on each planning application was tabled and agenda items were taken in the order of the list.

PI.7 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS

None.

PI.8 MATERIALS

None.

PI.9 P13/V1832/O - LAND TO THE WEST OF DIDCOT POWER STATION, SUTTON COURTENAY LANE, DIDCOT

The officer presented the report on an application for the proposed redevelopment to provide new buildings for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) and ancillary facilities, car and lorry parking, service areas, access and landscaping. (Revised drawings showing lower height and smaller footprint to main building). 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 officer clarified that the warehouse site is not in the ownership of Milton Park.

David Hignell, from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The negative impact of cumulative development, especially traffic and drainage.
- That the village feels as though it's losing its identity and setting and is being absorbed into Didcot.
- The proposed development would be out of keeping with the village.
- Vehicles used by potential employees would increase the traffic.

Philip Campbell from MEPC, the owners of Milton Park, spoke on behalf of the objectors to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The scale was out of kilter with the existing buildings and would the proposed warehouse would be 40 per cent of the size of Milton Park.

- Transport and infrastructure: Milton Park traffic would be affected and some of the volume which was currently on private roads would be forced back on to the public highway.
- Proposed S106 contributions were significantly lower than those for other comparable developments.
- There were inconsistencies with the Milton Park Development Order.

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

- The applicant has worked with planning officers to mitigate the scheme.
- It is an employment based development, and as such should be given "significant weight" under the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The proposed warehouse would give a boost to local jobs.
- The proposal has been amended following comments from local people.
- The proposal is policy compliant.

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

- The economic argument did not stack up, the proposed development would give a low quality economic return as it was the wrong type of development, not "high tech" enough.
- The warehouse would be too close to a residential area.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The Local Development Order allowed for structures between 12 and 16 metres in height, as permitted development. This application was for a structure 23 metres in height;
- The transport issues were not resolved, including those of staff transport to and from the site;
- The committee wanted further information on the s106 agreement, and a review of whether the contributions would be adequate;
- The scale of the proposed development was too big;
- The committee did not think that the application would bring appropriate types of jobs to the area: there was not currently a need for a large number of low skilled jobs;
- The committee questioned whether this application was in accordance with NPPF guidelines on sustainable development: there could be a negative environmental and social impact;
- There was likely to be a significant cumulative impact on the area;
- The development was likely to generate further housing pressure, where the Vale currently has a housing shortage and not an employment shortage;
- The proposal was speculative as there was no agreed tenant;
- The A34 is already "at capacity";
- There was further risk of losing the village identity.

RESOLVED (for 2; against 11; abstentions 1)

To accept the officer's recommendation to grant outline planning permission for this site.

Therefore the officer's recommendation was defeated.

RESOLVED (for: 10; against: 3; abstentions 1)

To refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1) The local planning authority considers the proposed development would, by virtue of its scale, bulk and height, unduly erode the rural setting of the historic village of Sutton Courtenay. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies NE9 and NE10 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and the NPPF

2) The lack of certainty provided regarding the potential occupant(s) of the speculative development raises an unacceptable degree of uncertainty regarding the pattern and nature of the impact of associated traffic on the local road network. Therefore the local planning authority considers that the transport data and conclusions put forward by the developer to be of limited value, posing unacceptable risk in terms of highway safety. Therefore the proposal is contrary to policy DC5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

3) The height and scale of the proposals, including the proposed six metre bund and its associated landscaping, will appear discordant, and will erode the long, open views that are characteristic of the Lowland Vale landscape area, together with the amenity of the local network of public rights of way, including the national cycle route. As such the works are not considered to be compliant with policies DC1, DC6 and NE9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

4) Given the scale of works proposed, the levels of S106 contributions proposed are not considered to adequately reflect the extra burden that will be placed on local infrastructure when reasonable comparisons are made to nearby commercial schemes. Therefore the works are not considered to be compliant with the provisions of policies E10 and DC8 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

PI.10 P13/V2562/RM - LAND WEST OF WITNEY ROAD & SOUTH OF A420, KINGSTON BAGPUIZE WITH SOUTHMOOR

The officer presented the report on an application for the erection of 63 dwellings and a 45 unit extra care facility including public open space, landscape and associated works from outline permission P12/V1836/O. 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

- Amended site plan received since publication of committee papers to introduce additional visitor parking to overcome holding objection from OCC Highways

Brian Forster, from Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The impact of the care home on the neighbouring properties;
- The parking arrangements did not appear to be adequate;
- The proposed level of growth would fundamentally change the nature of the settlements;
- The parish council wished to see the care home removed from the proposal.

Roy Wolfe a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The extra care home was out of keeping with the village setting.

Simon Kirk and Jonathan Headland, on behalf of the applicant and Steve Lynch from SOHA housing, spoke in favour of the application. They raised the following points:

- The design of the care home and had evolved with consultation and is fully compliant with all policies;
- This type of tenure has very low parking use.

Councillor Melinda Tilley, the ward councillor, spoke the application. The points she raised included the following:

- Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor is increasing by one third.
- The height of the care home would be too large;
- The design and layout of the care home is unattractive and resembles a prison;
- Visitor parking would be an issue;
- Drainage and foul drainage issues have been raised by both the Vale of White Horse District Council and by Thames Water;
- School Lane would be under the threat of closure during the construction period.
- An extra care home is needed, but not this proposal.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- There is a very limited number of two bed houses as part of the proposal;
- The construction management plan must be enforced;
- The committee were concerned about dominance, layout, height and location of the extra care facility;
- The committee were concerned about the security of the site and requested the extra condition of "Secure By Design".

RESOLVED (for 10; against 4; abstentions 0)

To grant reserved matters approval, subject to the receipt of outstanding technical comments, and to those comments proving to be acceptable, and also subject to:

1. Commencement within 18 months of outline consent on 11/04/2013;
2. Approved plans;
3. Samples of all external materials to be agreed;
4. Panel of walling materials to be provided on site and agreed;
5. Parking and turning as approved;
6. New estate roads to County Council specification;
7. Garage accommodation to be retained on plots 7, 8, 20, 23, 31, 32, 33, 43, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57 and 63;
8. No drainage to highway;
9. Tree protection as approved;
10. Noise mitigation as approved;
11. First floor south western windows of Plot 49 to be obscure glazed;
12. Commencement after all outline consent conditions agreed;
13. The proposed buildings should be "Secure By Design".

PI.11 P13/V2428/FUL - 34 NORTH HINKSEY LANE, OXFORD

The officer presented the report on an application for the demolition of existing dwelling and the erection of 9 two-bed flats with associated infrastructure and landscaping with new access from North Hinksey Lane. 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 additional letter of objection received, reiterating previous concerns.

Julia Hammett, from North Hinksey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The proposed development would not make a positive contribution to the locality;
- Overlooking, mass and height;
- It would be out of character with the local area;
- It is contrary to the design guide.

Philip Booth a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The impact on the local area;
- Loss of amenity;
- Potential for parking overspill and increased hazard on a lane which is a designated cycle route and part of the school run.

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

- The proposal is in a sustainable location and is consistent with the height of the adjoining properties.

Councillor Debby Hallett, one of the ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application. The points she raised included the following:

- The design is of poor quality and not consistent with the local area;
- There is inadequate amenity space in the proposal, including a lack of car parking;
- The proposed building is too high, has a lat roof and is out of alignment with the neighbours;
- There would be a loss of light, privacy and overlooking issues.

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

- The proposal does not fit in with the local character;
- There is inadequate parking.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The height and effect of the solar panels is still to be agreed and is covered by a condition;
- Add condition on bin storage;
- Slab level condition should include that no building work to commence until the slab level has been inspected;
- Local members to be added to the delegation.

RESOLVED (for 10; against 4; abstentions 0)

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

a S106 agreement with the County Council in order to secure contributions towards the provision of public transport and

conditions as follows:

1. Commencement three years;
2. Approved plans;
3. Samples of all materials to be agreed;
4. Sample panel of materials to be provided on site and agreed;
5. Slab and ridge heights to be agreed and no building work to commence until the slab level has been inspected;
6. Landscaping scheme to be agreed;
7. Implementation of landscaping scheme to be agreed
8. Tree protection to be agreed;
9. Surface and foul water drainage strategy to be agreed;
10. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed;
11. Details of boundary screening to be agreed;
12. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed
13. Details of solar panels to be agreed;
14. Access as approved;
15. Car parking as approved;
16. No drainage to highway ;
17. Bicycle parking as approved ;
18. First and second floor windows to be obscure glazed;
19. Bin storage to be agreed.

If the required section 106 agreements are not completed, and planning permission cannot be granted by 21 July 2014, authority to refuse planning permission will be delegated to the head of planning in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman.

PI.12 P13/V2490/FUL - LAND AT HIGHWORTH ROAD, SHRIVENHAM

The officer presented the report on an application to erect 35 dwellings with open space and 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

- None.

Sarah Day, from Shrivenham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- Noise from vehicles on the A420, and the proposed acoustic barrier would be visually intrusive;
- The proposal was the wrong mix of housing: too many four-beds and a shortfall of one and two-bed properties which was what was needed locally;
- The far side of the site would be too far from local amenities and would therefore create parking issues in the village.

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

- The application site currently formed a buffer between residents and the A420 bypass;
- There would be an increase in traffic.

Robert Froud Williams, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. His speech included the following:

- The acoustic fence would also provide protection for existing residents and would be softened by landscaping;
- There are no outstanding objections on highways grounds and Thames Water are content with the proposals.

Councillors Simon Howell and Elaine Ware, the ward councillors, had submitted a statement outlining their objections to the application, which was read on their behalf. The statement is briefly summarised below:

- Lack of adequate public consultation.
- Despite no objections from Thames Water, during periods of prolonged rainfall, residents experience raw sewage backing up on to their properties. Residents in Sandhill, the road adjoining the site, are some of those affected.
- The A420: there is no contribution to improve this major arterial route.
- Swindon Borough Council are consulting on 2380 homes at South Marston, which is within less than a mile of the county boundary and a proposed business Hub at Gablecross which is also within a short distance from the county boundary. Virtually all comments on these consultations refer to flooding risk and A420 issues.
- If this application is approved then any conditions attached must be monitored and adhered to.
- The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

RESOLVED (for 14; against 0; abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission, subject to a S106 agreement to secure the affordable housing and contributions, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – full application (one year from date of decision);
2. Approved plans;
3. Material samples and panel on site;
4. Building details of the proposed dwellings;
5. MC24 - Drainage details (surface and foul);
6. MC29 - Sustainable drainage scheme;
7. LS1 – Landscaping scheme (submission);
8. LS2 – Landscaping scheme (implementation and management plan) ;
9. LS4 – Tree protection;
10. Construction traffic management plan;
11. Provision of a local equipped area of play within the site;
12. Boundary treatment details;
13. Development in accordance with recommendations of noise report;
14. Details of alternative ventilation to first floor;
15. Provision of fire hydrants on site;
16. Written scheme of archaeological investigation.

17. Full details of the proposed site accesses
18. Full details of improvements to Stallpits Road;
19. Relocation of 30mph sign on Highworth Road;
20. Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings - plots 9-15 and 21-27;
21. Removal of permitted development rights to prevent the conversion of garages without planning permission – all garages.

PI.13 P13/V2691/RM - LAND OFF BARNETT ROAD, STEVENTON

The officer presented the report on a reserved matters application relating to outline planning application P13/V0094/O for details of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping and drainage for 50 dwellings. 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.

Jessica Holliday, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Bill Jones, one of the ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- Housing Services had raised concerns over the size of the two bedroom properties: this had not been addressed, but the registered social landlord was content;
- The affordable housing was not adequately distributed throughout the plot.

RESOLVED (for 12; against 1; abstentions 1)

To grant reserved matters, subject to the following conditions:

1. TL3 - Time limit - reflecting the time frame of the outline – within six months of the approval of reserved matters.
2. Approved plan numbers;
3. MC2 - Materials (samples) (full);
4. MC8 - Wall materials (panel) (full);
5. RE11 – Restriction on the change of use of garage accommodation without permission;.
6. RE18 - Slab levels (single dwellings) (full);
7. Submission of full details of any solar panels to be installed;
8. RE6 - Boundary details to be approved.
9. Lighting details (along the main streets) to be approved;
10. Submission of landscaping details;
11. Implementation of landscaping scheme;
12. HY12 – new estate roads layout (to county council specification).

Informative: The outline planning permission reference number P13/V0094/O, together with this approval, constitute the planning permission for this development. All of the conditions imposed on both the outline permission and this approval must be complied with.

PI.14 P14/V0133/FUL - VOLUNTEER INN, STATION ROAD, GROVE

Councillor Anthony Hayward left the meeting for the duration of this item, as he was the applicant's agent and therefore had a disclosable pecuniary interest.

The officer presented the report on an application for the conversion of existing pub (A4) to motel (C1), including side and rear extensions and new front porch; also erection of three bay car wash (*sui generis*) and repair centre and erection of new American style diner (A3) with new access to the rear. (*officer additions in italics*). 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

- A TPO tree unacceptably impacted by one of the spaces. A condition requesting revised drawings to the satisfaction of the tree officer has been appended.

June Stock, from Grove Parish Council, spoke saying that the parish council were generally in support of the application but were concerned about the following:

- The exit/ entrance to the site, especially with the proposed changes to the local bridge and the blind spots;
- Size and location of the proposed signage.

John Bishop, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He made the following points:

- The proposed motel would create 40 to 50 jobs and would bring the building back into use.

Councillor Sue Marchant, one of the ward councillors, spoke in favour of the application, but was also concerned about the safety of the ingress and egress points.

RESOLVED (for 13; against 0; abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission;
2. Approved plans;
3. Sample materials required (all);
4. No additional windows, doors or other openings;
5. No alterations or extensions;
6. UNIQUE - sustainable design Vale of White Horse District Council;
7. New vehicular access;
8. UNIQUE - Access and vision splays;
9. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained;
10. Cycle parking facilities;
11. Green travel plans;
12. No surface water drainage to highway;
13. Landscape management plan;
14. Tree protection (general);
15. No additional commercial floor space;
16. No panel beating / spraying;
17. No sale or display of vehicles;

- 18.HY8[I] - Car parking spaces (details not shown) (full);
- 19.MC24 - Drainage details (surface and foul (full);
- 20.MC29 - Sustainable drainage scheme (full).

Councillor Anthony Hayward returned to the meeting.

PI.15 P14/V0473/FUL - FARINGDON ROAD, STANFORD IN THE VALE

This item was deferred to a later meeting.

The meeting closed at 10.55 pm