

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held at the King Alfred's Suite, Civic Hall,
Portway, Wantage on Thursday, 20
February 2014 at 6.30pm



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

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

Substitute Members: Councillors John Amys and Andrew Skinner.

Other Members: Councillors Jenny Hannaby (in her capacity as County Councillor) and Fiona Roper (in her capacity as Town Councillor) .

Officers: Ms Sandra Fryer, Mrs Jennifer Thompson, Mr Stuart Walker

Number of members of the public: 70

PI.522 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

PI.523 URGENT BUSINESS

None.

PI.524 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Janet Shelley sent her apologies; Councillor John Amys was her substitute. Councillor Catherine Webber sent her apologies; Councillor Andrew Skinner was her substitute.

PI.525 MINUTES

RESOLVED: to adopt as a correct record the minutes of the committee meeting held on 4 December 2013 as circulated to all councillors in advance of this meeting and agree that the chairman signs them.

PI.526 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations of interest.

PI.527 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The speakers' list was tabled at the meeting.

PI.528 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS

None.

PI.529 CRAB HILL, WANTAGE P13/V1764/O

Sandra Fryer, Development Management Manager, introduced the proposal for the development of land at Crab Hill north of A417 and east of A338 at Wantage. The application would contribute to addressing the five year housing land supply shortfall; was an unallocated site in the Local Plan 2011 but was identified as a strategic location suitable for housing in the emerging Local Plan 2029; and is fully compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Stuart Walker, the planning officer responsible for the case management of this application, presented it to the committee. Members of the committee had previously undertaken a visit to the site.

This was an outline application with all matters reserved with the exception of the proposed means of access to the development and the Wantage Eastern Link Road (WELR), a road required to serve the application site and the strategic allocations at Wantage and Grove under Core Policy 14 of the emerging Local Plan 2029 part 1. The application was for residential development of up to 1500 dwellings including new employment space, a neighbourhood centre/community hub, new primary school, central park, ancillary areas (including allotments and sports pitches), with access off the A338 Grove Road and three accesses off the A417 Reading Road and provision of a strategic link road between the A417 and the A338 Road to be known as the Wantage Eastern Link Road.

Updates to the report:

An additional objection from a resident;

- further comments from Harwell Bikers User Group (HarBUG);
- Thames Water had confirmed 170 dwellings could be constructed in the first phase before major work to sewers and drainage was required;
- clarification that at paragraph 7.42 the public open space excluded football pitches.

The Chairman used his discretion to vary the rules in the Constitution and allow each group of speakers 20 minutes to address the committee.

Fiona Roper, in her capacity as Chairman of Wantage Town Council, spoke about this application, including the following points:

- The Town Council recognised the pressure to meet housing targets but this proposal did not accord with the current development plan and was another major development further increasing the population of Wantage and Grove. The town council recommended refusal of the application.
- Should it be approved, conditions should be added to:
 - reduce the density to the minimum required to provide a two-form entry primary school;
 - guarantee funding for the Wantage Eastern Link Road (WELR);
 - require the county council to bring forward improvement work to the A417 and A338;
 - provide a cycle route along the existing off-road route from Harwell to Ardington;
 - ensure that children would receive secondary education locally not have to travel elsewhere in the county;
 - ensure that bus routes through the site would be subsidised;
 - have a 15 metre buffer zone between the development and Charlton;
 - ensure that housing associations could not purchase a large percentage of the open market housing;
 - have a town council representative on the development delivery board;
 - guarantee the S106 funding requested by the town council.

Frank Parnell, Chairman of Grove Parish Council spoke against this application. He drew the committee's attention to Grove Parish Council's comments and emphasised a number of these including:

- increased strain on the public sewer and water systems, health services; and limited local employment;
- the access to the health centre should be changed to improve safety;
- the need for all developments to be taken into account should be reflected in the proposed conditions 50 and 51;
- there was too much reliance on the development of Grove Airfield site, but the two developments must work together to provide the agreed facilities for all residents;
- construction traffic should be prevented from using the Mably Way stretch of the A417;
- a pollution monitoring system and baseline should be established for Letcombe Brook
- local people and a drainage expert should be on the delivery board.

Ken Dijksman, spoke against this application, and asked if this was realistic and justified solution to the housing shortfall, given the likely long delivery time.

Julie Maberley, from the Wantage and Grove Campaign Group spoke against this application, including the following points:

- cumulatively the proposed and approved developments increased the population of Wantage and Grove by 60 per cent;
- the site was not formally allocated in the current development plan and the application was premature, on high quality agricultural land, and detrimental to the nearby Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- this application did not improve services in the town, add employment; or provide the necessary link road until 2021;
- there should be no further increase in permitted housing without substantial increases in infrastructure and relying on S106 funding was not sufficient;
- a fully funded package of infrastructure improvements should be approved by local residents and the two principal local authorities before the application was considered for approval;

- the proposed density was too urban in nature, higher than in Charlton, and changed the character of the area;
- there not sufficient school places now and the new school should be provided earlier than proposed;
- construction traffic should also be prevented from using Denchworth Road and the roundabout.

Richard Hart spoke against this application, including the following points:

The development had an adverse impact on the Charlton conservation area approved by this council, which referred to the rural views and open countryside lost to this development. He considered that 1500 homes must cause substantial harm. If approved, the open space proposed should be provided nearer to Charlton to maintain some semblance of rural, open views and to manage the conflict between Charlton and the new development.

Patricia Hyde endorsed the points made by the previous objectors.

Jenny Hannaby, in her capacity as county councillor, expressed her disappointment in this application. She urged the construction of the relief road first and in full. She supported refusing the application; deferring it; or at a minimum ensuring full ring-fenced funding was in place to construct the whole link road at the start, not the end, of the work on the development.

Guy Wilkin from HarBUG spoke about this application. He was concerned that the scheme for cycle routes was not adequate and did not link the development appropriately to other areas. He said that the cycle and pedestrian scheme should implement Department for Transport guidance for cycling and pedestrian routes and should implement the county council's cycling strategy.

Steven Sensecall, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of this application, including the following points:

- the proposal was not premature as the site had been included in the local development plan in 2007 and there was nothing to suggest it would not be included in the core strategy;
- this was a suitable area for development and a sustainable addition to the town and delivered housing to support employment growth in the Harwell and Didcot area;
- full impact appraisals had been undertaken to address concerns and the scheme density was appropriate over the site;
- infrastructure in line with the local authorities' requirements would be delivered;
- work with Thames Water and the Environment Agency on mitigating the risk of flooding and on water and sewerage capacity had influenced the plans and led to the conclusion that 170 homes could be delivered from 2015 without requiring major work to the sewer system;
- the conservation officer had raised no objection as the development did not cause substantial harm to the conservation area;
- the link road would be delivered by the site's developers and construction of the first two sections of the link road could be brought forward. However delivery in phases was the only viable way of providing this.

Councillor Charlotte Dickson, one of the local ward members, said that the application should be refused but should it be permitted her concerns included:

- construction of the whole of the WELR was crucial and this must be delivered before the first tranche of houses;

- all roads should be adopted so that parking regulations could be enforced;
- better public transport, cycle routes should be provided;
- the timetable for the delivery of S106 commitments should be binding and new schools should be provided early. There were concerns over secondary school provision;
- there must be no compromise on the provision of around 35 per cent affordable housing and this should be spread through the site;
- the nearby brook must be maintained to reduce the risk of flooding;
- the development delivery board should work closely alongside the airfield development delivery board.

Councillor Sue Marchant, one of the local ward members, spoke about this application, including the need for the WELR to be provided and to restrict traffic through Charlton; the concerns expressed by residents; the need to provide school places and shared ownership homes.

Councillor Bill Jones, one of the local ward members, spoke about this application, emphasising the need to improve the A417 and roads east of Wantage to cope with increased traffic to Harwell and Didcot; to improve access for the Hendreds; and welcoming better cycle provision. He asked if funding for a youth worker could be included in the S106 agreement.

Councillor John Amys, one of the local ward members, spoke about this application, emphasising the need to complete the link road in full before development started, and requesting improvements to the surrounding A-roads:

The planning officer responded to the questions and points raised by the speakers:

- housing numbers could not be reduced by condition;
- the mitigation measures proposed for the A417 were considered sufficient for this development. Oxfordshire County Council was considering the wider case for upgrading the road. The county council highways officer confirmed it may be possible to provide the central section of the WELR in advance of receipt of the S106 funding for this;
- he noted the bus company's comments about minimum road widths and the speakers' point about adopting all roads;
- car parking provision in the town centre was not a matter for the developer to address;
- the cycling provision strategy was still in development;
- planning consent could only specify the proportion and mix of affordable housing, and could not control the sale of the houses. The proposal was to provide 65 per cent market price, 30 per cent rented affordable and five per cent shared ownership units across the site;
- the report addressed the interdependence of this site and the Grove airfield site on the infrastructure proposals;
- he accepted speakers' comments about the composition of the delivery board;
- monitoring of and work on Letcombe Brook was included in the development strategy; and pollution monitoring could be included;
- a delivery strategy to manage integrated phased building by different developers in smaller parcels would be developed for the site;
- there was an expectation that different developers across this and the airfield site would work together to deliver required infrastructure and that work with Thames Water and the Environment Agency would continue;
- the S106 agreement would include a timetable with targets and would amongst other things cover schooling (with Oxfordshire County Council as the lead authority), an

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

extension to the health centre but not changes to the access or additional services, and a youth worker in principle.

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

- councillors noted the constructive suggestions offered by the speakers and noted the points which would come back as reserved matters applications;
- councillors noted the extensive list of proposed conditions;
- they noted the constraints on the planning authority caused by the lack of a five year land supply and the need to control development by granting permissions with comprehensive conditions and legal agreements to safeguard the benefits for communities;
- the delivery board was crucial. It should include relevant town and parish council representatives as well as those from interested groups in the town;
- they noted the expected delivery masterplan, proposals for sustainable and lifetime homes, and noted that quality design and a coherent development was expected;
- the phasing and trigger points of delivery of S106 funded infrastructure should be linked to the overall delivery targets on the site not to individual sections;
- they noted the provision of affordable rented and shared ownership housing and that this would be dealt with under reserved matters applications;
- while there was an impact on the setting of the conservation area but this was not sufficient to justify refusing the application;
- the density across the whole site was considered appropriate;
- bus operators should be invited to comment on the detailed scheme and there should be changes to ensure buses could run through the development and an assessment of the adequacy of the links to Harwell and Didcot;
- the improvements to foul drainage had to encompass more than just this site and the risk of flooding should be mitigated by the use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs).

A motion to grant outline planning permission as set out in the officer's report was proposed, seconded, and approved when put to the vote.

RESOLVED: (For: 11; Against: 0; Abstentions: 3)

That outline planning permission be granted subject to:

1: a section 106 agreement to deliver the provision of around 35 per cent affordable housing on the site (of which a minimum of 30 per cent shall be affordable rented) and the following infrastructure package of around £32m (more details in appendix 9 of the officer's report):

- Strategic highways and transportation
- Education
- Community infrastructure
- Indoor and outdoor sports and leisure facilities
- Green infrastructure
- Local economic development support
- Delivery costs

2: and subject to the following list of conditions:

Prior to submission of reserved matters:

1. Agreed Development Delivery Strategy that sets out how the development will be delivered including the masterplan, phasing and sub phases, development parcels, housing mix, design code strategy, site wide strategies and development monitoring.
2. Submission and approval of a masterplan for the entire site.

Time Limits and General Implementation Conditions:

3. Reserved matters time limits, covering all aspects of development. First parcel submitted within three years and all reserved matters submitted no longer than eight years from date of permission.
4. Reserved matters – time limit, development to start within two years of approval.
5. No phases of development to be begun without full detailed drawings for all reserved matters in that phase.
6. No more than 1500 houses to be built on the site.
7. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and Development Delivery Strategy document.
8. Development carried out in line with the mitigation measures in the environmental impact assessment.
9. All reserved matters in line with the Development Delivery Strategy and approved parcel or sub-phase plans.
10. Parcels of houses to be between 40 and 150 units maximum and to use a panel of different architects throughout the scheme.
11. Reserved matters for the neighbourhood centre to be in line with the agreed neighbourhood centre development brief.
12. Package of land uses as set out in the original application.
13. Housing mix (excluding affordable housing).
14. Ten per cent market homes to be constructed to lifetime homes standard.

Conditions requiring local planning authority approval before development commences:

15. Distribution of housing and monitoring of delivery across the scheme.
16. No development to commence until the plans for the phase or sub phase has been approved.
17. Design code for each phase or sub phase including planned monitoring of delivery to be prepared in accordance with the masterplan for the site and the Development Delivery Strategy.
18. Sub phases or parcels to be brought forwards in line with the Development Delivery Strategy and the approved masterplan.
19. No development to begin until phasing strategy and rate of delivery agreed.
20. Site wide construction environmental management plan (CEMP).
21. Construction environmental management plan (CEMP) for each phase / sub phase.
22. Hours of construction.
23. Energy delivery strategy for each phase or sub phase.

Landscaping and Ecology:

24. Site wide landscape and ecological management plan.
25. Hard and soft landscaping agreed for each phase of sub phase.
26. Tree planting and replacement required.
27. Tree protection.
28. Landscape and woodland management plan(s).
29. Landscape and ecological management plan for each phase or sub phase.

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

30. Bat box / owl roost or similar to be provided.
31. No clearance of site in the nesting season.
32. Allotment provision and timing of delivery.
33. Play areas.

Environmental management:

34. Considerate contractor scheme.
35. Noise mitigations measures within each phase of sub phase of development.
36. Noise impact of non-residential uses assessed and measure taken to mitigate impact.
37. Noise emissions and hours of operation of non-residential uses.

Archaeological Investigation:

38. Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation for each phase.
39. Staged programme of archaeological mitigation carried out by approved expert.

Soil resources:

40. Strategy for management of soil resources to be submitted and approved.

Contaminated land investigation and remediation:

41. Strategy and remediation of contaminated land to be agreed.

Lighting and light pollution:

42. Lighting strategy for the whole site.
43. Details of all lighting to be included in each phase of sub phase of development.

Waste management:

44. Site wide waste management strategy.
45. Waste management plan for each phase or sub phase.
46. Recycling facilities in each house.
47. Location of local recycling sites.
48. Recycled material for highways.

Surface drainage:

49. Site wide surface water drainage strategy.
50. Surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles for each phase or sub-phase of development.

Foul sewage:

51. Site wide foul drainage strategy.
52. Drainage strategy for each phase or sub-phase.

Prior to occupation conditions:

53. Boundary treatments.
54. Aerial and satellite dishes.

Development briefs for:

55. Neighbourhood centre.
56. Primary school.
57. Extra care housing.
58. Community hub.

Affordable housing:

59. Scheme for approval by the council of range of size, type and delivery of affordable houses and overall management.
60. Extra care housing scheme.

Education delivery:

61. Limit houses for occupation to 349 before primary school constructed.
62. Grampian condition to restrict the number of houses until adequate secondary school places available.

Highways and transport:

63. WELR, fall back measures in Wantage if road does not come forward.
64. Delivery of off site traffic mitigation schemes.
65. Western junction on to A417.
66. Eastern junction to A417.
67. No work to start on construction of WELR until all detailed drawings approved including landscaping.
68. Bus stops.
69. Public rights of way to remain open all through the development.
70. Garage condition not to be used for residential.
71. Section 38 or section 278 agreement required for all road or footway construction.
72. Detailed access design to be submitted for approval.
73. Parking and manoeuvring within the neighbourhood centre to be approved.
74. Not to begin any phase of development until bus access, egress and turning areas been agreed and constructed.
75. All houses to have cycle parking facilities.
76. Cycle parking across the development including at the neighbourhood centre, school and community hub.
77. Travel plan to be prepared and monitored for the residential areas, the school neighbourhood centre activities, community hub and extra care housing scheme.
78. Sustainable travel information pack prepared and available for each new home.

Sustainable construction:

79. Standards.
80. Rainwater harvesting.
81. Emission/energy efficiency.
82. Materials – samples.
83. Boundary treatments.
84. Slab levels.
85. Broadband.
86. Fire hydrants.

3 : and the delegation to the Head of Planning of the decision to switch between the use of planning condition or clauses within the Section 106 Agreement to achieve the agreed infrastructure package and other outcomes in line with this decision

4: and the setting up of a Development Delivery Board to support the delivery of the development in the Grove/Wantage Area.

PI.530 MATERIALS

The Chairman took this item at the end of the meeting.

The committee considered the layout plan and the material samples displayed for the discharge of condition 3 (construction materials) for application P12/V2653/FUL at Land off Draycott Road Southmoor, OX13 5NG.

RESOLVED: to approve the material samples shown on the layout plan supplied:

- Wall - Wienerberger - Dorchester Red
- Wall - Wienerberger - St Albam's Orange Stock
- Wall - Atlas Walling - Old Cotswold Rustic
- Wall - Marley Eternit - Weatherboard, C50 Black
- Roof - Redland Duoplain – Flame Red
- Roof - Redland Duoplain – Rustic Brown

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm