

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday 9 November 2016 at 6.30 pm
in The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Sandy Lovatt (Chairman), Eric Batts, Stuart Davenport, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Monica Lovatt, Ben Mabbett, Chris McCarthy and Catherine Webber

Officers: Holly Bates, Peter Brampton, Steve Culliford, Emily Hamerton, and Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel

Also present: Councillor Robert Sharp

Number of members of the public: 18

PI.133 Chairman's announcements

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

PI.134 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

Councillor Janet Shelley had sent her apologies for the meeting.

PI.135 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations

None

PI.136 Minutes

RESOLVED: to adopt as a correct record the minutes of the committee meetings held on 8 June and 27 July 2016, and agree that the chairman signs them, subject to the following amendments to the minutes of 8 June 2016:

- in minute PI.15, to spell Councillor Johnston's name correctly
- in minute PI.26, to record that Councillor Stuart Davenport stepped down for the committee for that item as he was the local ward councillor

PI.137 Urgent business

The chairman reported that the planning officers' addendum report was tabled at the meeting.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 9 November 2016

PI.1

PI.138 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications

The list showing members of the public that had registered to speak on planning applications was tabled at the meeting.

PI.139 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters

None

PI.140 P16/V1954/O - Abingdon Road, Steventon

The officer reported that application P16/V1954/O at Abingdon Road, Steventon, had been withdrawn from the agenda due to (1) the need to assess new information and (2) because the county council's education objection remained outstanding.

PI.141 P15/V2828/FUL - Close End House, 19 East Way, Drayton

The officer reported that application P15/V2828/FUL at Close End House, 19 East Way, Drayton, had been withdrawn from the agenda at the applicant's request.

PI.142 P16/V1589/O - Land west of Faringdon Road, Stanford-in-the-Vale

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1589/O for a residential development of up to 100 dwellings with associated access on land west of Faringdon Road, Stanford-in-the-Vale.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and addendum, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The officer also reported that the education authority planned to provide additional classroom capacity on the existing school site.

Peter Lewis, a representative of Stanford-in-the-Vale Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The development, although allocated for housing in the local plan, must be sustainable
- The lack of capacity at the village primary school had not been fully resolved
- The density of the development proposed on this site was too high, especially in this edge of village location

Nicky Brock, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. Her speech included the following:

- The proposal complied with the local plan
- There were no objections from the statutory bodies
- The applicant had worked with local people and the neighbourhood planning group to provide an acceptable development
- The applicant would pay a higher than standard contribution towards new education provision

- 100 homes should be achievable on this site but the exact number would be a matter for the reserved matters application
- The applicant had no right of access over the adjacent site

Councillor Robert Sharp, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application:

- The proposal had a high density for this edge of village location
- There was no masterplan for the three sites
- The housing density of the three separately-owned sites could result in more dwellings than the 200 homes allocated in the local plan for these three sites combined
- There was no agreement on additional education provision and this alone was a reason to refuse the application

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The discussion included the following points:

- The density of the site would be considered at the reserved matters stage
- The county council had assessed possible expansion of education provision on alternative sites but had concluded that the best option was to expand the primary school's capacity on the existing site
- The proposed expansion of the primary school's capacity covered the whole local plan allocation of 200 new homes
- Section 278 works could be covered by a planning condition

A motion was moved and seconded to defer consideration of the application to allow both this application and the application for the adjacent site to be considered together. The committee was advised that each application would have to be considered separately on its own merits and the two applications could not be considered together as one. It was also normal procedure to consider density at the reserved matters stage. In light of this, the proposer and seconder agreed to withdraw their motion to defer the application; the committee accepted this.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was then put to the meeting and was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to delegate authority to the head of planning to grant outline planning permission for application P16/V1589/O, subject to the following:

1. A S106 agreement being entered into in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
2. Conditions as follows:
 1. Commencement two years after reserved matters approval, reserved matters within three years.
 2. Reserved matters to include a biodiversity enhancement strategy.
 3. Approved plans.
 4. Road safety audit to be agreed.
 5. Off-site highway works to be agreed.
 6. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
 7. Residential travel plan to be agreed.
 8. Travel information pack to be agreed.
 9. Sustainable urban drainage scheme to be agreed.
 10. Tree protection to be agreed.

11. Contamination risk assessment to be agreed.
12. Access as agreed.
13. Visibility splays as agreed.
14. Protected species strategy as agreed.
15. Foul drainage strategy as agreed.
16. New estate roads to highway authority specification.
17. No drainage to highway.
18. No occupation until drainage scheme implementation.

PI.143 P16/V1903/FUL - The Gate House, Reading Road, Upton

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1903/FUL to replace the existing family dwelling at The Gate House, Reading Road, Upton.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and addendum, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Richard Boother, the agent of a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The plans submitted were inaccurate
- The footprint did not have the same basic dimensions
- There was a significant difference in site levels between the application site and the neighbouring property
- This resulted in a loss of privacy and an overbearing development
- The application should be deferred to allow the neighbour more time to respond

Neil Perry, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His speech included the following:

- The application was a result of human error by the architect; there had been no devious intention to build the house in the wrong location
- The council's enforcement officers had verified that the plan as presented was accurate
- The application met all council policies

The Democratic Services Officer read a statement on behalf of Councillor Janet Shelley, the local ward councillor, who was unable to attend the meeting. The statement included:

- The principle of a replacement dwelling on this site was not in question
- But the recommendation to approve this application resulted in an overwhelming impact on the neighbouring dwelling
- There was a variance in land levels between the two properties
- The development as built encroached towards Upton Lodge Cottage
- It was contrary to policy DC9 and was harmful to the neighbouring property through overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing and dominance

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The discussion included the following points:

- This was a retrospective application
- The house had been built in the wrong location and the council's enforcement team had taken spot measurements to verify this
- The officers wished to conduct further detailed checks of the final surveyed plan to ensure accuracy and asked for the application to be deferred to allow this to happen

A motion, moved and seconded to defer consideration of the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote. Officers were asked to suggest a beech hedge rather than cherry trees along the eastern boundary to give better screening to neighbouring property.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P16/V1903/FUL to conduct further detailed checks of the final surveyed plan to ensure accuracy.

PI.144 P16/V2181/HH - 1 Walnut Close, West Hanney

The officer presented the report on application P16/V2181/HH for a side extension at 1 Walnut Close, West Hanney. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/V2181/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years.
2. Approved plans list.
3. Materials in accordance with the application.
4. Details of access to garage, including visibility splays to be submitted.

PI.145 P16/V2341/FUL - 73 Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay

The officer presented the report on application P16/V2341/FUL to demolish the existing dwelling and the erection of a chalet style dwelling with first floor accommodation in the roof at 73 Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/V2341/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years.
2. Approved plans.
3. Materials in accordance with the application.
4. Rooflights to be located at least 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm