

# Minutes

## of a meeting of the Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 30 November  
2016 at 6.30 pm  
in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon,  
Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY

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

### **Present:**

Members: Councillors Sandy Lovatt (Chairman), Janet Shelley (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Stuart Davenport, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Monica Lovatt, Ben Mabbett, Chris McCarthy and Margaret Crick

Officers: Emily Hamerton, Susan Harbour, Holly Bates, Peter Brampton, Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel, Matthew Gaskin, Lisa Kamali and Cathie Scotting

Number of members of the public: 40

### **PI.146 Chairman's announcements**

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

### **PI.147 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence**

Councillor Catherine Webber sent her apologies. Councillor Margaret Crick attended as her substitute.

### **PI.148 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations**

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest or declarations which a member of the committee considered would prevent them from considering the applications with an open mind.

### **PI.149 Minutes**

The minutes of the following meetings were agreed by the committee and signed by the chairman as being an accurate record:

- 7 September agreed, items actioned.
- 28 September agreed, items actioned.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 30 November 2016

**PI.1**

- 19 October agreed, with a minor change to Councillor Bob Johnston's comments on application P16/V1283/FUL. He had said that Thrupp Lane was a "failed road", not that attempts to improve it had failed.
- 9 November agreed.

### **PI.150 Urgent business**

Emily Hamerton gave an update on the Inspector's report on the Local Plan, which can now be given "significant weight". It will be presented to Full Council on 14 December 2016 to be formally adopted.

### **PI.151 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications**

The public speakers who had registered would be heard with the relevant application.

### **PI.152 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters**

There were no speakers registered.

### **PI.153 P15/V2541/O - Land North of Shrivenham, Highworth Road, Shrivenham**

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V2541/O for:

- Outline planning permission for a mixed use development of up to 275 dwellings and up to 400 square metres of A1 retail use along with associated public open space.
- Provision of a new roundabout junction on the A420 and other associated highways works on to Highworth Road.
- All matters reserved, apart from access.

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.

This is an allocated site under the local plan.

The local highway authority have no objections.

The clerk read a statement from the parish council. They object to the provision of a 400 square metre retail provision on this development and were only prepared to accept a small convenience store.

Nathan McLoughlin, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The committee asked questions of the agent and the following points were raised:

- The agent had worked with the parish council and was only looking to provide a small retail unit to provide for day to day needs and not to compete with high street stores in Shrivenham.
- The delivery of the roundabout would be subject to discussions with officers and s106 agreements.

The committee asked questions of the officers.

The viability of the affordable housing, at 28 percent, is related to the roundabout which is being provided by the developers.

A motion, proposed and seconded, to accept the officer's recommendation was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to delegate the authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning subject to:

- i. A Section 106 legal agreement being entered into in order to ensure financial contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
- ii. Conditions (or provision in S106 as appropriate) as follows:
  1. Commencement after reserved matters approval.
  2. Reserved matters to be submitted.
  3. Approved plans list.
  4. Reserved matters to generally accord with Design and Access Statement and Illustrative Masterplan.
  5. Details of landscape specifics to be submitted under reserved matters.
  6. Landscape maintained for five years from completion
  7. Surface water drainage scheme based on flood risk assessment to be agreed.
  8. Noise mitigation for retail unit to be agreed.
  9. No occupation until drainage scheme implementation.
  10. Water supply infrastructure upgrade to be carried out.
  11. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
  12. Residential travel plan to be agreed.
  13. Travel information packs to be agreed.
  14. Off-site highway works to be agreed.
  15. Provision of A420 roundabout and Highworth Road junction.
  16. Detailed plans for pedestrian and cycle links and crossings to be provided.
  17. All accesses and visibility splays to be in place prior to occupation.
  18. Archaeological written scheme of investigation to be agreed.
  19. Staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation.
  20. Biodiversity construction environmental management plan to be agreed.
  21. Landscape and ecology management plan to be agreed.
  22. Baseline data to be collected from Tuckmill Meadows and submitted.
  23. Hydrological monitoring plan to be agreed.
  24. Traffic calming measures required to avoid impediment to circular walking routes.

## **PI.154      P16/V1457/FUL - 51 High Street, Sutton Courtenay**

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1457/FUL for a change of use of existing public house and associated works to create one 4-bedroom dwelling, together with construction of one 2-bedroom dwelling to the rear, including access, car parking, landscaping and bin and cycle storage at 51 High Street, Sutton Courtenay.

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.

This application was previously presented on 19 October to Planning Committee. The Plough public house will not be listed as an Asset of Community Value.

The viability report had been approved by an independent assessor who stated that The Plough is not economically viable as a public house.

Councillor David Hignall from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council spoke relating to the application. He noted that:

- Losing the public house was disappointing for the village.

Rebecca Tyler (a local resident) and David Cooper (CAMRA) spoke in objection to the application:

- They did not believe that the viability report was accurate as it is based only on barrelage, not other sales.
- They believed that the loss of viability coincided with the purchase by the current owner.
- They wanted the opportunity to purchase it as a community run public house.

The committee asked questions to the objectors:

- What were the plans and funding to fulfil the project? There was a group of 20 people who would put the public house into a community interest company, namely Friends of the Plough Ltd.

Julian Philcox, the agent for the owner, spoke to the committee:

- The independent reports show that it is not viable as a public house.
- The pub was advertised for sale for an entire year.
- Sutton Courtenay has three other public houses and other community facilities.

The clerk read a statement from the ward member, Gervase Duffield, who paid tribute to the work of those in support of saving the public house. He acknowledged that the case was unanswerable, however, and accepted that planning permission be granted.

The officers received questions from the committee:

- Was the additional dwelling added, as the Vale did not previously have a 5 year housing land supply? The committee was satisfied that the impact on the amenity is acceptable.

The committee noted that the villagers' tenacity was admirable, but on purely planning grounds, the viability report was compelling and the application was not considered refusible. Furthermore, there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development for planning reasons on economic, social and environmental grounds.

A motion, proposed and seconded, to accept the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans.
2. Time limit - full application (full).
3. Submission of details (full).
4. Submission of joinery details (full).
5. Materials (samples) (full).
6. Sustainable drainage scheme (full).
7. Tree protection (implementation as approved).
8. Access (details not shown) (full).
9. Turning space.
10. No drainage to highway (full).
11. Car parking spaces.

## **PI.155 P16/V2166/FUL - 34 North Hinksey Lane, Oxford**

The officer presented the report, and the addendum, to demolish the existing house and erect three dwellings with access from North Hinksey Lane, parking garages and other works at 34 North Hinksey Lane, Oxford.

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.

Henry Venners, the agent for the developer, spoke in favour of the application and took questions from the committee.

The committee was advised by the agent that a hydrological assessment has not yet been undertaken.

The committee asked questions to the officers:

- Should there be an additional condition that a hydrological survey be undertaken before the work commences, given the propensity of winterbournes in the area? There is already a drainage condition (10) and a survey could be undertaken to inform this.
- Was the mass and bulk too great? Figures in the report show the footprint; the roofs are pitched and this will reduce the bulk.
- Was there a robust plan for the removal of soil? A condition exists for a construction method statement. There will be controls on temporary disruptions.

A motion, proposed and seconded, to accept the officer's recommendation, was put and debated by the committee.

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

1. Commencement three years – full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Retaining structure details.
4. Levels.
5. Access in accordance with approved plan.
6. Access, car parking and turning.
7. Landscaping scheme.
8. Tree protection.
9. Materials (samples).
10. Drainage details (surface and foul). Including hydrology survey

11. Construction of method statement.
12. Permitted development restriction on extensions/outbuildings.
13. Cycling and refuse collection.
14. Ecology wildlife survey and mitigation.
15. Lighting.
16. S278.

**PI.156 P16/V1766/RM - Land to the West of Didcot Power Station, Sutton Courtenay Lane, Sutton Courtenay**

The officer introduced the report and the addendum for consent for landscaping as a reserved matter following grant of outline permission under reference P14/V1906/O (Proposed redevelopment of existing buildings and land to provide new buildings for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) and ancillary facilities, car and lorry parking, service areas, access and landscaping) at the land to the west of Didcot Power Station, Sutton Courtenay.

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.

David Hignall, from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council spoke, but had no objections.

Simon Sharp, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The clerk read out a statement from the ward councillor, Gervase Duffield, who agreed with the recommendation and hoped that it would be implemented as soon as possible.

The officers received questions from the committee:

- Concerns were raised about the use of poplar trees which are quick growing but short lived trees. The applicant's agent clarified there would be a mix of planting.

A motion, proposed and seconded to accept the officer's recommendation, was debated by the committee.

**RESOLVED: to grant reserved matters approval subject to:**

1. Commencement two years.
2. Approved plans.
3. Implementation of landscaping and maintenance as approved.
4. Habitat creation and restoration plan as approved.

**PI.157 P16/V1721/FUL - Grove Business Park, Downsview Road, Wantage**

*Councillors Ben Mabbett and Chris McCarthy stepped down for this item as part of the application site was in their ward.*

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1721/FUL for a hybrid application comprising:

- Outline planning application for erection, demolition and conversion of buildings to provide up to 40,000m<sup>2</sup> floor space comprising Class B1 and B8 uses with Class A3, Class D1 and Class D2 uses with all matters except access reserved.
- Full application for erection of Class B1 "incubator" Block (1,205m<sup>2</sup> GIA) with associated car parking following demolition of 7 buildings (1,778m<sup>2</sup>)

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.

No objections had been received to this application.

Sophie Matthews, a consultant, spoke in favour of the application and received questions from the committee.

Ward Councillors Mabbett and McCarthy spoke in favour of the application.

The committee asked questions of the officers.

The committee noted that traffic and loss of trees was of concern to the local residents.

The officer confirmed to committee members that an email had been received from the legal representative of a tenant of the business park. The email confirmed the tenant's intention (through their representative) to submit a Screening Direction request to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. This led to the deferral of this application from the October 19 committee meeting. However, at the time of this meeting, no such request had been made and so officers were satisfied that the committee could assess the planning merits of the proposal at the meeting and vote on a resolution to either approve or refuse the application.

Reserved matters will come back to committee at a later date.

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

**RESOLVED: to grant planning permission, subject to:**

- i. A section 106 legal agreement being entered into with the county council to secure a financial contribution towards Travel Plan monitoring; and
- ii. Conditions as follows for the "full" aspect of the application:
  1. Commencement three years.
  2. Approved plans.
  3. Slab levels to be agreed.
  4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed.
  5. Details of cycle parking to be agreed.
  6. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed.
  7. Updated bat surveys to be agreed.
  8. Tree protection to be agreed.
  9. Travel plan to be agreed.
  10. Materials as specified.

11. Turning, manoeuvring and parking as approved.
12. Sustainable construction measures as approved.
13. Implementation of landscaping scheme as specified.
14. Use Class B1 only.

iii. Conditions as follows for the “outline” aspect of the application

1. Reserved matters submitted within 3 years, commencement within two years of approval of last reserved matter.
2. Approved plans.
3. Site-wide landscaping master plan to be agreed.
4. Tree protection to be agreed.
5. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed.
6. Foul water drainage scheme to be agreed.
7. Biodiversity enhancement scheme to be agreed.
8. Travel plan to be agreed.
9. Pedestrian and cycle link improvements to be agreed.
10. Shuttle bus provision to be agreed.
11. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
12. Construction method statement to be agreed.
13. Turning areas and car parking to be agreed.
14. Written Scheme of Archaeological Investigation to be agreed.
15. Programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation to be agreed.
16. Contaminated Land Investigation to be agreed.
17. Building Heights to be as per approved Heights Parameter Plan.
18. Sustainable construction measure as approved.
19. Total amount of B8 storage accommodation not to exceed more than 1.6 hectares of the site.
20. Total amount of ancillary accommodation (A3, D1, D2) not to exceed 2,500 square metres, with A3 less than 500 square metres.
21. Any gates provided to be set back 12 metres from carriageway.
22. Cycle parking, shower/washing/changing facilities to be provided as part of reserved matters.
23. Noise attenuation measures to be provided as part of reserved matters.

Informative – The indicative layout would not receive support at reserved matters stage.

**PI.158 P15/V2828/FUL - Close End House, 19 East Way, Drayton**

Councillor Davenport stepped down from the committee for this item as the application fell within his ward.

The officer presented the report and the addendum on application P15/V2828/FUL for the development of 8 dwellings and a new access road (as amended by revised layout and new character study in March 2016, and further amended on 12 October 2016 by revised design, housing mix and site layout, Arboricultural Assessment, and revised East Way Improvement drawing and schedule of works).

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 Williams, a representative of Drayton Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the application. He argued that:

- The proposed development was not compliant with the Drayton neighbourhood plan.
- The implications on traffic and drainage would be negative.
- The application should be deferred until Local Plan part 1 is adopted.

The speaker received questions from the committee:

- Had this site been considered as part of the neighbourhood plan? This was one which they were not aware of at the time, so it has not been assessed by the village.
- Why is it contrary to the neighbourhood plan? It is not one of the three sites allocated as part of the plan.

Mr Hagan and Mark Tamburro spoke objecting to the application. They raised concerns that:

- It was not consistent with the neighbourhood plan.
- Flooding was already an issue in the area.
- The traffic problems on the bridleway would be worsened.

The speakers received questions from the committee.

Mike Gilbert and Euan Fergusson, the agent and a supporter, spoke in favour of the application. Their points were as follows:

- A neighbourhood plan cannot block sustainable windfall sites within the boundary of the village and cannot cap development.
- County highways do not object to the amended scheme.
- The development will improve the Eastway at no cost to the residents with a 10 year maintenance plan.

Both the objector and the supporters were given an extra 30 seconds to speak.

Councillor Davenport, the ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- It is not part of the neighbourhood plan.
- Access to the site is poor.
- The roads will not be fit for more vehicles.

The speaker received questions from the committee and the following point was raised:

- The neighbourhood plan does not forbid the site for development, but it has not been assessed and other more suitable sites have been found.

The officers received questions from the committee. The following points were clarified:

- This is not a five year housing land supply site, it is an “infill” site and does not extend the village’s boundaries, so complies with policies.
- The concerns about flooding were addressed; the drainage engineer has raised concerns but they can be addressed by condition 11 (see below).
- The level of parking provision overall is considered acceptable.

- The absence of this site from the neighbourhood plan does not form a material planning consideration.

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

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

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. No obstructions to bridleway during construction.
4. Vehicle access (construction): No construction / demolition vehicle access to be taken along or across the bridleway without appropriate safety/mitigation measures.
5. Vehicle access (occupation): No vehicle access to be taken along or across the bridleway without appropriate safety and surfacing measures.
6. No changes to bridleway unless otherwise agreed in writing.
7. Bridleway improvements to be completed prior to first occupation.
8. Garages to be used for vehicle parking only.
9. Landscaping (hard and soft landscaping including lighting, boundary treatment, and replacement tree planting) to be approved.
10. External materials samples to be approved.
11. Detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme (SUDS) to be approved, and then implemented in full prior to occupation.
12. Biodiversity enhancement strategy to be approved.
13. Ecology survey (to include a mitigation scheme, if required) to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of the development
14. Slab levels to be approved.
15. Details of amended rumble strip at bridleway end of private drive to be submitted and approved.
16. Combined total floor space of the eight dwellings shall not exceed 999 square metres.

**Informatives:**

1. The new lamp post on East Way and the new specimen tree at the site entrance should be positioned so they do not obstruct access for waste collection vehicles.
2. Approval is required from the County Council before any works within the public highway.
3. Works to East Way must be delivered under a Section 278 agreement with the County Council. If safe public access cannot be maintained during works to the public bridleway then the route must be closed using a temporary traffic regulation order, requiring a minimum of 12 weeks' notice.
4. Private drive to be constructed to Oxfordshire County Council adoptable standards, via a Section 38 Agreement but will not be adopted, therefore a private road agreement with OCC will be necessary.
5. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
6. Groundwater Risk Management Permit required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm