

DC.73

**MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL,
ABINGDON ON MONDAY
12TH SEPTEMBER, 2005**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Sylvia Patterson (Chair), Terry Quinlan (Vice-Chair), Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Tony de-Vere, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Peter Jones, Monica Lovatt, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Briony Newport, Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Pam Westwood and John Woodford.

OFFICERS: Rodger Hood, Carole Nicholl, David Quayle, Geraldine Le Cointe and Katie Rooke.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 12

DC.109 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

DC.110 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 July 2005 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.111 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

One Councillor declared an interest in report 111/05 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Councillor Margaret Turner	Personal	CHI/11792/9	The agent acting for the land owner was a fellow Councillor on the Parish Council	DC.121

DC.112 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair announced that application LRE/4783/4 had been withdrawn from the agenda, (Minutes DC.119 refers).

The Chair reminded Councillors and members of the public that all mobile telephones should be switched off during the meeting.

DC.113 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.114 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.115 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that five members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting, although one decided not to do so at the meeting.

DC.116 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials as follows: -

- (1) Demolition of Existing House and Construction of 12 Flats in two buildings, 214 Kennington Road, Kennington KEN/18891

By 17 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

Bricks – Warnham Red

Tiles – Eternit Acme Hawkins plain clay tiles in Heather Mix

Stone – Cotswold natural stone - cream, grey and buff mix

Render – cream colour

- (2) Demolition of existing garage building. Erection of 4 one bedroom flats, 2 two bedroom house, 2 three bedroom house / four bedroom house or 2 five bedroom houses together with associated parking and garages, Uffington Garage, Broad Street, Uffington UFF/1082/8

By 17 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the applicant be requested to erect a panel of sample materials on site.

DC.117 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal lodged with the Planning Inspectorate for determination and one which had been withdrawn.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.118 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered details of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

RESOLVED

that the report be received.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 111/05 of the Assistant Director (Planning) detailing Planning Applications, the decisions of which are set out below. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.119 LRE/4783/4 – CONVERSION OF STABLES TO FORM THREE DWELLINGS. ANTWICKS
STUD, MAIN STREET, LETCOMBE REGIS

As referred to elsewhere in these Minutes, it was noted that this application had been withdrawn.

DC.120 LRE/8663/4-A – NEW SIGNAGE, PAVILION, LETCOMBE CRICKET CLUB, BASSETT
ROAD, LETCOMBE REGIS

The Chair advised that she had requested that this application be brought to the attention of the Committee as she had some concerns regarding the proposal in terms of visual impact in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). She commented that the area was very open and any advertisements could be seen. She considered that they would be very intrusive and harmful.

Other Members disagreed, considering that the signs would not be inappropriate in this location.

It was suggested that an informative should be added to any permission to advise that the permission was for the continued display of these signs only and that for any further signs the applicant must first apply for permission which would be given careful consideration in view of the location of the site in the AONB.

One Member commented on the need for a site owner's permission to erect the signs and it was suggested that it should be made clear to the applicant the difference between that consent and the need for Advertisement Consent granted by the Planning Authority. The Officers undertook to clarify that this was a standard requirement of all advertisement consents and that the above informative would be sufficient clarification.

By 16 votes to 1 it was

RESOLVED

that application LRE/8663/4 – A be approved subject to: -

- (i) the conditions set out in the report; and*
- (ii) an informative to advise that the Advertisement Consent is for the continued display of the existing signs only and that for any further signs the applicant must first apply for permission which will be given careful consideration in view of the location of the site in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*

DC.121 CHI/11792/9 – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING. ERECTION OF 11 DWELLINGS
AND COVERED PARKING WITH ACCESS FROM NEWBURY ROAD, CHILTON, THE
HORSE AND JOCKEY, CHILTON

Councillor Margaret Turner had declared a personal interest in this item and she left the meeting by choice during its consideration.

Members were advised of the difference between the approved scheme and the current proposal and it was suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, in view of the siting of drains to the north of the site, an additional condition should be added requiring slab levels to be agreed in writing.

Mrs D Messer, also speaking on behalf of Mrs Turnbull of No. 7 made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She specifically raised concerns regarding traffic in view of the existing level of cars going to the garden centre; the inadequate car standing area; the lack of public transport; the need for a complete car parking ban along the highway and noise. She referred to noise from traffic on the A34 and suggested that a possibility to resolve this might be road upgrading. She referred to a nearby site where there was a planning application for houses which if approved would impact on this proposal. She commented that the Committee should have regard to the impact of that application and other developments nearby including the Synchotron development.

Mr N Crowley, the applicant made a statement in support of the application. He asked the Committee to look at the application as an amendment to the approved scheme rather than as a new development. He commented that the proposal had the same physical attributes with broadly the same footprint as the approved scheme. He advised that the size of the units had been reduced. He explained that the main local concern seemed to be traffic, but the extra two units would only increase traffic by 8 to 10 movements per day for each unit which was minimal. Finally he reported that the scheme accorded with all planning standards.

Mr S Lily, the applicant's agent was due to make a statement in support of the application but he declined to do so.

Members considered that the proposal was acceptable and that there was no reason to refuse permission.

By 16 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application CHI/11792/9 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional condition requiring slab levels to be agreed.

DC.122 ASH/12053 - ERECTION OF A DETACHED HOUSE AND GARAGE (AMENDED PLANS), LAND BETWEEN RECTORY FARM COTTAGES, IDSTONE, ASHBURY

The Committee was advised of the reason for the application which primarily was to address the requirements of building control in terms of emergency exits, although some windows were required to allow extra light and for design reasons.

Members expressed concern at the proposal commenting that the additional fenestration would be visually unacceptable. The requirements of building Control were questioned and furthermore it was noted that the approved drawings had shown stone and brick whereas these new plans showed brick only.

It was proposed by the Chair, seconded Councillor Terry Cox and by 17 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that consideration of application ASH/12053 be deferred to allow discussions with the Council's Building Control Service and the applicant regarding an amendment to the

application removing those windows not needed for escape purposes and to clarify the materials proposed for the front elevation.

DC.123 HAR/12063/20-X – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF BUILDING FOR STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION. (CLASS B8) OR GENERAL INDUSTRIAL USE (CLASS B2), SPRINKLER TANK, IMPROVEMENTS TO ACCESS ROAD, HGV PARKING, CAR PARKING AND STRUCTURAL PLANTING. PLOT 9A, LAND WEST OF DIDCOT POWER STATION

Further to the report the Committee was advised that the County Engineer had no objection to the application subject to (1) contributions to the Highway Authority which would require a Section 106 agreement, (2) improvements to the roundabout and (3) a traffic routing agreement to prevent HGV traffic going north through the village of Sutton Courtenay or Milton Park.

One of the local Members raised concerns regarding the cumulative effect of permitting this application. She referred to other recent development in the area, raising concern regarding traffic.

One Member questioned the benefits of a routing agreement, commenting on the difficulties in the enforcement of existing routing agreements in place for other developments in the area. He reported on local concerns regarding traffic and questioned whether an agreement could be carefully considered at the time a tenant was found for this development. The Officers responded that the tenant was irrelevant as permission ran with the planning consent commenting that there were many such agreements in place which were monitored and enforced by the County Council.

One Member expressed concerned regarding the number of permissions granted in this area resulting in increased traffic and increased HGV's passing through Sutton Courtenay. He commented that every time a permission was granted the situation became worse and he questioned the physical measures which could be taken to address this problem and whether this had been discussed specifically with the County Council.

The Officers referred to the Didcot Integrated Transport Study (DIDITS) which included consideration of traffic management in villages in this area. It was reported that the site benefited from a Certificate of Lawful Use and that to seek a routing agreement should be welcomed.

One Member suggested that the concerns of the Committee regarding the cumulative effect of approving development in terms of traffic generation should be drawn to the attention of the County Council, with County Officers being asked to suggest any means of resolving this problem. However, it was reported that the County Council was establishing a large developer contribution fund towards DIDITS measures. A formula for contributions towards a package of measures was being drawn up and it was likely that the fund would be extended to provide measures in the Wantage and Grove area. The County Council was aware of the commercial build up, the power station and the need for infrastructure in this area.

By 17 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Members be delegated authority to approve application HAR/12063/20-D subject to:-

- (i) *appropriate conditions;*
- (ii) *other conditions to address the comments of the County Engineer, namely improvements to the roundabout and a traffic routing agreement to prevent HGV traffic going north through the village of Sutton Courtenay or Milton Park; and*
- (iii) *a Section 106 agreement to secure a contribution towards highway improvements in the Didcot area.*

DC.124 MIL/16391/4 – ERECTION OF FOUR FLATS. LAND ADJACENT TO 15 HIGH STREET, MILTON

Mr G W Strange made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns that the proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding area in that there were no flats in the High Street; design in terms of the building unsuccessfully seeking to reflect the design of neighbouring Grade II listed barns; traffic; and access in that opposite there was a well used lane and the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders could be compromised. He reminded the Committee that the site was in the Conservation Area and that the proposal did not amount to infill. Finally, he advised that the Parish Council was not opposed to some form of development but considered that a single dwelling or a pair of semi detached houses would be appropriate.

One of the local Members raised concern at the proposal commenting that the site was not in a sustainable location and that there would be a need for the occupiers to rely on private vehicles.

One Member expressed concern regarding boundary treatment commenting that the proposed fence might become unsightly. He suggested that a wall or railings along the front boundary and the boundary with the cemetery car park would be preferable. He suggested that there was no reason to refuse the application and clarified that whilst the previous planning permission had expired, that was a material consideration unless the circumstances or planning policy had changed.

One Member concurred with the views of the speaker regarding design but did not consider that the design was so harmful as to warrant refusal.

By 16 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

RESOLVED

that application MIL/16391/4 be approved subject to: -

- (i) *the conditions set out in the report; and*
- (ii) *an informative to advise that the boundary treatment to the front and on the boundary with the cemetery car park should be walling or railings rather than fencing.*

DC.125 DRA/16643/3 – TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION FOR LOUNGE AND UTILITY WITH BEDROOM OVER. INTERNAL ALTERATIONS. WALNUT COTTAGE, ABINGDON ROAD, DRAYTON

By 17 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application DRA/16643/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.126 WAT/18458/2 – CONSTRUCTION OF CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA. PUBLIC HOUSE, A420 TRIANGLE, MAJORS ROAD, WATCHFIELD

The Committee was advised that the applicant had considered alternative locations for the play equipment and the reasons why these had been rejected were explained.

One Member commented that he did not accept the reasons for discounting the alternative locations expressing concern that in this position the play equipment would be visually intrusive. He explained that the building had been sensitively designed and that this proposal would compromise its setting. Furthermore, he expressed concern regarding the safety of children who might rush to cross the busy road to use the equipment which would be clearly visible in this location.

Other Member disagreed considering that the location was appropriate. However, it was considered that there should be improved boundary treatment secured by an appropriate landscaping and boundary treatment condition and that the type of play equipment should first be agreed by the Planning Authority.

By 14 votes to 3 it was

RESOLVED

that application WAT/18458/2 be approved subject to: -

- (i) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (ii) further conditions to include the prior approval by the Planning Authority of a landscaping scheme, boundary treatment and the play equipment; and*
- (iii) the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Members being consulted on the landscaping scheme.*

DC.127 SHR/18823/2 – ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS. LAND REAR OF 9-11 HIGHWORTH ROAD, SHRIVENHAM

Ms L Parslee made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly raised concerns regarding the proposal in terms of it being out keeping; the scheme amounting to over development; dominance, height, access, over looking, loss of privacy, removal of trees and car parking. She explained that the height of the proposed houses would be 9 metres compared to the height of other dwellings in area which were about 7.5 metres. She commented that the site was next to a recycling area and reported that there was likely to be access conflicts in the car park, which was small. She expressed concern at the possible felling of trees which would result in loss of her privacy. She referred to the amount of fenestration which she considered was in appropriate and would result in over looking. She advised that the site was on the edge of the Conservation Area and was close to a listed building. Finally, she explained that she had no objection to the principle of development, but reiterated that the current proposal was not acceptable in terms of over development, being out of keeping adjacent to smaller properties, loss of privacy and out look.

Some Members spoke in support of the application commenting that the site was large enough to accommodate the buildings and access was not to the main road. It was commented that detached houses would not be out of keeping and the design would not be harmful to the street scene. In addition it was commented that the windows would not over look neighbouring habitable rooms.

One Member referred to the comments of the speaker expressing some concern at the proposed access across the car park. He questioned whether the access across the car park would be protected and to what extent this was a planning issue. Furthermore, he questioned whether the Highway Authority would have had regard to this when making its observations. The Officers clarified that the County Engineer had raised no objection. It was explained that two spaces in the car park would be lost but the Council did not have details of these. It was confirmed that the County Engineer had specifically looked at the access, as no access was shown on the original application. It was suggested that a condition could be added to any permission to require that the access should be kept clear.

One Member expressed concern at the proposal in terms of height in that he considered that it would dominate the street scene. However, he was not convinced that it was so harmful as to warrant refusal. The Officers commented that the height was not unusual and in this case there would be difficulty in seeking to reduce the height because of the roof span. A redesign of the buildings might be necessary. In response to a question raised, the Officers advised that the ridge heights of the surrounding dwellings were unknown.

By 13 votes to 4 it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to approve application SHR/18823/2 subject to: -

- (i) the conditions set out in the report; and*
- (ii) a further condition to require details of how the access across the car park can be achieved and retained free of obstruction.*

Exempt Information Under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972

None.

The meeting rose at 8.30pm.