

DC.96

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL,
ABINGDON ON MONDAY, 7TH
NOVEMBER, 2005 AT 6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), John Woodford, Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Tony de Vere, Richard Farrell, Jenny Hannaby, Peter Jones, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Briony Newport and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Mary de Vere (In place of Jerry Patterson), Eddy Goldsmith (In place of Pam Westwood), Bob Johnston (In place of Sylvia Patterson) and Robert Sharp (In place of Monica Lovatt)

OFFICERS: Rodger Hood, Laura Hudson, Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl and David Quayle.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 13

DC.159 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The attendance of Substitute members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above, with apologies for absence having been received from Councillors Monica Lovatt, Jerry Patterson, Sylvia Patterson and Pam Westwood. An apology for absence was also recorded from Councillor Richard Gibson.

DC.160 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 September 2005 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.161 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interest in report 169/05 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Eddy Goldsmith	Personal	WAN/906/6	Member of and present at a meeting of Wantage Town Council's Planning Committee when the application was discussed	DC.170
Terry Cox	Personal	BOU/5703/19	He had visited the school as part of his work	DC.172

Jenny Hannaby	Personal and Prejudicial	WAN/13040/1 WAN/13040/2 -CA	Applicant	DC.176
Tony de Vere Mary de Vere Richard Farrell R T Johnston Julie Mayhew-Archer Briony Newport Terry Quinlan John Woodford	Personal	WAN/13040/1 WAN/13040/2 -CA	They were not only acquainted with, but were friends of Councillor Jenny Hannaby the applicant	DC.176

DC.162 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair reminded everyone that their mobile telephones should be switched off during the meeting.

DC.163 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.164 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.165 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that seven members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting.

DC.166 MATERIALS

None.

DC.167 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda report which advised of five appeals which had been lodged with the planning Inspectorate for determination, three which had been part allowed and part dismissed and one which had been allowed.

In addition to the report, the Committee was advised that having just undertaken a six monthly review, it should be noted that only 17% of appeals made had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate for the Vale area which was very good considering the national average was around 35%.

One Member referred to the dismissed appeal in respect of Willowdene, Great Coxwell thanking the officers for their continued work on this matter and welcoming this successful conclusion.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.168 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a report which advised of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

RESOLVED

that the report be received.

DC.169 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (WANTAGE) NO 7 2005

The Committee received and considered report 170/05 of the Landscape Officer (Arboriculture) which advised that a provisional Tree Preservation Order had been made in May 2005 on a chestnut tree on a site at the corner of Hampden Road, Wantage.

In considering the report, the Committee had regard to a letter dated 31 October 2005 objecting to the Tree Preservation Order, a copy of which had been circulated to all Members prior to the meeting. In addition, the Committee had regard to further representations received reiterating concerns previously raised regarding pigeons, conkers and leaf drop.

It was noted that it would be possible to prune the tree to reduce the nuisance experienced. However, this was not being recommended but might be a course of action that the owner could apply for at a later date. The Committee was advised that the Officers considered that the visual amenity of the tree outweighed the concerns expressed by the objector.

One of the Local Members agreed with the views of the Officers noting that the tree was a significant visual asset to the area and concurring that the Order should be confirmed

Other Members also supported confirmation of the Order without any conditions or caveats.

By 15 votes to nil with 1 of the voting Members not being present during consideration of this item it was

RESOLVED

that Tree Preservation Order (Wantage) No.7 2005 be confirmed.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 169/05 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.170 WAN/906/6 – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 27 NO. 1 AND 2 BEDROOM FLATS TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. BUS DEPOT, GROVE STREET, WANTAGE.

Councillor Eddy Goldsmith had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34, he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report the Committee noted that the County Engineer had no objection in principle to the proposal, but had made recommendations to include the narrowing of the access, cycle storage and a financial contribution of £1,000 towards a bus shelter.

It was reported that the Officers had considered the provision of a gate as suggested by the Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser, but because the gate would have to be "set in" the Officers did not support the proposal. However, the Officers did support the provision of railings as recommended by the Advisor.

It was noted that the whole site was being proposed as affordable housing subject to funding being available. If the funding was not available only 5 units (19%) would be provided for rent. This was under the Local Plan 25% threshold. However, the Housing Officers considered this acceptable as this provision would help to meet the need for rented housing in the area. The rest of the site would be market units.

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application, additional conditions should be added to any permission to address access; parking; cycle storage; materials; landscaping; boundary treatment to include railings to the front of the development to address the Consultant Architect's comments; contaminated land; drainage; slab levels; affordable housing; amended plans and a financial contribution to the public transport infrastructure.

Mr Neddelkoff the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the revised scheme would provide a frontage similar to other frontages in Wantage. The number of units had been reduced and therefore the scheme could accommodate more car parking. Finally, he advised that the height was similar to the houses opposite which the Town Council had considered acceptable.

One Member expressed concern regarding the roofing and height of the development. He reported that the applicant had met with members of the Town Council's Planning Committee to discuss the proposals and had been obliging in meeting the concerns raised. The Town Council had considered that the building needed softening. The revised plans did not meet all the concerns, but the Town Council considered the proposal more acceptable in view of what had been done to modify the scheme to meet the concerns raised; the site was a brown field site, and if funding was secured, affordable housing would be provided.

One Member commented that this proposal would result in a prominent building but it would sit very well within the area and much needed affordable housing would be provided.

In response to a question raised regarding the justification for agreeing under 25% provision of affordable housing, the Officers explained that advice from Housing Services was that the primary need was for rental housing.

Other Members supported the application commenting that the revised design was an improvement and it would fit in well in this area.

In response to comments made, the Officers clarified the windows which would overlook different areas of the development, particularly the car parking areas to provide natural surveillance, an issue raised by the Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor. It was also considered that an additional condition could be added to any permission to require revised fenestration details having regard to the comments of the Consultant Architect.

By 16 votes to nil 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 WAN/906/6 subject to: -

- (i) *conditions to address access; parking; cycle storage; materials; landscaping; boundary treatment; contaminated land; drainage; slab levels; affordable housing; amended plans and revised fenestration; and*
- (ii) *a financial contribution to the public transport infrastructure.*

DC.171 DRA/2330/2 – ERECTION OF A TWO BEDROOM BUNGALOW LAND ADJACENT TO EASTWAY MOBILE HOME PARK, DRAYTON

The Committee noted that the Parish Council maintained its objection to the amended plans in terms of over development, siting and setting a precedent for development on land nearby.

In response to a question raised the Committee was advised that the land had been previously developed and that the proposal was not contrary to policy.

By 16 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that application DRA/2330/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.172 BOU/5703/19 – LAYING OUT OF TARMACADAM NETBALL COURT AND PLAY AREA PINEWOOD SCHOOL, BOURTON

Councillor Terry Cox had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Carel Bouwens the School Bursor made a statement in support of the application commenting that it was for a variation of an application previously approved. He explained the need for the development in that a hard-standing was essential for netball, clarifying that the tennis courts were unsuitable for this use. He explained that the all weather pitch had a shock resistance surface which was not suitable for netball matches. He confirmed that trees taken out would be replaced. Finally, he emphasised that the School needed to develop to survive and that the proposals were sympathetic to the area.

Members supported the application but considered that the surface material should be green in colour if possible. To this end it was agreed that an Informative should be added to any permission.

By 16 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application BOU/5703/19 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an informative to advise that green is the preferred colour of the surface material of the new court.

DC.173 CHD/9684/3 – ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION WITH INTERNAL ALTERATIONS 10 WEST STREET, CHILDREY

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that the subsidence issue raised by the objector was a building control matter. The Committee was further advised that should it be minded to approve the application, an additional condition to require the extension to be ancillary to the main dwelling should be added.

Mr Jon Davis made a statement on behalf of 5 neighbours in West Street objecting to the application raising concerns regarding overshadowing; visual impact and adverse impact generally on the street scene. He explained that the plans had not been drawn to scale correctly and that the proposed extension would be closer to the neighbour at No. 11 than shown. Furthermore, the proposal was not aligned with the building line. It was considered that the separation between the extension and the main dwelling was important. He referred to subsidence in the past, commenting that the risk of further subsidence should be established. He referred to the former council houses opposite with extensions, stating that most were not visible. Finally, he commented that the extension should be better designed and should not have the appearance of a separate dwelling.

Mrs Collins the applicant made a statement in support of the application explaining that the current proposal was a revision of the original application taking account of the concerns raised. She reported that a structural engineer would be employed and would have regard to Building Regulations. She explained that the proposed extension would have a lesser footprint than the existing garage, which needed replacing. She reported that there would be no loss of trees and that she could see no reason why there would be any damage to drains as a result of one extra bathroom. She explained that the proposal would not result in a separate dwelling. She explained that the front door would be re-sited. She confirmed that the plan was incorrect in that her garden ran further to the south than was shown.

One Member commented that the design was not pleasing, with the roof lines appearing confused. He suggested that it would not fit well in the street scene. He considered that the proposal would look like a separate building to the main house but that this was not a sufficiently material planning reason to refuse the application

Other Members supported the proposal.

One Member referred to the windows in the front elevation of the main house compared to those in the extension suggesting that the windows in the extension should be matching. On being put to the meeting, there was a straw poll of 6 votes for and 10 against the suggestion that should the Committee be minded to approve the application there should be a condition to reduce the windows in the extension to match those of the main dwelling.

By 15 votes to 1 it was

RESOLVED

- (a) *that application CHD/9684/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition to require the extension to be ancillary to the main dwelling; and*
- (b) *that in view of the discrepancies in the plans referred to by the objectors and the applicant, the Officers be requested to check their accuracy in this case.*

**DC.174 ASH/12053/7 – ERECTION OF DETACHED HOUSE AND GARAGE (AMENDED PLANS),
LAND BETWEEN RECTORY FARM COTTAGES, IDSTONE, ASHBURY**

The Committee was advised that a letter had been received explaining that the windows were required a a means of escape and aesthetic reasons. Reference was made to planning permission given for side windows in a neighbouring property and no objections had been received from the neighbours. Furthermore it was explained that permitted development rights had not been removed on the original permission and therefore, the windows as now proposed could be added at a later date without the need to submit a planning application.

With reference to materials it was acknowledged that the previous plans had included stone. However, neighbouring properties were built in brick and in this context the Officers felt that brick was more appropriate.

By 16 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application ASH/12053/7 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the previous report to the meeting of the Committee held on 12 September 2005 with condition 8 being amended to take account that not all the windows are required for escape reasons and further conditions to provide for obscure glazing and to allow the window to the play room required for fire escape purposes at second level to be capable of opening.

DC.175 SUT/12063/21-X - BUILDING FOR STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION WAREHOUSE (CLASS B) OR EMPLOYMENT (CLASS 2) USE, GATEHOUSE AND SPRINKLER TANK, ACCESS, PARKING AND STRUCTURAL PLANTING, LAND WEST OF DIDCOT POWER STATION, DIDCOT

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that there was an established commercial use on part of the site and that great crested newts had been found on the neighbouring site.

The Committee was further advised that the County Archaeologist now supported the application subject to a condition to provide that an archaeological evaluation of the site should be carried out but not necessarily before planning permission is granted.

The Committee was advised of the concerns of the local member regarding the possibility of traffic from the development following a northerly route through Sutton Courtenay. He had discussed with the Officers the capping of the number of vehicles. However, having spoken to the County Engineer it had been confirmed that it would be difficult to do this. It was noted that the nature of a distribution use involved vehicles and their movement and that to determine and enforce a top limit on numbers of vehicles would be difficult to achieve. The Officer had also investigated the inclusion of a condition to the same affect, but this would not be enforceable. The Officer understood the concerns raised regarding the cumulative effect of allowing such applications but the County Engineer felt that the routing agreement covered this.

The Committee was advised of a letter received from DPDS on behalf of Milton Park commenting that it had no objection subject to a routing plan and a financial contribution towards the local highway network.

Finally, the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application, a condition should be included to address the issue of ecological mitigation.

Mr M McFarland, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application confirming that the site was previously developed land. He commented that whilst the application was for outline permission it was supported by the Highway Authority, the County Archaeologist, the Environment Agency and others. He referred to the Parish Council's response which he suggested referred to general points and not specifically to this application. He explained that the routing agreement was similar to other developments and there would be improvements to the junction with Sutton Courtenay Lane to prevent right turning. Finally, he clarified that the wider transport issues would be addressed under other means via a contribution which was to be made.

One Member referred to the objection made by Milton Parish Council reiterating that increased traffic in this area would be detrimental. She agreed that capping the number of vehicles would be unenforceable but considered that the provisions of any routing agreement needed further investigation and she asked that the local Member be involved in any consultations on the proposed traffic route. She expressed concern regarding the cumulative impact of these types of applications commenting on the concerns of local people.

In response the Officers advised that the routing agreement was a separate agreement made with the County Council and therefore it was not up to this Authority to specify who should be involved in any consultation.

One Member commented that there was no reason to refuse the application. He suggested that earlier routing agreements did largely stop heavy goods vehicles travelling through Sutton Courtenay. He commented that whilst there were ongoing discussions regarding traffic in this area, there were no firm plans to improve the Milton interchange and the A34. He suggested that at some point decisions would have to be taken to prevent further developments pending the infrastructure and the A34 being addressed.

The Officers reported that there were measures proposed for a signal junction and three lane traffic at the Milton Interchange.

By 15 votes to 1 it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee and the Local Member be delegated authority to approve application SUT/12063/21-X subject to: -

- (i) *a Section 106 agreement relating to contributions to the local highway network;*
- (ii) *a HGV routing agreement and travel plan*
- (iii) *conditions to include the carrying out of an archaeological evaluation of the site; ecological mitigation measures; the submission of reserved matters; highway improvements; parking; materials; surface water control; drainage details; contaminated land and timing of landscaping.*

DC.176 WAN/13040/1 & WAN/13040/2-CA – DEMOLITION OF WORKSHOP, ERECTION OF THREE STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS AND CONVERSION OF PROPERTY TO FORM THREE FLATS. 33 WALLINGFORD STREET, WANTAGE

Councillor Jenny Hannaby had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing order 34 she withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

Councillors Tony de Vere, Mary de Vere, Richard Farrell, R T Johnston, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Briony Newport, Terry Quinlan and John Woodford had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee noted that Wantage Town Council had objected to the applications on the grounds of over development and that the neighbour's privacy would be compromised.

Sarah Mitchell made a statement objecting to the applications raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report namely overshadowing, overlooking, loss of privacy and

loss of light in the morning. She questioned the usability of her garden which would be adversely affected. She further raised concerns regarding noise and parking. Finally, she reported that there was no access and that the proposal would amount to dramatic over development of this Listed Building in the Conservation Area.

Donald Fisher had been due to make a statement at the meeting but did not.

One Member expressed concern regarding over development and adverse impact of the neighbours in terms of dominance. He reported that the Town Council had not supported the applications. He referred to the narrowness of the plot and the lack of access, commenting also on the likelihood of overlooking and loss of privacy.

One Member expressed his concern regarding the lack of parking provision referring to the comments made at a previous meeting of the Committee which had subsequently been amended advising that only 13% of householders did not have cars.

In response, it was reported that the Officers did not feel that the extension would have an adverse impact over and above that of the existing development sufficient to warrant refusal of the application. There was a window in the rear elevation at the present time and a new window similarly would look down the garden. There was an acceptance that there would be some overlooking because the properties were terraced.

Some Members spoke against the applications raising concerns regarding dominance, overlooking and adverse impact in terms of loss of privacy and light. It was commented that the proposal would undermine the character of the area. Furthermore, it was difficult to accept that there was no requirement to provide parking. It was suggested by some Members that the height of the building would be over dominant and there would be significant overlooking from the window on the second floor which would project further forward than the existing window. It was suggested that the building would be enormously high.

However, other Members spoke in support, agreeing with the view of the Officers and commenting that there was limited privacy in terraced areas by design. It was noted that the County Engineer had raised no objection regarding parking.

One Member questioned the extent of the perceived overlooking referring to the photographs taken from the window of the neighbouring property. It was suggested that an organised site visit would be beneficial.

Members considered the application for Conservation Area Consent to demolish the buildings and agreed that this should be approved.

RESOLVED

- (a) *that application WAN/13040/2-CA be approved subject to the condition set out in the report, (agreed by 15 votes to nil); and*
- (b) *that consideration of application WAN/13040/1 be deferred pending an organised site visit (proposed by Councillor Richard Farrell, seconded by Councillor Tony de Vere and agreed by 9 vote to 5 with 1 abstention).*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 9.35pm.