

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 23 August 2017 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), Stuart Davenport, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Ben Mabbett, Catherine Webber, Robert Hall and Chris Palmer (In place of St John Dickson)

Officers: Martin Deans, Adrian Duffield, Sarah Green, Laura Hudson, Ron Schrieber, Penny Silverwood, Sally Stradling and Stuart Walker

Also present: Councillors Dudley Hoddinott and Judy Roberts

### PI.38 Chairman's announcements

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

### PI.39 Apologies for absence

Councillor StJohn Dickson tendered apologies. Councillor Chris Palmer acted as his substitute.

### PI.40 Minutes

#### RESOLVED: to

- (a) approve the minutes of the meetings held on 10 and 13 July 2017 as correct records and agree that the chairman sign these as such:
- (b) approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2017 as a correct record, subject to the following amendment, and agree that the chairman sign these as such:

Minute 36, Public participation: insert “, Councillors Robert Hall and Bob Johnson” between “Councillor Sandy Lovatt” and “stepped down from the committee”.

## **PI.41 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Ben Mabbett declared that, in relation to application P17/V0652/FUL – Land at Crab Hill, land north of A417, Wantage, he would be stepping down from the committee as he was a member of Wantage Town Council and had attended its planning committee meeting which had considered the application.

Councillors Bob Johnston declared that in relation to application – The Bungalow, Townsend Grove, Wantage, he was acquainted with the applicant's agent.

## **PI.42 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **PI.43 Public participation**

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

## **PI.44 Land at Crab Hill, land north of A417, Wantage**

Jenny Hannaby, a local ward councillor and Ben Mabbett, a Wantage Town councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The officer presented the report on application P17/V0652/FUL, for a variation of Condition 1 (amended parameter plans), 24 (phased tree protection works), 33 (additional land to be included within the archaeological written scheme of investigation) and 52 (vehicle access) of planning permission P13/V1764/O at Land at Crab Hill, land north of A417, Wantage.

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.

June Stock, a representative of Grove Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The access points to the development were dangerous for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians;
- She questioned why changes to the signed S106 legal agreement should be proposed; and
- The proposed number of houses in phase 1a was not acceptable.

Julie Mabberley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- Delays to completion of road accesses would create increased risk of accidents on the already very busy A417;
- The developers had accepted the conditions imposed in the S106 agreement so should be required to honour them; and
- Oxfordshire County Council appear to have recommended acceptance of the delays in trigger points because of delays to the Grove Airfield development, but the Airfield agreement had now been signed.

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

- The number of units had not changed, only the density;
- The access point at the eastern junction of the A417 could comfortably accommodate the traffic generated by the new dwellings; and
- Although the Grove Airfield agreement had now been signed, the agreement had been delayed for a considerable time which will delay its delivery;

Jenny Hannaby, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- She reiterated the views expressed by the other objectors;
- The trigger points had been agreed and should not be subject to change; and
- She expressed concerns about traffic and cyclist safety on the A417.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate. Officers reported that outline planning permission had already been granted and that the County Council had no objections to the proposed trigger point changes to the S106 agreement which only affected its obligations.

A motion, moved and seconded, to delegate authority to grant outline planning permission to the head of planning 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 P17/V0652/FUL subject to:

1. The completion of a deed of variation to the S106 legal agreement of application P13/V1764/O; and
2. The conditions set out in the draft decision notice attached at Appendix 1 to the report.

### **PI.45 Land adjoining no. 38 Barrow Road, Shippon, Abingdon**

Catherine Webber, the local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and did not take in the debate or voting for this item.

The officer presented the report on application P16/V3165/FUL, a proposal for four dwellings and works thereto at Land adjoining no.38 Barrow Road, Shippon, Abingdon.

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 recommended the inclusion of an additional condition removing permitted development rights for the dwellings for extensions, alterations and outbuildings in order to conserve the setting of the listed buildings.

Carole Priestly, a representative of St Helen Without Parish Council, had submitted a statement objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The Parish Council supported the principal of limited infill within the green belt but this proposal was inappropriate as the local need was for smaller houses and the proposed designs were too high;

- Due to bedrock in the substrata being close to the surface it may not be possible to lower the site as proposed; and style of the building and three storey layout were out of keeping with the surrounding area;
- Parking provision was inadequate; and
- The proposed access from Barrow Road was unacceptable as it would require considerable breaching of the stone boundary wall to achieve appropriate sight lines.

David Churchouse, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The proposal constituted inappropriate development in the green belt;
- The proposal failed to protect heritage assets; and
- There were no special circumstances to justify approval of this application.

Laura Kavanagh, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. Her points included the following:

- This was a policy compliant proposal and represented a positive addition to the village;
- Numerous amendments had been made to the scheme including reducing the site levels;
- Mature trees would be retained; and
- The stone boundary wall would be rebuilt.

Catherine Webber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The development was not limited infill and would be harmful to the green belt; and
- The density of housing was unsuitable for a rural area.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate. Officers reported that, in their view, the proposal amounted to "limited infill" for the purposes of Policy CP13 of the Local Plan.

A motion, moved and seconded, to grant planning permission, subject to the additional condition recommended by the officer, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** To grant planning permission for application P16/V3165/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Commencement of development – three years.
2. Approved plans.

Prior to commencement

3. Samples of materials for buildings.
4. Full details of Barrow Road boundary wall – including samples of materials, mortar and bedding/pointing.
5. Detail windows and doors.
6. Landscaping and boundary treatments to be submitted.
7. Drainage strategy and any off site works.
8. Foul water drainage details.
9. Surface water drainage details.

10. Full site level details.
11. Tree protection details.

#### Prior to occupation

12. Access and vision splays to be in accordance with plan.
13. Parking to be in accordance with plan.
14. Landscaping and boundary treatments in accordance with condition.
15. Details of any external lighting if required.

#### Compliance

16. Garages to be retained for parking.
17. Permitted development rights removed for extensions, alterations and outbuildings.

### **PI.46 8 Elms Road, Botley, Oxford**

The officer presented the report on application P17/V1418/FUL, for the demolition of an existing two storey house and the creation of a two storey apartment block to accommodate seven 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom apartments at 8 Elms Road, Botley, 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.

Andrew Pritchard, a representative of North Hinksey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The proposal constituted overdevelopment of the site;
- There was a lack of amenity space for most residents;
- Parking provision was inadequate and some of the spaces would be difficult to access; and
- The closeness of the building to the road would be detrimental to the privacy of ground floor residents .

Huw Mellor, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His points included the following:

- This was a sustainable development;
- The design was appropriate for the locality;
- The proposed number of units had been reduced; and
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to delegate authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** To delegate authority to the head of planning to grant planning permission for application P17/V1418/FUL subject to:

1. The completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to secure an amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order to remove eligibility for resident parking permits, and
2. The following conditions:

## Standard

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.

## Pre-commencement submission

3. Details of materials.
4. Foul and surface water drainage details.
5. Communal cycle store details.
6. Tree protection and wall/fence foundation details.
7. Landscaping scheme and boundary details.
8. Construction/demolition delivery times.

## Prior to occupation

9. Access and parking in accordance with plan. Visitor space to be marked.
10. Implementation of landscaping scheme and boundary details.
11. Refuse storage provided.
12. Cycle stores provided.

## **PI.47 Land Adjacent to Chowle Cottage, A420, Great Coxwell, Faringdon**

The officer presented the report on application P17/V1020/FUL, for the construction of a detached four bedroom dwelling, detached double garage and driveway on infill plot between Chowle Cottage and Walnut Cottage.

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.

Jacqueline Russell, a representative of Great Coxwell Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The proposal was for a new dwelling in the green belt contrary to the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan;
- The development would have a negative impact on the green buffer;
- The development would be in an isolated, unsustainable location; and
- The proposal constituted ribbon development along the A420.

Jeremy Flawn, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His points included the following:

- The development was in a sustainable location, close to a bus stop and within walking distance of the local school and village; and
- Planning permission had been granted for other developments in the vicinity and it would be inconsistent to refuse this application.

Simon Howell and Elaine Ware, the local ward councillors, had submitted a written statement in support of the application. Their points included the following:

- Planning permission had been granted for other infill developments in the vicinity and this application appeared to be treated differently; and
- If permission were to be granted with a condition to keep the existing landscape screening, this development would not have any significant impact or loss of green buffer for the village.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** To refuse planning permission for application P17/V1020/FUL for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is for a new dwelling on a site within open countryside. As such the proposal is contrary to policies CP3 and CP4 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and to the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal is for a new dwelling on a site that forms part of the rural setting of Great Coxwell. As such the proposal will harm the rural setting of the village, contrary to policy EDQ1 of the Great Coxwell Neighbourhood Plan.

### **PI.48 55 Meadow Close, Farmoor, Oxford**

The officer presented the report on application P17/V1376/HH, for a single storey rear conservatory at 55 Meadow Close, Farmoor.

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.

Councillor Dudley Hoddinott, a representative of Cumnor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The height of the conservatory would have an overbearing and overshadowing effect on the neighbouring property;
- The proposed development was much larger than neighbouring properties and out of keeping with the locality; and
- The proposal would constitute disproportionately large development in the green belt.

Dave Coveney, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The development was extremely overbearing;
- The development was much larger than existing properties in the locality;
- The development would cut out the light to his garden.

Councillors Judy Roberts, a local ward councillor, spoke spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- By her calculation, a previous planning permission had increased the volume of the property by 50% rather than approximately 35% as stated in the report;
- The permitted development rules should not be applied as the neighbour was objecting to the proposal; and
- Given the narrowness of the neighbour's garden, the harm caused to his amenity would be significant.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** To grant planning permission for application P17/V1376/HH subject to the following conditions:

Standard conditions

1. Development to be commenced within three years.
2. Development to be built in accordance with approved plans.

Compliance conditions

3. Materials to be in accordance with application.

## **PI.49 The Bungalow, Townsend, Grove**

Ben Mabbett, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and did not take in the debate or voting for this item.

The officer presented the report on application P17/V0134/RM, a reserved matters application following outline planning permission at The Bungalow, Townsend, Grove.

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.

June Stock, a representative of Grove Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The style of the building and three storey layout were out of keeping with the surrounding area;
- Parking provision was inadequate; and
- There was insufficient amenity space for residents.

Julie Mabblerley, Campaign Manager, Wantage and Grove Campaign Group, spoke objecting to the application. Her points included the following:

- The application no longer acknowledges the scale of adjoining development and would tower over the surrounding properties;
- The development was out of keeping with the surrounding area; and
- The proposal failed to meet the council's standards for amenity space.

Mike Gilbert, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His points included the following:

- Following comments made at a previous committee meeting, a number of changes had been made to the scheme's design;
- The architects' panel considered the overall scheme and principles to be acceptable; and
- This was a reserved matters application. Matters such as parking provision had already been approved as part of the outline application.



Ben Mabbett, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The scale of the development was out of keeping with the surrounding area; and
- The three storey layout was unacceptable.

The committee discussed the application, with clarification from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded, to grant reserved matters consent was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** To grant reserved matters consent for application P17/V0134/RM subject to the following conditions:

Standard conditions

1. Approved plans.

Prior to commencement

2. Details of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment to be submitted.
3. Arboricultural method statement including tree protection plan to be submitted.
4. External materials details.

Prior to occupation

5. Existing vehicular access to be stopped up.
6. Parking in front of bin store to be prevented – details to be submitted.

Compliance

7. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained in accordance with approved plan.
8. Vision splays retained in accordance with approved plan.
9. Landscaping to be implemented and maintained for five years.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm