

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday 11 May 2022 at 7.00 pm  
135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, OX14 4SB

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

### **Present in the meeting room:**

Councillors: Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Paul Barrow, Diana Lugova, Ben Mabbett and Mike Pighills

Officers: Paul Bateman and Emily Hamerton

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Sally Povolotsky

Officers: Charlotte Brewerton

## **26 Chair's announcements**

The chair ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to an in-person meeting which was being simultaneously broadcast.

## **27 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby and Janet Shelley. Councillor Paul Barrow substituted for Councillor Batstone.

## **28 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 9 March 2022 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

## **29 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **30 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **31 Public participation**

The committee had received a list of public speakers prior to the meeting. Statements which had been made by the public in respect of the application had been circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

## **32 P21/V0376/FUL - Land at Ashfields Lane and A338, East Hanney**

The committee considered application P21/V0376/FUL for full planning application for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of 45 dwellings, provision of public open space, formation of vehicular and pedestrian accesses from the A338, provision of pedestrian access to Ashfields Lane, landscaping and other associated works (as amplified by biodiversity metric information received 3 March 2021) (as amended by agents email and amended plans dated 09 December 2021 reducing the number of dwellings from 50 to 44 and other associated design changes throughout the site, as detailed within the revised design and access addendum, and as amended and amplified by information received 27 January 2022, 8 & 24 February 2022, 15 March 2022 & 01 April 2022) on land at Ashfields Lane and A338, East 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 the meeting.

The planning officer reported to the committee that the table under paragraph 5.95 of the report contained an error; the paragraph '...public art on site or in Stanford in the Vale Parish', should read '... in East Hanney Parish'. With reference to paragraph 5.41, in respect of public open space, the planning officer advised the committee that council officers had understood that the East Hanney Parish Council wished to manage those areas in the event of planning permission being approved. This could be secured through a S.106 legal agreement. The planning officer also reported that further details of the Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and attenuation basins were to be provided via a pre-commencement condition.

The planning officer reported that access into the site was acceptable and that the required visibility could be achieved. Following amendment to the layout, a relocated footpath would lead to the southeast corner of the site into Ashfields Lane and was considered acceptable to provide safe pedestrian access and connections from the site into the village. This was in addition to the highways officer requesting a connection to the footpath at the northeast of the site onto A338 into an existing public right of way (PROW) - (footpath 198/2). Pre-occupation condition 16. 'footpath connection PROW 198/2 details' would consequently be removed from the proposed conditions.

A drainage statement by Mr. David Bell, the senior flood risk engineer, who was the district council's senior drainage officer, had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

The planning officer concluded by stating that there were no protected species on the site and that the proposal was fully policy compliant and on an allocated site. Layout, design, forestry and landscaping issues were acceptable and there were no technical objections. Pedestrian connections and highways aspects of the development were considered to be safe.

Councillor Steve McKechnie, a representative of East Hanney Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by the parish council had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Ms. Roz Pollard, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

A statement by Mr. Peter Mothersole, a local resident, had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Daniel Lampard, the agent, spoke in support of the application. A statement by Mr. Lampard had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting. Statements by Pye Homes, including FAQs, had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Mateo Docal, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application, answering questions from the committee in respect of drainage issues.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the site's possible susceptibility to flooding, Mr. Docal replied that the one area that could possibly be at threat had been removed from the application. This was the area edged in blue, which had been referred to in the planning officer's presentation. All water from the site would be conveyed northwards and not south. The culvert and its ongoing maintenance would be an issue and pre-commencement and pre-occupation conditions were designed to deal with this issue. The committee was assured that the development would not increase flood risk and would in fact improve the situation. The committee remained concerned that some existing properties would be at flood risk from the development, but Mr. Docal reassured the committee that the whole site would be subject to a gravity run-off and that there would be some ground uplifting to bring the ground level up beyond the maximum water table. Porous paving, swards and gullies would all help to prevent flood risk. Existing properties would not be affected by these works.

With respect to a related question from the committee regarding the reliability of the proposed drainage measures, the planning officer replied that the council's the senior flood risk engineer had carefully examined all the plans, including the attenuation basins, and was satisfied that the modelling was realistic and feasible. A plan for the detailed design of the drainage scheme would come forward as a planning condition. Responding to a further question from the committee regarding the robustness of the drainage arrangements and their analysis, the planning officer confirmed that pre-commencement condition 13, 'SUDS compliance statement', (i.e. sustainable drainage systems), would comprehensively cover all aspects of drainage.

Councillor Sally Povolotsky, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Councillor Povolotsky had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the nature of the Frilford Junction works, Mr. Lampard replied that the Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) had proposed mitigation by increasing the length of the left turn lane on the west bound carriageway of the A415, opposite the existing petrol station. This would allow for a greater flow of traffic to join the south bound A338, thereby mitigating the increase in queue lengths that this scheme might otherwise produce. This mitigation could be secured by a S106 legal agreement, as a financial contribution that OCC could utilise to implement the left lane widening or pool it towards wider improvements at Frilford junction. On this basis, the proposal could mitigate its impact and was therefore acceptable to OCC and council officers, as he understood.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the extent of the applicant's engagement with East Hanney Parish Council, Mr. Lampard replied that he had met with the Parish Council at the end of 2019 and had held a consultation event in the village hall. Feedback was very helpful and provided a solid basis for progress. The Parish Council had been very clear about their issues and concerns.

In response to a question from the committee regarding details of biodiversity issues, the planning officer replied that the countryside officer had concluded that there were no populations of protected species on this site. The mature ash tree at the front of the site, to be felled for access, could have some moderate potential for roosting bats. However, this could be conditioned on any grant of approval for a license to be obtained if bats were found to be present after surveying. The committee also asked whether offsetting, to achieve a net gain, could take place specifically in the East Hanney area. The planning officer responded that generally such arrangements applied to Oxfordshire, rather than a closely identified location. The district council had an ongoing working relationship with the Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment (TOE) and the parish council were at liberty to contact the Trust and agree an arrangement for targeted measures employing S.106 funding.

The committee asked a question regarding the impact of proposals for a reservoir in the local area and the planning officer replied that the implications were not clear at the present time.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the suitability of car parking arrangements, the planning officer replied that car parking provision was acceptable to council officers. The numbers had been reduced from 116 spaces to 101 spaces as a result of fewer dwellings being provided. 90 off street spaces and 11 visitor spaces were also to be established throughout the site.

In conclusion, the committee noted the strategic housing market assessment (SHMA) incorporating smaller dwellings on this site, which it supported. The committee, after full debate and questioning, was satisfied that there would be certainty regarding drainage arrangements, but considered that improved liaison between the applicant, the local community and the parish council would be necessary in the future. It was also important to encourage local farmers to maintain their drainage ditches and culverts, and it was desirable for the parish council to initiate a meaningful dialogue at this time. It was also essential to involve the local ward councillor and the parish council in the drafting of the S.106 agreement. The committee also supported in principle the parish council owning and maintaining the public open spaces relating to the development.

Recognising the importance of having effective drainage arrangements for this proposed development, the committee directed that pre-occupation condition 15 in respect of watercourse repair should become a pre-commencement condition. The committee was also eager to ensure that condition 21 (SUDS compliance report) should include all aspects of drainage and flooding. The planning officer read out the full wording of the proposed condition, with which the committee was fully satisfied.

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 P21/V0376/FUL subject to:

1. A S106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and services including education, waste and bus service improvements, a mitigation package for Frilford Junction, and secure affordable housing, space standards, public open space, and public art.
2. The following planning conditions:

## **Standard**

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Approved plans

### **Pre-commencement**

3. Arboricultural method statement & Tree protection
4. Construction Traffic management Plan
5. SUDs Scheme
6. Foul drainage details
7. Biodiversity enhancement plan
8. Biodiversity offsetting provider details
9. Archaeological staged investigation
10. Electric vehicle charging details
11. Attenuation basin details
12. LEAP Details
13. SUDS compliance statement
14. Cycle parking details

### **Pre-Occupation**

15. Watercourse repair details (n.b. the Committee determined that this condition would become a Pre-Commencement condition)
16. Footpath connection PROW 198/2 details

### **Compliance**

17. Car parking as per approved plans
18. Materials in accordance with approved plan
19. Access as per approved plans
20. Biodiversity offsetting compliance
21. SUDS compliance report
22. Planting management plan

### **Informative**

23. No mud on highway
24. No Highway Obstruction
25. Biodiversity offsetting providers

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm