

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday 24 July 2024 at 7.00 pm in Meeting Room 1, Abbey House, Abbey Close, Abingdon, OX14 3JE

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills and Emily Smith.

Officers: Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Holly Bates (Team Leader (Applications)), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Natasha Ireland (Planning Business Manager) and Stuart Walker (Planning Officer)

Remote attendance:

Officers: Katherine Canavan (Planning Officer) and Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer)
Guests: Councillor Andy Cooke

124 Chair's announcements

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

125 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Scott Houghton, who was substituted for Councillor Emily Smith, and Councillor Jill Rayner.

126 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 19 June 2024 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

127 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

128 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

129 Public participation

The committee noted the list of the members of the public who had registered to speak at the meeting.

130 P24/V0261/RM - Land at Crab Hill, Land north of A417 and east of A338 Wantage

The committee considered application P24/V0261/RM for a reserved matters application (access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping) for 115 dwellings and associated infrastructure, pursuant to application reference P23/V0134/O. (Outline application for a phased development for up to 669 residential units and Neighbourhood Centre (Use Class E and Sui Generis) with associated infrastructure and open space which is capable of coming forward in distinct and separate phases in a severable way.), on Land at Crab Hill, Land north of A417 and east of A338 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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was part of an allocated site in the local plan and that it came before the planning committee due to the objection of Wantage Town Council. The proposal was located to the centre of the allocated site, to the west of the existing primary school. The planning officer advised that the proposal comprised three parcels with a mix of apartments and dwellings. The proposal included 42 affordable units which were spread throughout the parcels in accordance with the site wide master plan and the proposed number was in line with housing delivery requirements.

The planning officer then gave an overview of the layouts of each of the three parcels. He advised that all units in parcel A would face outwards creating a courtyard parking arrangement and rear parking for all other units. This arrangement took account of the public space surrounding the parcel. The planning officer went on to give an overview of the features of parcel B and informed the committee that there would be a link from this parcel to Aldworth Avenue which would be delivered by the master developers for the site, St Modwen. The proposed parcel comprised a mixture of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. The planning officer informed the committee there was a bus stop and a continuous cycle route located to the northern edge of the site. The planning officer then set out the features of parcel C of the proposal. This parcel also proposed a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings with units facing outwards and a parking court arrangement for the proposed apartments.

The planning officer then advised the committee that parcel B of the proposal was the one which had the most influence on residential amenity and privacy to existing residents in Charlton village. The planning officer identified that properties on Aldworth Avenue and Westfield Way were located closest to the proposal and showed the committee photos from a number of these properties. He then highlighted the section plan which had been included in the agenda pack and detailed the distances from existing properties to the proposal. The planning officer confirmed that officers were satisfied that the distances, levels and relationships between existing and new dwellings were acceptable.

The planning officer concluded by advising that the proposal was considered to accord with the relevant policies in the local plan and the approved site wide development strategies for Kingsgrove. Access, appearance, scale, landscaping and layout were acceptable for the

reasons set out in the officer's report and there were no technical reasons why the application should not be approved. As such the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

Bernard Connolly, a representative of Wantage and Grove Campaign Group, spoke objecting to the application.

Jonathan Chick (Nexus Planning), the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee reflected that concerns had been raised by Wantage Town Council in relation to drainage and asked the planning officer to confirm this proposal would not exacerbate the issues. The planning officer advised that condition 30 of the relevant outline consent required submission of a sustainable drainage scheme before works could commence. He advised that the details of this would be considered under the relevant discharge of conditions application and should not hold up the processing of the reserved matters application before the committee. He further confirmed that this had been accepted by the drainage engineer and the lead flood authority.

The committee also indicated that Wantage Town Council were concerned about the proposed changes to the levels and the impact of overlooking on 44 Aldworth Avenue. The committee asked if it was possible to include more planting to mitigate this. The planning officer informed the committee that the change in levels from the approved advanced infrastructure works application and the reserved matters application before them was 15.7cm and officers were of the view this was not significant enough to be detrimental to residential amenity. The planning officer advised that, due to the location of a water main and the necessary easements for this, it would not be possible to secure more planting but that the proposed distances between existing properties and new dwellings were in excess of those stated in the design guide.

The committee went on to ask the planning officer to explain the concerns which had been raised in relation to the proposed cycle path and the materials to be used. The planning officer confirmed that this was the subject of another separate application and the concerns were being addressed.

The committee asked the planning officer if they felt that the condition to build in accordance with the approved plans was sufficient to ensure that adequate visitor parking was allocated and that these were then not simply used by residents. The planning officer informed the committee that it was not possible to condition the use of no parking signs or to prevent residents from parking in allocated visitor spaces. He advised that the level of parking proposed was accepted by the highways authority and that across the proposed site there was an over provision of five allocated parking spaces.

The committee asked the planning officer to comment on the request made by Thames Valley Police that two lighting columns were moved from their proposed location to further away from the boundary walls. The planning officer was of the view this was an unreasonable ask as sufficient surveillance of parking spaces was provided from overlooking properties and having the lighting columns closer to walls was better from a design perspective as they were less likely to be hit by a car, for instance.

The committee reflected that there were no technical objections to the application. Whilst they recognised the concerns which had been raised by Wantage Town Council and the

Wantage and Grove Campaign Group they felt these had been explored with the planning officer and clarification had been obtained.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P24/V0261/RM, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans.
2. Vision sprints in accordance with approved plans.
3. Parking provision in accordance with approved plans.
4. Cycle parking in accordance with approved plans.

Informative

1. The applicant is reminded of the obligation of compliance with the relevant conditions on the outline application that apply to this phase (e.g., CEMP & LEMP implementation, noise mitigation and tree protection).

131 P23/V2847/S73 - 10 Halls Close, Drayton, Abingdon, OX14 4LU

The committee considered planning application P23/V2847/S73 for the variation of condition 8 (Drainage Details (Foul Water) (Full) in application P23/V1805/S73 Erection of 22 dwellings together with replacement garage for 10 Halls Close, on Land at 10 Halls Close Drayton Abingdon, OX14 4LU.

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 introduced the report and highlighted that the application sought to vary a condition on a previously approved application for 22 dwellings. He informed the committee that the application was before them following it's call in by the local ward member, Councillor Andy Cooke. He went on to inform the committee that the application sought to vary condition 8 in relation to foul water drainage. The condition required that the foul water drainage serving the development was fully implemented on the site prior to occupation of any of the new buildings. The application sought to amend this condition to allow for a phased handover of dwellings on the site and to do so it was proposed that the first five dwellings would be moved to a gravity fed foul drainage system. The planning officer advised the committee that the condition as proposed would still require that the foul drainage system relating to properties was complete prior to their occupation, just not that the drainage for the whole site was complete prior to occupation.

The planning officer informed the committee that the drainage engineer had no objections to the revised proposal. He also confirmed that Thames Water had no comments to make on the revised proposal. On the basis of the lack of concern or objection from any of the technical drainage consultees officers were of the view there was no technical reason to refuse the application, therefore the application was recommended for approval subject to the proposed conditions. The officer concluded by advising that the condition list had been revised to take account of the conditions which had already been discharged.

Councillor Andy Cooke, a local ward member, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee raised concerns that Thames Water had not raised no objections but instead had no comments to make on the application. The planning officer advised that this was a usual response from Thames Water on revised schemes where there was nothing further for them to assess. Thames Water had already accepted that the additional flow from the development into the system was acceptable. The application before the committee related to the onsite specifics of how the drainage would connect to the system as opposed to creating any additional flow beyond that already agreed.

The committee went on to enquire as to what the drainage engineer would have checked. The planning officer confirmed that they will have checked the technical aspects up to the connection with public sewer. The planning officer further confirmed that no work was anticipated on the part of Thames Water to accommodate the additional 22 dwellings.

The committee reflected that there were no technical objections and therefore grounds to refuse the application on.

The committee sympathised with residents on the basis of the concerns raised but were of the view there were no grounds for refusal.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V2847/S73, subject to the following conditions:

1. Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Access in accordance with approved plans
4. Tree protection in accordance with approved details
5. External lighting in accordance with approved details
6. Materials in accordance with approved details
7. Drainage details (surface water) in accordance with approved details
8. Drainage details (foul water) in in accordance with approved details
9. Boundary treatments in accordance with approved plans
10. Landscaping scheme in accordance with approved plans
11. Construction Traffic in accordance with approved details
12. Green Travel Plan in accordance with approved plans
13. Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement in accordance with approved plans.

132 P24/V1017/PIP - Land at Townsend Road, Shrivenham

The committee considered planning application P24/V1017/PIP for Permission in Principle for residential development of single-storey dwellings, on Land at Townsend Road Shrivenham

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 introduced the report and highlighted that the application sought permission in principle for a residential development of up to five dwellings on the western edge of Shrivenham. She went on to explain that where permission in principle is sought these applications are dealt with in two parts with the permission in principle considered

first. If this is granted then a technical details consent application had to be submitted which considered the detail and technical matters. The planning officer advised the committee that the only matters which could be assessed as part of the application before them was if the principle of development was acceptable in the proposed location and if the application complied with the spatial strategy.

The planning officer informed the committee that a previous refusal on the site had been dismissed at appeal as it had been considered that the application site was beyond the built limits of Shrivenham. However, that application had been for a much larger site area. The application before the committee had a much reduced site area which was surrounded on three sides by existing built form.

The planning officer went on to note that whilst there were protected trees on the site this was not a constraint to development. She also advised that there were no drainage constraints which were an in principle issue with the site. The planning officer went on to confirm that infrastructure contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy would be calculated at the technical details consent stage.

The planning officer clarified that no conditions could be added to a permission in principle but that a minimum and maximum number of dwellings on the site should be stated. In this instance the minimum was one and the maximum was five.

The planning officer concluded that the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Richard Bartle spoke on behalf of Shrivenham Parish Council, objecting to the application.

The committee asked the planning officer to clarify the inability to place conditions on the application beyond the maximum number of dwellings and what would happen if a technical details consent application came forward proposing more than five dwellings on the site. The planning officer confirmed that the role in setting the minimum and maximum number of dwellings was the best mechanism available to limit what could be built on the site. This number was based on a high level assessment and it was for the applicant to submit a technical details consent application with a layout that works within those parameters. The planning officer went on to advise if an application for more than five dwellings was submitted it would be possible to refuse the application as it went against the principle which had been established.

The committee reflected that the site was clearly part of a larger piece of land and queried if there was anything that could be done to prevent future applications expanding the site. The planning officer advised that the application before the committee had to be considered as submitted and that any future applications would be assessed on their own merits.

The committee asked how much the cumulative impact of development in the area could be taken into account when it came to the impact on services for instance. The planning officer advised that infrastructure contributions to go towards services and facilities through the Community Infrastructure Levy would be calculated at the technical details consent stage. She advised that considering what could be accommodated in line with spatial strategy was something that could be considered at this stage. As the site was a windfall site and closely related to existing built form the principle of development was acceptable.

The committee reflected that whilst they had heard the concerns of Shrivenham Parish Council and previous applications on the site had been refused, sites such as this one should be considered as housing was required.

Some members of the committee had reservations about approving an application with so little information as they felt anything that was built should be in keeping with existing character of the area.

The committee noted that the site was restricted in size in comparison to the site area of previously rejected applications and due to the fact it was surrounded on three sides by buildings should be considered infill development.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P24/V1017/PIP, subject to the following advisory notes:

Advisory notes

1. Minimum / maximum number of dwellings should range from 1 to 5
2. Technical details consent is required
3. CIL

133 Appeals Information

The committee received the appeals information report from the head of planning. The development manager highlighted that the report covered six appeal decisions of which four had been dismissed and two had been allowed. She noted that the quality of decision making was measured on a two year rolling basis and that the council was performing well within national targets for both major and minor applications.

Overall, the committee were happy with the council's appeal performance and agreed to note the report.

The meeting closed at 8.03 pm