

# DC.18

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON ON  
MONDAY, 11TH JUNE, 2007 AT 6.30PM**

**Open to the Public, including the Press**

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Councillor Anthony Hayward, Councillor Angela Lawrence, Councillor Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Councillor Val Shaw and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Julie Mayhew-Archer (In place of Tony de Vere).

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 21

DC.22 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The attendance of a Substitute Member who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with an apology for absence having been received from Councillor Tony de Vere.

It was noted that Councillor Melinda Tilley was due to substitute for Councillor Peter Saunders, but unfortunately she was also unable to attend the meeting.

DC.23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Interests were declared in report 10/07 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	CHD/16632/2	She was acquainted with the applicant.	DC.34
Jerry Patterson	Personal	GFA/19758/1	He was a Member of South East Regional Assembly and a member of the Scrutiny Committee which oversaw the Southeast.	DC.37
Roger Cox	Personal	GFA/19758/1	He had met and spoken to one of the objectors who was speaking at the meeting.	DC.37
Carole Nicholl (Democratic Services Officer)	Personal	GFA/19883-X	She was a former resident of Nursery View and was acquainted with some of the residents.	DC.38

DC.24 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

The Chair announced that agenda item 10 – ABG/1615/51 – Demolition of existing garden centre; extension to store and car park, Tesco, Marcham Road, Abingdon had been withdrawn from the agenda on the advice of Officers.

DC.25 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.26 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.27 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

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

DC.28 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials as follows: -

- (i) ABG/19126-2D - Land at 75/77 Northcourt Road, Abingdon

*RESOLVED*

- (a) *that the following materials be approved: -*

*- Bricks – Hanson Cheshire and Hanson Mandarin*

- (b) *that authority be delegated to the deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee to approve tiles.*

- (ii) (ABG/ 17140/1) Land Adjacent to the Police Station, Colwell Drive, Abingdon

*RESOLVED*

- that the following materials be approved: -*

*- Render – buttermilk*

*- Bricks - Michelmersch Hampshire grey brown main brick and Charnwood detail brick*

*- Tiles – Eternit plain clay tiles in Century*

DC.29 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered details of two appeals which had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate and four which had been dismissed as follows:-

Allowed

- (i) Appeal by Mr S Munday against condition number 2 of planning permission STA/8763/4 for the erection of a small scale wind turbine at 3 High Street, Stanford in the Vale.
- (ii) Appeal by Carpetright plc against the Council's decision to refuse to permit the display of two internally illuminated flex-face fascia signs and two non illuminated poster frames at Unit 2A, Fairacres, Marcham Road, Abingdon (ABG/505/75A).

Dismissed

- (i) Appeal by M & W Richardson against the Council's decision to refuse to permit the erection of a replacement dwelling, including linked garage at Chilswell Farm Villa, Boars Hill (CUM/18846/3).
- (ii) Appeal by Mr D Ridgeway against the Council's decision to refuse to permit an outline application for the erection of one dwelling on land at Hillview, Shrivenham Road, Longcot (LON/16205/6-X).
- (iii) Appeals by Tapeacrown Ltd against the decisions of the Council to:-
  - (a) Refuse to permit an outline application for the cessation of lorry park use and the erection of a new building for business use (648m<sup>2</sup>) with new parking and turning area, as well as the provision of a new access onto the A420 route and the closure of two existing accesses (GCO/2087/21-X);
  - (b) Refuse to permit the provision of a new access onto the A420 route and the closure of two existing accesses (GCO/2087/22).on land at the Faringdon Business Park, A420, Great Coxwell.
- (iv) Appeal by Mr J Bell against the Council's decision to refuse to permit the construction of a dwelling and garage on land at 5A Kingfishers, Grove.

*RESOLVED*

*that the agenda report be received.*

DC.30 **FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS**

The Committee received and considered a schedule setting out details of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received.*

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received and considered report 10/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy), regarding various planning applications, the decisions of which are recorded below.

Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.31 ABG/1615/51 – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARDEN CENTRE. EXTENSION TO STORE AND CAR PARK. TESCO, MARCHAM ROAD, ABINGDON OX14 1AA

As referred to elsewhere in these minutes, this item was withdrawn from the agenda.

DC.32 DRA/2395/12 – ERECTION OF A GREENHOUSE & POTTING SHED. GILBOURNS FARMHOUSE, 155 DRAYTON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY OX14 4HA

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that the Design Officer had suggested that details of construction should be sought. Therefore, should the application be supported, Members were asked to agree the addition of Condition CN8 which would require details of the framework to be submitted and approved.

Mr D Russell, the applicant, made a statement in support of the application commenting that he was mindful of the character of the surrounding area and the style of local houses. He explained that the application sought to enhance the existing house and would be an improvement. He reported that a leylandii hedge had been removed and the position of the greenhouse had been carefully considered. Finally, he commented that there was adequate screening.

Members supported the application.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application DRA/2395/12 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report together with a further condition, (CN8) to require the applicant to provide details of the framework for prior approval.*

DC.33 KBA/3105/9 – CONSTRUCTION OF TWO GARAGE BUILDINGS TO SERVE NEW HOUSES (RETROSPECTIVE), RESTWOOD, FARINGDON ROAD, SOUTHMOOR OX13 5AF

The Committee noted that in view of the level of screening the Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable. One Member suggested that an additional condition should be added requiring that the existing planting should be retained at a minimum height.

One Member expressed concern that the garages would not be used for parking but storage and questioned whether the level of remaining parking elsewhere on the site would be adequate. Other Members agreed with this view, commenting that it would be reasonable and it was necessary for a condition to be imposed preventing doors being erected. It was considered that without doors, the garages would be retained as car ports and used for parking, thus reducing the likelihood of on street parking, which was considered dangerous in this area.

It was noted that in addition to the garages, there were 9 parking spaces.

One Member reported that the Oxfordshire Design Study had undertaken a survey which had concluded that over half of all garages were used for storage.

By way of a straw poll, it was proposed by Councillor Jerry Patterson, seconded by Councillor Richard Gibson and agreed by 8 votes to 6 that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, a condition be imposed requiring that doors should not be erected on the garages.

By 13 votes to 1, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KBA/3105/9 be approved subject to :-*

- (1) the condition set out in the report;*
- (2) a further condition to require that the existing planting should be retained at a minimum height of 2.5 metres; and*
- (3) a further condition to require that doors shall not be erected on the garages.*

DC.34 CHD/16632/2 – GARAGE EXTENSION WITH ROOMS FOR RELATIVE ABOVE & INDOOR SWIMMING POOL SITED AT SIDE / REAR. RIDGEWAY HOUSE, WEST STREET, CHILDREY, OX12 9UL

Councillor Jenny Hannaby had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Officers explained that the proposal was in two elements, details of which were outlined. It was noted that the application site was adjacent to the Conservation Area and a Listed Building. It was highlighted that the Parish Council had objected to the application and there had been 4 further letters of objection, details of which were set out in the report.

Reference was made to the block plan and it was reported that the dormer windows of the extension would look towards the Listed Building, but this was 25 metres away. In addition, there was a property to the west of the application site called Appleton House, although the nearest element of the proposal to this house would be the garage extension and to a lesser extent the swimming pool on the other side of the access drive. In addition it was commented that there was another neighbouring property, Holton House, the gable end windows of which would look out on the extension. It was therefore proposed that the windows on the extension would be set at 1.7 metres to avoid overlooking. Finally, it was commented that there was a fence to the front which would obscure the views from the main street.

It was noted that notwithstanding the objections raised, the Officers considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the area or the Listed Building.

Mr A Brough the occupier of the Listed Building, speaking on behalf of his wife and other neighbours made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly raised concerns regarding loss of privacy; overlooking; height; dominance; the creation of a blank wall overlooking the lane; adverse impact of the rural appearance and character of the area; noise from the users of the pool and its pump.

One Member referred to the elevations and suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, an additional condition to address slab levels should be added. With reference to noise, the Member commented that the swimming pool without the enclosure could be built without planning permission.

One Member agreed with the concerns raised regarding potential noise and requested that a condition be included to address this. In response, the Officers explained that there was potential for noise from the pump house and hence condition 5 set out in the report was

proposed to address this. Furthermore, it was explained that should a noise nuisance occur, this could be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation.

One Member referred to the comments of the Parish Council in terms of percentage increase in floor space and this being contrary to planning policy GS3. However, the Officers clarified that this policy related to the Green Belt and that the application site was not in the Green Belt.

Concerns was expressed at the need to retain the fence and to this end it was considered that should the Committee be minded to approve the application a further condition should be added to require this.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application CHD/16632/2 be approved subject to: -*

- (1) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (2) further conditions to address slab levels and boundary treatment to ensure the retention of the boundary fence.*

DC.35 DRA/17328/1 – PROPOSED LOFT EXTENSION. 54 STEVENTON ROAD, DRAYTON, ABINGDON, OX14 4LD

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application DRA/17328/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.36 ABG/19628/2 – ERECTION OF ONE TWO STOREY FOUR BED DWELLING WITH GARAGE. LAND ADJOINING 2 NORMAN AVENUE, ABINGDON OX14 2HQ

Mr M Lavelle, the applicant made a statement in support of the application. He explained that he lived at No.2 Norman Avenue and wished to build a new house for himself. He explained that he wanted a property which exceeded the environmental requirements and was in a new different style. He commented that the design was very interesting and in his view would add to the street scene. The property had been set back and to the left of the site to maximise the natural light potential. There would be amenity space to the front. He commented that large window were proposed to make the best use of natural light and there would be environmental measures such as solar collectors in the roof and grey water reuse. He explained that he wished to recycle water in the garden. Finally, he reported that the design was stylish and would be appropriate for this location.

One of the local Members commented that both she and the other local Member raised no objection to the proposal. She commented that she had visited the site and that there was no overall design or character in Norman Ave. She commented that she did not like the flat roof element but noted that it would not be visually harmful in this location.

Other Members spoke in support of the application welcoming the design and the efforts being made to address environmental considerations. It was agreed that there was a large variety of house types and designs and that the proposal would not be out of keeping.

One Member whilst supporting the application questioned whether there was sufficient space between the proposed house and the neighbouring property to allow for maintenance. In response, the Officers clarified that a one metre distance was shown on the plans.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the plans and it was noted that the property would be sited to the southeast of the neighbouring property and not to the east as stated. As such it was suggested that there could be some loss of light. However, it was noted that the building was to be constructed adjacent to a solid wall and therefore there would be no impact on the neighbour's amenities and the property had been set back to avoid overshadowing. Furthermore, the main bulk of the proposal would be in line with the neighbouring property.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/19628/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.37 GFA/19758/1 – EXTENSION TO BRUNEL HOUSE AND ERECTION OF 17 INCUBATION UNITS FOR B1 USE (FARINGDON BUSINESS CENTRE). LAND ADJOINING HEALTH CENTRE, VOLUNTEER WAY, FARINGDON SN7 7YP

Councillors Roger Cox and Jerry Patterson 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 was advised that the applicant's objectives in developing the site were primarily to address the lack of small and flexible workspace for new businesses in the area, as little commercial development had been undertaken within Faringdon in recent years, and to provide start up units in the face of continual pressure for employment land to be used for other uses such as housing.

Details of the development were explained.

Ms Andrea Storey made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly raised concern regarding volume of traffic and car parking. She explained that the access was not wide enough to accommodate additional traffic and that she had concerns regarding vehicle movements; traffic congestion and cyclist and pedestrian safety. She referred to the existing car parking problems associated with the adjacent Health Centre commenting that the current proposal would exasperate this. In addition she raised concerns regarding the design; elevations; height and materials. She considered that the two storey element would be out of keeping and over dominant. She considered the proposal overbearing; out of keeping; incompatible in terms of materials in that red brick would not compliment the existing houses. Finally, she raised concerns regarding security and management of the site. She suggested that the lack of visibility of the area would attract local youths resulting in antisocial behaviour.

Mr T Gashe, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the applicant regarded this development as an important part towards sustainability in Faringdon. He explained that the applicant would be making a financial contribution towards highway improvements and that as the proposal was for small units, which were usually occupied by very low numbers of people, the proposed level of parking was satisfactory. In terms of design he commented that whilst the towers were two storey, they were flat roof and as such would not be over dominant on the adjacent residential development. In terms of security, he considered that this would be managed by the occupiers of the units.

One of the local Members considered that the proposal did not amount to overdevelopment in terms of scale and size which in his view was subjective. He agreed that the Health Centre car park was well used but that the County Council had raised no objection on highway ground. He agreed that there was traffic congestion onto the A420 but noted that a financial contribution was to be made towards highway infrastructure. He welcomed materials being reported back to Committee for approval and commented that in his view the proposal was acceptable. However, he expressed some reservations regarding car parking but noted that the level proposed was considered acceptable by the Officers.

Other Members spoke in support of the application commenting that the proposal would be beneficial to Faringdon. It was considered that parking for this development would be adequate in view of the small units proposed which were unlikely to generate high traffic levels. It was commented that the parking problems experienced at the Health Centre were not relevant as the proposal needed to provide parking for its own purpose and not that elsewhere. It was suggested that the Officers should discuss parking requirements for health centres generally, with the County Council, especially when those centres covered rural areas. Finally, it was considered that care was needed regarding materials to ensure that they complimented the existing houses.

One Member whilst supporting the application commented that in future Officers should seek to obtain financial contributions towards waste collection and recycling.

In response to a comment made, the Officers clarified that the applicant would maintain the building and landscaping and would also manage the site. It was also highlighted that the Crime Prevention Advisor had raised no objections to the application. Furthermore, the Officers reported that there would be a financial contribution in the sum of £4,780 towards bus service provision and a further £500 to amend the Traffic Order requiring restrictions.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

- (a) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy), in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to approve application GFA/19758/1 subject to: -*
- (1) *the conditions set out in the report;*
  - (2) *the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the required highways financial contribution; and*
  - (3) *a panels of materials being erected on site with details of those materials coming back to Committee for approval.*
- (b) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy), in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to refuse application GFA/19758/1 should the Section 106 agreement not be completed within the 13 week period (which ends on 28 June 2007), with the reason for refusal being based on the lack of necessary financial contributions towards improving local highway infrastructure.*



Carole Nicholl, the Democratic Services Officer had declared an interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 35 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

It was noted that the comments of the Environment Agency were awaited.

It was noted that the application was for outline permission with all matters reserved. Hence it was noted that the plans were illustrative only.

Further to the report the following points were highlighted: -

- the employment site was now in a different location, details of which were explained. It was commented that its re-siting assisted in the appearance of the site;
- there would be an integration of residential development into the landscape, with a landscape strategy being worked up;
- landscape buffers were to be proposed and there were many trees on site which could be moved around;
- landscaping would help to screen the development;
- there was a proposal to make three distinct neighbourhoods with distinct design boundaries;
- a land transfer was being negotiated with the owner of the RAC site to enable a better access;
- landscaping was proposed to soften the entrance; and
- there had been significant public consultation.

Mr D Rixton, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application. He referred to the significant public consultation and explained that comments received had been taken on board.

One of the local Members commended the applicant on the extent of the public consultation. He expressed his support for the proposal noting that it accorded with Planning Policy and PPS3. He commented that the proposal made good use of a previously developed site. He commented that there was a nearby adequate highway and the contribution to sports facilities would be welcomed locally. He noted that access was being addressed. Finally, he welcomed the retention of trees and commented that the development would be beneficial to Faringdon.

Other Members also spoke in support of the application commending the applicant on the level of public consultation. It was considered that the proposal would be welcomed in Faringdon.

One Member noted that the plans were illustrative only and emphasised the need for appropriate landscaping and retention of the trees. Furthermore, she suggested that the public art should be well considered and appropriate for the site.

It was reported that the issue of siting and facilities were to be resolved at the reserve stage. The proposals for art had yet to be submitted and the planting would be included in a future application.

In considering the application the following comments were made: -

- There should be a commuted sum towards the maintenance of trees and open space. It was noted that the terms of a Section 106 obligation were being discussed with applicants.
- An Informative should be added to any permission to require the spread of affordable housing throughout the whole of the development.

- There should be a financial contribution towards waste collection and minimisation and recycling services. It was noted that this had not been discussed with the applicants.
- There was a suggestion that the applicant should pay for the provision of at least 400 green boxes.
- More industrial units in Faringdon were welcomes.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be delegated authority in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Members to approve application GFA/19883 – X subject to: -*

- (1) *the completion of Section 106 obligations with the District and County Councils to secure*
  - (a) *financial contributions towards affordable housing and waste collection (such as dog bins, waste bins and green boxes);*
  - (b) *a commuted sum towards the maintenance of landscaping and*
  - (c) *phasing of the development*
- (2) *conditions;*
- (3) *an informative regarding the spread of the affordable house throughout the development.*

DC.39 ABG/20064 – DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARAGE. EXTENSION OF A 1 BEDROOM HOUSE ATTACHED TO EXISTING DWELLING. 6 CHILTON CLOSE, ABINGDON OX14 2AP

It was noted that the Town Council had objected to the proposal as it was contrary to the Design Guide. However, the Officers considered the proposal acceptable as it would be difficult to detect that the proposal was not an extension.

One of the local Members reported that she had not received any comments either in support or against this application. She considered that on balance the proposal was acceptable, commenting on the need for smaller units of accommodation.

Some Members spoke against the application raising concerns regarding the setting of a precedent and increased parking. It was commented that approval of similar applications could result in a terracing affect which cumulatively would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It was suggested that many of these types of proposals would change the character and openness of the estate. Furthermore, there would be additional vehicles.

However, other Members spoke in support of the application considering that a terracing appearance would not result as the proposal was set back from the main house and was less dominant.

By 10 votes to 4, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/20064 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 8.55 pm