

# DC.1

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 2ND JUNE, 2008 AT  
6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Richard Gibson (Chair), John Woodford (Vice Chair), Paul Burton, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Mary de Vere, Richard Farrell, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Jerry Patterson, Terry Quinlan, Val Shaw and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Tony de Vere for Councillor Sue Marchant and Councillor Peter Saunders for Councillor Matthew Barber.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Claire Litchfield Carole Nicholl and Paul Yaxsley.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 6

**DC.1 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 Matthew Barber and Sue Marchant.

**DC.2 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday 10 March 2008 were adopted and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Minute DC.300 CUM/80/29-D – the deletion of the following sentence in the 12<sup>th</sup> Bullet point of paragraph 17 “Members had not stated at that time a completely new scheme” and the substitution thereof with the words “Members had not anticipated at that time a completely new scheme.”

**DC.3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors declared interests in report 07/08 as follows:-

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Application</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
John Woodford	Personal	ABG/20379	In that he knew the applicant.	DC.12
Roger Cox	Personal	GFA/12807(10&1	In that he was a member	DC.10

		1)	of Faringdon Town Council who had considered the application. However he was not on the committee that considered the application	
Jerry Patterson	KEN/204 47	Personal	In that he was a Member of Kennington Parish Council who had considered the application however he was not on the committee that considered the application.	DC.13
Richard Gibson	ABG/203 79	Personal	In that he resided on Victoria Road, adjacent to Park Road. He also was acquainted with some of the objecting residents and members of Christ's Hospital.	DC.391

#### DC.4 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed members of the public to the meeting and reminded everyone to switch off their mobile telephones.

He requested that members of the public listen to the debate in silence and advised of the emergency exit routes.

The Chair advised that application DRA/20481 had been withdrawn from the agenda.

#### DC.5 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

#### DC.6 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

#### DC.7 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

Four members of the public had given notice that they each wished to make a statement at the meeting.

#### DC.8 MATERIALS

None.

DC.9 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a list of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received.*

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 07/08 detailing 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.10 GFA/12807(10 & 11LB) AMENDMENT TO APPLICATIONS GFA/12807/8 AND GFA/12807/9-LB TO CREATE TWO ADDITIONAL SELF-CONTAINED ONE BEDROOM FLATS. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LEAN-TO EXTENSION. ERECTION OF NEW EXTENSION TO REAR OF COURTYARD, AND PROVISION OF CYCLE STORAGE. PORTWELL HOUSE, 27 MARKET PLACE, FARINGDON, SN7 7HU.

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

Officers reported that these applications returned to Committee following a referral from the 21 April meeting to the County Engineer in respect of parking concerns raised by Faringdon Town Council.

Officers stated that the County Engineer had submitted further comments which had been received on the 2 May. Officers advised that no objections had been raised to the application by the County Engineer, who had commented that given the town centre location of the development it was unlikely that the substandard parking provision was not a sustainable reason for refusal.

One Member commented that he understood the concerns of Faringdon Town Council but noted that in light of the County Engineer's comments and the Officer recommendations he would be in favour of approval.

By 15 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/12807/10, subject to the*

*completion of a section 106 agreement for highways contributions and subject to the conditions set out in the report; and*

- (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 approve application GFA12807/10-11LB subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement for highway contributions.*

DC.11 WLS/20026 ERECTION OF STABLES AND TACK ROOM WITH FOOD STORE (RESUBMISSION). WOODRUFF ORCHARD, WOOLSTONE ROAD, WOOLSTONE SN7 7RF

The Officers advised that the original application had been submitted for 5 stables and that this application was for 4 stables. The Committee was shown photographs of the previous structure which had occupied the site. Officers advised that an objection had been received from the Parish Meeting raising concerns relating to matters already covered by the report. Officers explained that it was not considered that a precedent would be set for future development in the area. The Officers referred the Committee to the concerns of residents, which were contained within the report. Officers were satisfied that the application related to stables which would be used for personal purposes, not as a commercial concern and highlighted the proposed conditions attached to the recommendation.

Mr Spink spoke on behalf of Woolstone Parish Meeting in objection to the application. He advised that he had been a resident for 32 years. He stated that he was under the impression that this was a site which had never and would never be developed. He commented that the photograph of the structure on the site had been given temporary planning permission for Ostrich sheds and it had taken great effort to get the structures removed when they had ceased to be functional. He highlighted the special location of the site in that it looked up to White Horse Hill. He raised concerns in respect of the lack of parking, lighting issues and the lack of adequate drainage in the village. He commented that the motivation of the occupier was in question, and advised that the application had been made by a person who was not the owner of the land.

Members were advised by the Officers that it was acceptable for a tenant to make an application. Officers stated that the question of ownership was not relevant and that the Committee should only consider the nature of the use of land.

One Member commented that he had been to visit the site and had found that it was well screened. He questioned what would amount to personal use versus a commercial concern. Officers commented that whether the stables were considered a commercial concern would depend on the scale of the proposal and use. Officers further commented that they had no objection to the proposal.

One Member commented that an application for stables was acceptable in the Green Belt. He advised that he considered the building to be modest and functional.

One Member questioned how many horses could be placed in a stable. It was confirmed that this application allowed for one stable, one horse.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application WLS/20026/1 be approved subject to the condition set out in the report.*

DC.12 ABG/20379 ERECTION OF RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING SIGNS (6 ENTRY SIGNS AND 11 REPEATER SIGNS), PARK ROAD AND PARK CRESCENT, ABINGDON OX14 1DA

Councillors John Woodford and Richard Gibson had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 remained in the meeting room.

The Committee noted that the application was for 13 repeater signs, rather than the 11 referred to in the report.

Officers explained that the material considerations of this application were narrowly focussed as it was an application under the Advertisement Regulations and therefore the Committee could only consider the visual impact of the proposed signage on the amenity of the area and the potential harm to highway safety as a result of the signage.

The Committee was shown photographs of mock-up signs which had been attached to sign posts in order to demonstrate their impact. Officers advised that no objections had been raised by the County Engineer on highways grounds.

Officers stated that several letters of objection had been received from worshippers of Trinity Church and St Michael's Church, who were concerned with how the scheme would operate. Officers advised that this was a matter for Christ's Hospital, not for the Development Control Committee.

Officers advised that the reason that there would be such a number of signs, repeated frequently was to ensure that the scheme was workable. It was commented that it was necessary for motorists to be aware that the scheme was in operation in order to facilitate the prosecution of offenders.

Officers commented that Abingdon Town Council had raised no objections, subject to the approval of the District Council's Conservation Officer. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer had raised no concerns.

Mr Robin Smith made a statement, objecting to the application. He argued that by its very nature the signs would have visual impact in order to make them noticeable enough to ensure prosecutions were successful. He commented that at no point would someone be out of sight of a sign. He considered that the yellow clamp in the centre of the sign was unattractive and not in keeping with the Conservation Area. He stated that the signs would be distracting to motorists and therefore would have an impact on highway safety. He commented that the crossroads of Victoria Road and Park Road was very busy and narrow and drivers would be distracted by additional signs

informing them of the parking scheme. He advised that this must be the case because it was the intention of the signs to attract the attention of drivers informing them of the scheme.

Mr Geoffrey Morris made a statement in support of the application. He advised that he was a Master of Christ's Hospital. He stated that the road and park were the property of the charity and had not been made to modern specifications. He commented that parked cars were affecting highway safety and this scheme aimed to resolve this issue. Furthermore he stated that the charity could not afford to keep up with the maintenance of the grass verges which were being damaged by vehicles. He commented that the Charity had received advice that legal action would not be successful against motorists parked illegally unless there were adequate signs advising motorists that they must not park. He confirmed that meetings had taken place with Officers and they had proposed a design which would have minimal impact, and the repeater signs would actually be no larger than a piece of A4 paper. He advised that the Charity would be willing to negotiate with residents or worshippers who had concerns about the working of the scheme.

One of the Local Members commented that parking was a real problem and that the introduction of the scheme would displace the parking problem from Park Road and Park Crescent elsewhere. He advised that there would be an impact on Abingdon School and the residents. He commented that many of those who had objected to the scheme were in fact not resident in the ward, but worshippers at the two affected churches. He questioned whether Officers and Christ's Hospital had considered the partial implementation of the scheme with the option of reviewing the position at some later date. He expressed his hope that enforcement of the scheme would be sympathetic, given that often there would be people wishing to park attending funerals or weddings. He advised that given the Officer's comments there was little option but to approve the application.

The Chair commented that the Committee was only able to consider whether the application affected visual amenity in the area and whether highway safety would be affected. He advised that he was unconvinced of the highway safety effects of the scheme. He commented that the County Engineer was happy with the application and therefore he did not consider that there were any grounds to refuse the application.

The Chair advised that Mr Smith, one of the speakers had a valid point, the signs would have a visual impact, as they must in order to serve their purpose. He advised that he considered the impact to be slightly detrimental but not harmful.

One Member agreed that there were no highways grounds to refuse the application, and he pointed out that within the conservation area there were signs of twenty first century, for example, double yellow lines. He advised that he considered that the signs were acceptable and hoped that Christ's Hospital would negotiate permits for people attending functions at the churches. He suggested that the signs should be on black poles, rather than grey.

Some Members were concerned about the size of the signs in that they contained lots of information and questioned whether they would be of sufficient size to convey all of the information. One Member was concerned that Christ's Hospital would be unable to

prosecute offending motorists if the signs were too small. He was worried that this would prompt a further application from Christ's Hospital to make the signs bigger.

Officers confirmed that the notion of having a trial of the scheme had not been discussed with Christ's Hospital.

By 12 votes to 3 votes it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/20379 be approved subject to:-*

- (1) the standard advertising conditions;*
- (2) an informative to provide that the mounted poles for the signs be painted black:  
and*
- (3) an informative providing that Christ's Hospital should enter into negotiations with Abingdon School, Trinity Church and St Michael's Church with a view to providing parking permits for special events.*

**DC.13** KEN/20447 VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 OF PLANNING PERMISSION KEN/7664 TO EXCLUDE NUMBER 5 PERKINS FROM AGE RESTRICTION. 5 PERKINS, UPPER ROAD, KENNINGTON, OX1 5LN.

Officer's reminded Members that this item returned to Committee in order that the reasons for refusal be formally endorsed

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KEN/20447 be refused for the reason set out in the report.*

**DC.14** ABG/20476 –ERECTION OF A GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR TO FORM ADDITIONAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION. DEMOLITION OF GARAGE TO REAR, 9 ETHELHELM CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 2RE

Officers presented the report to the Committee and advised that Abingdon Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds of the impact that the development would have in respect of loss of parking spaces. Officers advised that it was not considered that the development would have a harmful impact on the street scene or on the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Officers commented that they were satisfied with the provision for parking outlined in the plans and therefore the recommendation was for approval of the application.

Mr Robin Mann made a statement objecting to the application. He advised that the development would have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties in that it would be over dominant and he raised concern in respect of the applicant's failure to include details of the height the development would be and any measurements. He

advised that the applicant had failed to include any precise measurements. He raised concerns over the issue of parking space and commented that the applicant currently has a caravan parked on the driveway permanently which he believed the applicant used for storage. He commented that the applicant would lose more storage with the demolition of the garage and that the purpose of the car parking spaces were to park cars, not provide storage.

One Member commented that the position of the caravan should not be considered. He advised that he had noted a gravelled area in front of the house, which could be used as an extra parking space. Another Member commented that two spaces should be available for parking at all times. He added that he was concerned that there were no dimensions in the plans to demonstrate how far the wall was from the boundary line.

Officers confirmed that this was a three bedroom property and as such it was standard that two parking spaces be allocated. Officers commented that should the householder choose to use one of these spaces for a caravan this could not be controlled by the Council. It was further reported that the development would effectively be on the boundary with the neighbouring property.

One Member commented that looking at the photographs it was difficult to imagine that there was adequate room for a car to be parked. Officers advised that the space was 2.5 metres, which was acceptable for car parking.

One Member complained about the quality of the drawings which had been submitted.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/20476 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.15 DRA/20481 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR EXTENSIONS AND CHIMNEY AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF ROOF SPACE. ERECTION OF GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF TWO VELUX WINDOWS AND THREE DORMER WINDOWS IN ROOF. EXTENSIVE 8 HIGH STREET, DRAYTON, ABINGDON, OX14 4JL.

This item was not considered at the meeting as it had been withdrawn from the agenda.

DC.16 ABG/20508 RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CONVERSION OF GARAGE, 31 ANNA PAVLOVA CLOSE, ABINGDON OX14 1TF

Officers advised the Committee that this application was retrospective seeking permission for the conversion of the garage into living accommodation. The Committee noted that Abingdon Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds of insufficient off road parking. Officers confirmed that there had been no objections from the County Engineer and there was adequate off street parking



provision for two vehicles within the curtilage of the property and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

One Member commented that the Town Council was mistaken to object on these grounds in light of the comments of the County Engineer. One Member wondered whether in these circumstances the Town Council could have been invited to withdraw its objections. Officers confirmed that efforts had been made but it was difficult to get Town Councils to withdraw objections.

*RESOLVED (nem com)*

*that application ABG/20508 be approved.*

**DC.17 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME**

The Committee received and considered report 08/08 of the Strategic Director and the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which sought approval to take enforcement action in respect of land adjacent to 7 Nash Road, Abingdon. The Committee noted Planning Permission ABG/265/1 granted in 1974 required the land at 7 Nash Drive to be kept as open amenity "play space".

The Committee was shown photographs of the fence which had been erected around the land adjacent to 7 Nash Road, Abingdon.

*RESOLVED (nem com)*

*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 take enforcement action against Mr G McIntyre of 7 Nash Drive, Abingdon to remove the unauthorised fence and gates and cease the unauthorised use of the land as residential curtilage if he considers it expedient to do so.*

**Exempt Information Under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972**

None.

The meeting rose at 8.15pm