

DC.10

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON
ON MONDAY, 23RD JUNE, 2008 AT
6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Tony de Vere for Councillor John Woodford and Councillor John Morgan for Councillor Matthew Barber.

OFFICERS: Rodger Hood, Laura Hudson, Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl, Sarah Commins and Martin Deans.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 15

DC.18 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 Matthew Barber and John Woodford.

DC.19 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 21 April and 24 April 2008 were adopted and signed as correct records subject to the following amendments: -

1. **Minute DC.334 – Conservation Area Appraisals**

In the second paragraph the deletion of the word “to” after the words “for the support given” and the substitution thereof with the word “by”.

2. **Minute DC.336 – WHA/4310(9)**

The insertion of a comma after the word “comments” in the second paragraph.

In the last sentence of the fourth paragraph, the deletion of the word “undergrade” and the substitution thereof with the word “capacity”.

3. **Minute DC.338 – ABG/10612/17**

In the third paragraph the deletion of the word “affect” in the second sentence and the substitution thereof with the word “effect”.

In the fourth paragraph, the deletion of the words “Mr Impney” and the substitution thereof with the words “Mr Impey”.

In the last sentence of the fifth bullet point of the penultimate paragraph the insertion of an apostrophe in the word “Engineers”.

4. Minute DC.341 – CUM/16152(1)

In the third paragraph, the deletion of the word “Mr” and the substitution thereof with the word “Dr”.

5. Minute DC.344 – GFA/19649/2-D

In the ninth bullet point of the fifth paragraph, the deletion of the word “was” and the substitution thereof with the word “were”.

In the twelfth bullet point of the fifth paragraph, the deletion of the word “were” and the substitution thereof with the word “was”.

The insertion of a full stop at the end of the second bullet point in the seventh paragraph.

6. Minute DC.363 – SUT/20422

In the third sentence of the second paragraph the insertion of an apostrophe in the word “Councils”.

In the last sentence before the resolution, the deletion of the words “by 8 votes with 1 abstention” and the substitution thereof with the words “by 8 votes to nil with 1 abstention”.

7. Minute DC.364 – Enforcement Programme
(1) George and Dragon Public House Upton

The deletion of the word “contained” and the substitution thereof with the word “container” in the second sentence of the second paragraph.

DC.20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in report 34/ 08 as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	WAN/2186/17	In so far as she was a Member of Wantage Town Council and had been present at the meeting when this application had been discussed.	DC.28

			However, she advised that she had not taken part in that discussion.	
John Morgan	Personal	WAN/2186/17	In so far as he was a Member of Wantage Town Council and had been present at the meeting when this application had been discussed. However, he advised that he had not taken part in that discussion.	DC.28
Roger Cox	Personal and Prejudicial	GFA/14935/3-X	In so far as he lived within the vicinity of the application site.	DC.30
Richard Farrell	Personal and Prejudicial	GFA/19883/3 - D	In so far as he was a Member of the Vale Housing Association which was a partner in this proposal.	DC.32
Roger Cox	Personal	GFA/19883/3 - D	In so far as he was a Member of Faringdon Town Council which had commented on the application. However, he advised that he was not a Member of the Town Council's Planning Committee and had not taken part in any consideration of the application.	DC.32
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	WAN/20523	In so far as she was a Member of Wantage Town Council and had been present at the meeting when this application had been discussed. However, she advised that she had not taken part in that discussion.	DC.35
John Morgan	Personal	WAN/20523	In so far as he was a Member of Wantage Town Council and had been present at the meeting	DC.35

			when this application had been discussed. However, he advised that he had not taken part in that discussion.	
--	--	--	--	--

DC.21 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed everyone present to the meeting. For the benefit of members of the public he pointed out the Officers who were present to give advice and to minute the proceedings and he explained that only elected Members of the Development Control Committee could vote on the items on the agenda. He commented that local Members could address the Committee but could not vote on any applications unless they were a Member of the Committee. The Chair reported that this was explained more fully in an information sheet circulated around the public gallery.

In the unlikely event of having to leave the meeting room, the Chair pointed out the emergency exits.

The Chair asked everyone present to ensure that their mobile telephones were switched off during the meeting. He asked everyone to listen to the debate in silence and allow anyone speaking to make their comments without interruption.

The Chair welcomed Councillor John Morgan to his first meeting of the Development Control Committee.

Finally, the Chair congratulated Councillor Paul Burton on the recent birth of his first child.

DC.22 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.23 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.24 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. However, two members of the public declined to do so.

DC.25 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials in respect of the following -

(1) Ameys Site, Appleford Road, Sutton Courtenay – SUT/19470/4-D

It was noted that an additional tile and brick were awaited and would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee. The Committee expressed a preference for natural slate tiles.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

- *Hanson Salisbury Multistock bricks*
- *Marley Acme – Farmhouse Brown*
- *Natural slate*

(2) Land adj to Stainswick Lane, Shrivenham – SHR/20042 – Rural Exception Site

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

- *Ibstock Lambourn Orange Multi Stock*
- *Terca Woodstock Buff feature brick*
- *Marley Acme Single camber clay tiles in Farmhouse*

(3) Care Village, Letcombe Regis – LRE/957/66

It was noted that some materials in respect of this site had been approved at the last meeting of the Committee and that the materials now to be approved were in addition to those, with the exception of the clay tile which would replace the previously approved Marley Brindle clay tile.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

- *Ibstock Lambourn Orange Multi Stock*
- *Marley Eternit Red Smooth clay tile*

DC.26 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of two appeals which had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate and one which had been dismissed.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.27 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a report detailing forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

RESOLVED

that the report be received.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 38/08 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) detailing planning applications the decisions of which are set out below. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.28 WAN/2186/17 - BERKELEY HOMES OXFORD AND CHILTERN LTD. VARIATION TO CONDITION 11 OF APPROVAL WAN/2186/14 TO SUBSTITUTE AMENDED DRAWINGS AS PER THIS APPLICATION. ST MARY'S SCHOOL, NEWBURY STREET, WANTAGE, OX12 8BZ.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby and John Morgan had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 33 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Officers explained the proposal and the further amendments to Block B8, commenting as follows: -

- Looking at the terraces there was an intention to increase the number of units to 237 instead of 230. This was to provide more affordable housing. The plans of the approved terrace compared to the amended proposal were shown.
- The overall scale of the terrace had been reduced with the ridge line reduced by over 1m.
- The integral car parking was no longer part of the scheme.
- Terrace T3 - The integral garages had been removed and it was now proposed that there would be 11 units. The design was considered to be an improvement to the original scheme. The scale was being reduced by 0.7m.
- Terrace T15 – This would be slightly longer to provide 4 units instead of 3. The Architects Panel believed that the appearance of the scheme was more pleasing.
- Regarding car parking it was noted that 6 of the 7 units in terrace T1 were being provided with 1.5 spaces per unit and Members were asked to refer to

- Appendix 5. It was noted that terrace T1 would be made up of 7 social rated units. The evidence in this regard came from the Census Data for the Charlton Ward which had shown that rented accommodation generated a lower level of car ownership. On this basis the applicant was looking to provide less car parking. Members were asked to note that it would be difficult to provide further car parking in this area without impacting on the listed buildings. It was noted that the County Engineer had raised no objection. It was emphasised that this applied to only 6 of 230 units and as this was a town centre site the Committee should not look for maximum provision on this site.
- In respect of Blocks B3 and B2 there had been a change of orientation and of the under-parking croft.
 - Block B8 – The footprint remained the same. There was a relocation of the centralised bin area which freed up some room.
 - B8 was all affordable housing. The Section 106 agreement would be amended to include all the proposed changes to the location and size of the affordable housing units. There would be a loss of one car parking space with visitor parking being reduced from 13 spaces to 12.
 - There was a change to the first floor plan, in that in the original plan there had been a lean-to element over a car parking space. The building would be pulled back in line with the ground floor.
 - Terrace T4 was to be rented units, but these were being substituted into T1.

Further to the report the Officers commented that most of the buildings on site had now been demolished. It was reported that English Heritage had no observations to make other than that the Council should consider the application having regard to the normal policies for listed buildings and Conservation Areas and subject to the involvement of Council's Conservation Officer.

It was also reported that the Architects Panel had raised a query regarding the mix of materials on the site. It was commented that there was to be less tile hanging because of the removal of gables in Terraces T1 and T3. It was reported that the Officers were content with the mix of materials on the site, it being noted that these would be presented to the Committee for approval at a later stage.

Further to the report there had been one letter of objection raising concern regarding the lack of car parking and reference was made to other developments in Wantage such as at Newbury Street, suggesting that these might cause knock on problems in terms of parking.

It was noted that comments were awaited from Wantage Town Council on the amendments to Block 8. The Officers commented that it was expected that the Town Council would raise similar objections as before, given that there would be a loss of one car parking space.

It was reported that the consultation period on the amended plans had not expired and therefore the Committee was asked to delegate authority to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) to approve the application following the expiry of the consultation period and subject to no new issues of concern having been raised. It was emphasised that it was anticipated that the Town Council would object to the proposal on the same grounds previously raised and that the Committee was being

asked to consider those issues now. It was clarified that if the Town Council raised new reasons for objecting, then the application would need to be presented to the Committee again for further discussion.

It was noted that the previous permission had a condition attached to it requiring the provision of gates to the undercroft car parking spaces in Block B8. It was considered that this would be an attractive feature and therefore the Committee was asked to agree that a similar condition be added to this permission, if the Committee was minded to approve the application.

One of the local Members questioned whether the total affordable housing was in excess of 70 units and that it was thought that the applicant wished to provide more. The Officers responded that the scheme was compliant with the policy in respect of the provision of affordable housing, in that there was to be in excess of 50% affordable housing proposed. However, the exact amount which could be provided on the site was a private matter between the applicant and the housing association. It was noted that there was no upper limit to the level of affordable housing which could be provided.

The same local Member raised concerns at the proposal in terms of the reduced level of car parking. He commented that parking was a major issue in this part of the town. He considered that if the level was reduced in respect of the provision associated with the affordable housing, this would impact on the whole development. Finally, he disagreed with the view that these residents would have less cars, commenting that most households now had two vehicles.

One Member disagreed with this comment advising that it was not correct to assume that all these households would have two cars.

Another local Member reported that this development was a major concern to the people of Wantage and to the Town Council. She considered that the units were being packed into this site and she questioned the appropriateness of using census data to assess parking requirements. She expressed concern that a parking space was being lost, commenting that in her view parking on this site was going to be problematical. Furthermore, she expressed concern regarding the affordable housing and whilst recognising the need for this, she was concerned that a ghetto area might result on this site.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to Appendix 5 of the report which explained the justification for a reduction in the level of parking. He stated that the Committee should not refuse this application on parking grounds when Members had before them information setting out a justification for the proposal.

One Member drew attention to the fact that the information was based on 2001 data. He commented that the figures were dated and that there had been changes in car membership over the last seven years. He commented that he recollected that car ownership had increased by about 20%, which he considered was a relevant factor and that this needed to be reflected now. He commented that he did not have any objections to the changes to the buildings, but he had some anxiety about the car parking provision and that the Committee needed to be sure that adequate parking

was being proposed. Furthermore, he expressed concern regarding the possibility of receiving more amendments to the scheme. He highlighted that this was an important town centre location. He drew Members' attention to the report commenting that the dissipation of garage car parking was referred to, but he advised that he did not understand what impact this would have on this very well designed scheme. He asked the Committee to be cautious and to be mindful not to lower expectations of quality. Finally, he commented that he considered that open car parking could alter the character and quality of the scheme.

The Officers reported that as part of its work on the Local Development Framework the Council had undertaken its own travel survey of new houses in the Vale built since 2001. This had indicated that 10 % of households in new dwellings in the District had no car at all.

One Member expressed concern regarding the amendments presented commenting that she was concerned there would be more changes. She considered that this was a site which should be closely monitored and she asked if the local Members could be consulted by the Deputy Director when exercising his delegation to approve the application, if this was what the Committee decided.

One Member referred to the Council's data, noting that the demand seemed to be for two cars. The Officers responded that there would be parking spaces elsewhere and that the figures had shown that not all households would need a parking space. It was reported that across the scheme in its totality there would be spaces available and that over the whole scheme there should be some flexibility for car parking.

One Member commented that the population density had not changed much and he questioned how the 1.5 car parking spaces per household would be allocated.

The Officers responded that spaces would be allocated within the development. It was explained that spaces were to be numbered and that in respect of Terrace T12, there would be 1 space per dwelling and the other spaces would be shared within the development.

One Member expressed concern regarding the use of 2001 data. He considered that trends might show that 1.5 parking spaces was adequate but he was concerned regarding the need in future years which was not possible to determine. He commented that there was 20% growth per household and that beyond this it was not possible to speculate any further. He noted the concerns of local Members that the need for parking was getting to a point which was unmanageable.

One Member suggested that information about car ownership should be sought from registered social landlords, it being noted that they collected car ownership details from their tenants themselves.

One of the local Members commented that it was disappointing that the views of the Town Council on the amendments had yet to be received. The Officers clarified that the consultation period had not yet expired and that any comments received by the Town Council would be considered and that if new issues were raised the application would be referred back to the Committee for further discussion.

One Member referred to the statement on the justification of parking provision for three bedroom shared ownership units commented that in 2001 the typical level of car ownership was one per household. He commented that 1.5 spaces was proposed for this development and therefore even factoring in a 20% increase on 2001 figures, the level being proposed would be sufficient. Furthermore, he commented that car ownership might reduce.

One Member commented that it was inappropriate to compare the 2001 data with the latest information as the respondents which provided the information were completely different.

By 8 votes to 7 it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair and Oppositions Spokesman of the Development Control Committee and the local Members be delegated authority to approve application WAN/2186/17 subject to: -

- (1) the expiry of the consultation period on the amended plans and no new points of objection having been received;*
- (2) the completion of a variation to the existing Section 106 Agreement;*
- (3) the conditions set out in the report; and*
- (4) an additional condition requiring the provision of metal gates to the parking spaces on block B8.*

DC.29 NHI/6423/3 - CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO PLAYROOM WITH ALTERATIONS. (RETROSPECTIVE) 40, WESTMINSTER WAY, NORTH HINKSEY, OXFORD, OX2 0LW

Mr Philip Stevens made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application. He commented that this had been a difficult site since the first application in 2006, in that the proposal had been overlarge and overbearing on neighbours. He commented that it had included a very long wall and the proposal was close to the boundary. However, eventually planning permission had been granted with a requirement that prior permission to change the garage structure or its use was necessary. The Parish Council was concerned that the applicant had acted contrary to this condition which had been imposed to retain the garage in the interests of highway safety. It was commented that conditions were imposed for definite purposes and he suggested that if the Committee now approved this application, it would demonstrate to the public that they could ignore conditions. He commented that approval would set a precedent for similar applications, which the Committee would then be unable to refuse. He commented that the proposal would adversely affect the amenity of the neighbour in terms of noise and disturbance. Furthermore, it was considered that the proposal would go against a parking condition already imposed

and the reasons for that condition. He raised concern regarding design, in terms of a window instead of a garage door, which he considered would be out of keeping with the rest of Westminster Way. He reported that the Parish Council had felt strongly that this application should be refused and that enforcement action should be taken.

One of the local Members expressed sympathy with the views of the Parish Council and local residents commenting that the window would be large. However, in planning terms he considered that the proposal was acceptable and should be approved. He drew the Committee's attention to the Inspector's comments set out in Appendix 1 to the report advising that during construction it had become apparent that the walls between the twin garages which had been set in the space between nos. 40 and 42 Westminster Way, though poor in condition, should remain in place and that this had been included in the Party Wall Award set up between the two properties. He noted that once this had been agreed, the already very narrow garage which did not meet modern standards, had become even more narrow and impossible to use. At that point the applicant had taken the decision to extend the insulated cavity wall on the boundary between 40 and 42 forward to form the side wall of the enclosed space. He had insulated the floor and mono-pitch to bring this narrow space inside the habitable envelope. The local Member suggested that the applicant should have applied for permission for a change of use at that time. Finally, he went on to comment on the drawings set out in the report highlighting that two velux windows were shown in the front elevation. He recommended that the plans should be corrected. Furthermore, he requested that the Officers should be certain that planning permission was not being sought for additional windows in the roof.

One Member commented that there was nothing unlawful about retrospective applications and that the Committee was required to consider such applications without regard to this. He emphasised that being retrospective was not a material planning consideration. He reported that anyone who undertook to construct a proposal without planning permission took the risk that planning permission might not be granted and enforcement action could result. He commented that in this case there was the advantage that Members could view the proposal. He considered that the proposal was acceptable and he questioned whether the rendering of the north facing wall could be required as part of this planning permission and that this should be done within a reasonable timescale.

The Officers advised that a condition to require matching materials was proposed and therefore it would be possible for the Committee to take a view as to what was a reasonable time to comply with this condition and then take enforcement action for non compliance if appropriate.

One Member referred to the loss of a parking space noting that a minimum number of parking spaces was normally required. The Officers clarified that the Committee should not set unduly unrestrictive parking requirements and that the objective of the Government's policy in this regard was to discourage the use of the car.

In response to a question raised, the Officers confirmed that it was possible to pave over front gardens under permitted development rights.

Other Members supported the proposal, but agreed that the wall should be rendered as it was currently unsightly and would obviously be an irritant to the neighbours. Members did not consider that there would be a noise nuisance resulting from the use of the room as a play room noting that it abutted the neighbour's garage and not a habitable room.

In response to a comment made regarding the skylights, the Officers confirmed that the plans on the file showed two sky lights.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application NHI/6423/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.30 GFA/14935/3-X - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO PROVIDE ACCESS DRIVE, THE ERECTION OF TWO DWELLINGS ON LAND FORMING PART OF THE REAR GARDENS OF NOS.15A AND 15B COXWELL ROAD, AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAYOUT OF THE FRONT GARDEN OF NO.15B TO PROVIDE PARKING. 15B COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON, SN7 7EB.

Councillor Roger Cox had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 33 he withdrew from the meeting room during its consideration.

The Committee noted that the layout was illustrative only and that Members were being asked to consider whether the principle of development and two houses was acceptable.

Further to the report, the Officers confirmed that they considered that the impact on the street scene would be minimal.

The Committee noted that Faringdon Town Council had objected to the proposal raising concerns regarding over-development of the site and the lack of safety at the access.

It was noted that the County Engineer had no objection to the proposal, but had raised concerns regarding the need for a turning area within the site. The Officers explained that this could be accommodated within the detail

It was noted that four letters of objection had been received as set out in the report.

The Committee noted the receipt of amended plans which addressed some of original comments of the County Engineer regarding the narrow access and also allowed for the provision of a bin store.

One Member referred to the comments of the County Engineer regarding the need for a turning area. The Officers clarified that the County Engineer was not objecting in principle to development on this site, as it was believed that a turning area could be accommodated within the site. The Member emphasised that the County Engineer

had stated that he needed to be satisfied that the turning area could be provided to which the Officers responded that they believed that it was possible to achieve this. The Officers further commented that the houses shown on the illustrative plan were a substantial size and that it could be possible to have single fronted houses for example which were reduced in size with the garages pushed back into the site. It was commented that the space available was large enough to provide a turning area on site, but smaller houses might result.

By 14 votes to nil with one of the voting Members having been out of the room during consideration of this matter, it was

RESOLVED

that application GFA/14935/3-X be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.31 CHI/16448/3 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND ERECTION OF FOUR DWELLINGS AND GARAGES. DOWNLANDS, SOUTH ROW, CHILTON, OX11 0RT

The Committee noted that permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of four dwellings and garages had been allowed on appeal. It was noted that there was a requirement that the rooms should be on the ground floor only. However, it was reported that the Officers considered that accommodation in the roof space was acceptable. It was considered that there would be no harm arising from the dormers in the roof space; there would be no overlooking and the distances to neighbouring buildings were acceptable.

It was noted that there had been four letters of objection and that one concern which had been raised was landscaping to the rear of site. It was reported that the applicants had discussed this with the Council's Arboricultural Officer who had advised that the indigenous hedgerow would grow which would provide adequate screening. Notwithstanding this a condition to require a landscaping scheme was proposed.

It was noted that the windows faced into the site and hence there would be no overlooking and that the closest property would be sufficiently far enough away to avoid harm from overlooking.

Mr Ian Thompson made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application. Mr Thompson explained that he also represented the views of neighbouring residents. He raised concern relating to matters already covered in the report commenting that it was difficult to understand the Officers' opinion. He commented that recommendation of approval was odd having regard to the clear view of the Inspector as set out in his report. He commented that the number of bedrooms per dwelling; the need for accommodation on the ground floor; a turning head within the site and the need for screening had been ignored. He considered that Officers had disregarded the Inspector's decision and Policy H12. He raised concern regarding the number of bedrooms per dwelling, the number of dwelling and commented that the application was contrary to planning policy and should be refused.

Mr M Gallington made a statement in support of the application. He commented that as outline planning permission had been granted there was only a need to consider design and scale. He commented that the scale was acceptable in that four very modest chalet bungalows were proposed which he considered were sympathetic to the surrounding character and environment, more so than some neighbouring properties. He reported that the design was sympathetic to the surrounding landscape and that first floor windows would face into the village so that the roof lights facing out had a minimum impact. He reported that the use of landscaping would create a natural boundary and that in this regard the Council's Arboricultural Officer had been consulted. He explained that there would be an upgrade of the lane which would be of benefit to all the other properties along the lane. He reported that there would be an upgrade of the water and sewage supplies. He commented that there was a turning area in the development shown in the drawings at the entrance to the property which would benefit the existing homes. Finally, he commented that having more properties would increase the use of the existing services.

Mr N Lyzba had given notice that he wished to make a statement at the meeting but he declined to do so.

Some Members spoke against the proposal making the following comments: -

- The comments of the Parish Council were understandable as the proposal now recommended for approval appeared to have no regard to the Inspector's comments
- The Inspector had specified living accommodation at ground floor and yet this was not the case in this application.
- The Parish Council was concerned about the public's perception of the planning process and the apparent lack of regard to Inspector's views.
- The proposal was contrary to Policy H12.
- Chilton village did not have a clear village envelope.
- There was concern regarding the number of dwellings and the number of bedrooms for each.
- There was concern regarding the future maintenance of the lane. The Officers reported that the upkeep of the lane would be the same as at present.
- There was concern regarding the water and sewage disposal and who was responsible for adopting these. The Officers highlighted that a condition was proposed requiring details of drainage.
- There was a need to improve the access and this was key to the whole proposal being acceptable.

Other Members spoke in support of the proposal making the following comments: -

- It was commented that the Officers now recommended approval of this application in the light of the Inspector's decision which had to be taken into account.
- The design was acceptable.
- There was no harm caused by chalet bungalows on this site
- Whilst the Inspector's decision had referred to accommodation at ground floor level, reference had been made to the need to apply for planning permission for dormer windows which implied that the Inspector might have had in his mind that use of the roof accommodation might be possible.

- Policy H12 was subjective and that had the applicant shown one bedroom as a study that would have met the criteria. In this regard it was suggested that the policy needed to be reviewed and to make reference to floor space limits instead of bedrooms.
- There was no harm arising from the proposal.
- There was two storey houses on the adjacent plot which was of similar size and therefore it was difficult to see how this plot would have more impact.
- The proposal might enable families to move into the village.

By 12 votes to 3 it was

RESOLVED

that application CHI/16448/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.32 GFA/19883/3-D - CONSTRUCTION OF 52 HOUSES AND 16 FLATS (PHASE 1) -
FOLLY PARK, PARK ROAD, FARINGDON, SN7 7BP

Councillor Roger Cox had declared a personal interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 33 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Richard Farrell had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 33 he withdrew from the meeting room during its consideration.

Further to the report the Officers explained that the applicant was concerned to bring forward this scheme having regard to the current economic climate. In addition it was noted that 3D massing drawings had been received which were presented at the meeting.

It was noted that changes had been made to the proposal as follows: -

- There was an increase in the amount of enclosure to reflect the comments of the Consultant Architect.
- There had been a reconfiguration of the Square to make it more enclosed also to address the comments of the Consultant Architect.
- Parking ratios had been increased in accordance with concerns regarding the level of public transport provision.
- A plan for parking had been provided and it was suggested that this could be considered by the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) under delegated powers.
- The design had been amended to reflect properties elsewhere in Faringdon. The design and quality were being discussed and it was proposed that there would be continued negotiation regarding this.
- Elevations had been altered. Street perspectives had been submitted and these were considered. It was noted that the buildings were to be primarily stone and brick with render. The applicant had also submitted 3 dimensional perspectives of the street level which were presented at the meeting.

- The on-street parking had been integrated into the design and this would be broken up with trees.

It was noted that the final comments of the consultant architect had yet to be received. It was noted that the existing mature hedgerows would be transferred into the Council's ownership. The distances to neighbouring properties were explained and it was noted that the Council's minimum distances were exceeded in terms of protecting privacy.

It was noted that the affordable housing was to be located in one area, the reasoning for which was set out in the report. However, it was explained that there would be a spread of affordable housing throughout the remaining part of the Folly Farm site.

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted an indicative material schedule. It was noted that the proposed walling materials for this phase included a mix of render, stone and brick. It was commented that the Consultant Architect and the Architects Panel had considered that there was too much red brick and that Faringdon was comprised of mostly stone and render. It was noted that buff brick was proposed on the back of some units where it was believed that the surfaces were less conspicuous. Members felt that the amount of red brick was acceptable, but that the use of the buff brick was not acceptable.

It was noted that the Town Council sought an alternative access into the site.

Further to the report it was noted that there had been two additional letters of objection reiterating the concerns addressed in the report. The letters also raised concerns that the whole development would result in the loss of natural habitats which would have a harmful impact on some species; the development was too large; there would be an adverse impact on the local infrastructure; there would be congestion on roads; the scheme could attract a new shopping development which would be harmful; there would be a loss of open space; the skateboard park was not required; there had been a lack of consultation; there was a risk of an increase in flooding and drainage problems and the reduced screening would reduce the noise barrier of traffic on the A420. The Officers commented that these matters mostly related to the principle of development which Members were reminded had already been agreed.

Ms B Disborough had given notice that she wished to make a statement at the meeting but she declined to do so.

One of the local Members made the following comments in support of the application:

-

- The design was interesting and sympathetic to the existing dwellings in Faringdon.
- Pre-application discussions with local people and the Town Council had been beneficial and well received.
- Although this would be an extension of the modern development next door, the scheme was excellent.
- The layout of parking needed to be addressed.
- The use of the proposed materials, including red brick and render was acceptable and would break up the development.

- The distances to neighbouring properties were exceeded.
- The existing facilities at the Health Centre could cope with the additional residents.
- There were some reservations regarding the affordable housing which it was considered should be spread throughout the whole development.

Other Members made the following comments: -

- The overall quality of the scheme was important and the design work was welcomed to break up the bulk and mass of the proposal.
- Care should be taken to ensure that the scheme did not provide for cars to be parked in big blocks.
- Quality materials would be used where seen but the proposal to use cheaper materials in other areas was unacceptable in terms of the long term quality of the development which it was considered essential to retain. The Officers clarified that some units would be fronted with artificial stone and some of red brick.
- A panel of materials should be erected on site.
- The buildings were well separated.
- There was concern regarding the proposed parking area which it was considered needed to have windows overlooking it. This was to prevent antisocial behaviour.
- It would be preferable if the affordable housing could be spread throughout the entire development but the reasons why this was not possible were noted. The Officers reported that the mix and location of affordable housing had been agreed with the Housing Officers and that the most demand was for smaller housing units.
- The quality of the affordable housing was essential. The Officers reported that affordable housing was usually built to a higher standard with a higher specification. However, it was suggested that the developer could be asked to look at the detailing and gables of the affordable units.
- There should be as much landscaping as possible.

In response to comments raised the Officers clarified that the Section 106 obligation had been agreed at the outline stage.

By 14 votes to nil with 1 of the voting Members having left the room during consideration of this item it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be delegated authority in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Development Control Committee and the local Members to approve application GFA/19883/3-D subject to conditions, including external materials; architectural detailing; highway surface materials; landscaping and car parking.

DC.33 GRO/19964/1 - ERECTION OF A SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO FACILITATE THE CONVERSION OF A SINGLE DWELLING INTO TWO FLATS. 33 GLEBE GARDENS, GROVE, OX12 7LX.

Further to the report the Officers advised of the receipt of a letter sent on behalf of the residents of Harlington Avenue and Glebe Gardens which was read out in full. Concerns were raised regarding the Grove Lands Estate being intended as an open development; the spread of development giving the appearance of less density and the adverse impact that the proposal would have on this; the detrimental impact on the character and appearance of this pleasant road; the harmful impact on Harlington Avenue; access in terms of the single entrance to no 33 being altered; design in terms of the new gable end; proximity with the development being only 5ft from the highway when it should be a minimum of 20ft; the felling of a Beech tree without consent and the adverse impact through the loss of this tree; lack of parking; increased vehicles and vehicle movements; grey water disposal; density; garden grabbing and the loss of open space; adverse impact on wildlife; hard surfaces and possible flooding; precedent and loss of green area.

One of the local Members spoke against the application agreeing with the comments of the objectors and the Parish Council. She referred to a decision to refuse an application for a house on this site in view of the harmful impact and she commented that she considered the circumstances now to be no different and hence the application should be refused. She expressed concern that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and the loss of this area of green would be harmful. Furthermore, she referred to the footpath adjacent to the site and commented that the proposal would have a harmful impact in this regard.

One Member commented that there had been many similar proposals in Kennington and South Hinksey some of which he reported had been allowed on appeal. He asked Members to think carefully about possible material reasons for refusing the application commenting that there were none. Finally, he emphasised that just because a proposal was unpopular, this did not substantiate a reason for refusal.

In response to a question raised the Officers confirmed that flats did not have permitted development rights. Furthermore, it was clarified that the car parking was at the rear of the garden where there was a garage and that there was a car parking space in front with another two additional spaces. It was explained that reversing onto the highway was acceptable because of the nature of the road in this location.

One Member drew attention to the grass area at the side of the dwelling and noted that one of the flats had a small garden area. He suggested that there might be an attempt to enclose the open garden area which he considered should remain open and to this end he questioned whether an additional condition could be added to any permission to require this.

The Officers explained that the proposed boundary condition was intended to secure the open space. It was commented that to impose a condition to require that the area permanently remain open would be unfair it being noted that the neighbour had grown a hedge.

The Member noted this but commented that cumulatively the loss of open areas would alter the character of the area and could be harmful.

The Officers clarified that the test as to whether to impose conditions or not was reasonableness and in this case a condition to retain the open space was considered not reasonable. However, it was suggested that an informative could be attached to the permission advising the applicant that there should be no fences or walls in order to retain the open feel of the area and that preferably a low hedge might be planted.

By 13 vote to 2 it was

RESOLVED

that application GRO/19964/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an informative advising that there should be no fences or walls in order to retain the open feel of the area and that preferably a low hedge might be planted.

DC.34 DRA/20481 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR EXTENSIONS & CHIMNEY. EXTENSION TO REAR OF PROPERTY TO WIDEN SPAN AND HEIGHT OF DWELLING & CONVERSION OF NEW ROOF SPACE TO CREATE TWO BEDROOMS. ERECTION OF TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS. INSTALLATION OF TWO VELUX WINDOWS & THREE DORMER WINDOWS IN NEW ROOF 8 HIGH STREET, DRAYTON, ABINGDON, OX14 4JL.

Further to the report, the Officers advised of the receipt of an additional letter of objection raising concerns regarding whether the applicant did have a right of access across the lane.

Some Members raised concerns regarding the use of red brick. However, it was considered that there was no material planning reason to refuse the application. One Member suggested that the application should be drawn to the attention of the Enforcement Officer, it being considered that he might wish to monitor this site having regard to the nature of the proposal in terms of span and height of the dwelling.

The Chair highlighted the proposed condition to reduce the size of the dormers which was supported.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application DRA/20481 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.35 WAN/20523 - PROPOSED CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND OUTSIDE CUPBOARD INTO HABITABLE ROOM. 35 SEGSBURY ROAD, WANTAGE, OX12 9XP.

Councillors Jenny Hannaby and John Morgan had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 33 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Mr I Fitzgerald made a statement in support of the application clarifying that the level of parking was adequate as there was only one vehicle at the property and that there

were two properties in the vicinity which had had similar conversions. He commented that the loss of the green area was regrettable but overall not so harmful as to have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

One of the local Members noted the concerns of the Parish Council regarding parking and the loss of the garage. However she expressed her support for the proposal.

Other Members spoke in support of the application. In response to a comment made it was considered that an informative should be added advising the applicant the use of grasscrete for the surfacing of the parking the area would be preferable in terms of visual appearance.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application WAN/20523 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and to the addition of an informative advising that grass-crete should be used for the surface of the parking area.

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

None.

The meeting rose at 9.50 pm