

# DC.44

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

**HELD AT THE CIVIC HALL, WANTAGE  
ON TUESDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 2008 AT  
6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Pat Lonergan for Councillor Richard Gibson and Councillor John Morgan for Councillor Terry Cox.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER: Councillor Tony de Vere (Leader of the Council).

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

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 10

**DC.57 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), were recorded as referred to above with apologies for absence having been received from Councillors Terry Cox and Richard Gibson.

**DC.58 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 23 June and 14 July 2008 were adopted and signed as correct records subject to the following amendments: -

**Development Control 14 July 2008**

(1) Minute DC.37 – Minutes

The deletion of the paragraph and the Substitution thereof with the following: -

“The minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 12 May and 2 June 2008 were adopted and signed as correct records.”

(2) Minute DC.38 – Declarations of Interest

The deletion of the second declaration of interest made by Councillor Jerry Patterson and the substitution thereof with the following: -

Jerry Patterson	Personal	GRO/20495-X	In so far as he was a Member of the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and he was also the Liberal Democrat consultee on major planning applications, of which this was one. However, he explained that he had declined to take part in any consideration of this particular application.	DC.52
-----------------	----------	-------------	---	-------

## DC.59 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in report 60/08 – Planning Applications and report 61/08 – Enforcement report as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Application / report</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Min Ref</u>
Matthew Barber	Personal and Prejudicial	Agenda Item 12 - NHI/3368/2	In so far as he was acquainted with the representative of the Parish Council speaking at the meeting.	DC.68
Pat Lonergan	Personal	Agenda Item 14 –ABG/9747/1	In so far as he was a Member of Abingdon Town Council which had objected to the application. He explained that he had not taken part in consideration of this matter at the Town Council.	DC.70
Roger Cox	Personal	Agenda Item 16 – GFA/20309/1	In so far as he was a Member of Faringdon Town Council which had objected to the application. He explained that he had not taken part in consideration of this matter at the Town Council.	DC.72
Val Shaw	Personal and Prejudicial	Agenda item 18 - WTT/20578	In so far as she lived in the vicinity of the application site.	DC.74

Anthony Hayward	Personal and Prejudicial	Agenda Item 19 – ECH/20580	In so far as he was the applicant's agent.	DC.75
Val Shaw	Personal and Prejudicial	Enforcement Report – WTT/5313/3	In so far as she was friends with Mr Olive and Ms O'Donovan and also she lived in the vicinity of the site.	DC.77

## DC.60 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed everyone present to the meeting and explained where the emergency exits were in the unlikely event of having to leave the meeting room.

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.

Finally, the Chair announced that agenda item 13 – WLS/5900/5 and WLS/5900/6-LB had been withdrawn from the agenda.

## DC.61 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

## DC.62 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

## DC.63 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that six members of the public had given notice that they wished to make a statement under this Standing Order.

## DC.64 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials in respect of the following developments and agreed materials as set out: -

- (1) WAN/2186/14 - St Mary's School, Wantage

One of the local Members commented that care should be taken with regard to the materials on this site. She commented that Terca Baggeridge Maplehurst Light Multi Stock bricks and artificial blue slate would not be appropriate and the latter recommendation was supported by the Committee.

The Officers undertook to seek details of the proposed brick detailing, including the use of Flemish Bond with Blue/Black Brick Headers for Phase 1 to be reported to the next meeting, together with a roofing plan showing the proposed roofing materials for the whole site.

*RESOLVED*

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

*Walling*

*Ibstock Lambourn Orange Multi Stock  
Winchester Multi Stock  
Terca Baggeridge Maplehurst Light Multi Stock  
Acme Natural Orange (Tile Hanging)  
Rendered paneling  
Terca Baggeridge Blended Orange Gilt Stock.*

*Roofing*

*Acme Natural Orange Clay Tile  
Acme Smooth Brindle (agreed by 10 votes to 5)  
Barco Standard Natural Blue Slate  
Redland Plain Concrete Terracota*

(b) *that the use of the Eternit and Artificial Blue Slate and the Redland Plain Concrete Farmhouse Red be not approved.*

(2) SUT/19470/4-D - Ameys Works Site, Sutton Courtney

*RESOLVED*

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

*Hanson Madehurst Red Multi Stock Bricks  
Hanson Salisbury Multi Stock Bricks*

*Marley Acme Farmhouse Brown Clay Tiles  
Trulock Natural Slate*

(b) *that the use of the additional tile submitted (Marley Acme Vintage Brown) be not approved and therefore it be agreed that the Farmhouse Brown be used on its own.*

(3) CHI/19897 - New Computer Building – Rutherford Appleton Laboratory

*RESOLVED*

*that the use of the following materials be approved: -*

External Walls

Staffordshire Blue Brindle Smooth Bricks - Plinth

White Monocouche render

Kingspan KS1000 FL composite wall panels (Colour HPS200 Sirius)

Kingspan Thermatile ceramic rainscreen cladding (Colour Flame)

Roof

Rigidal Micro-Matt Stucco Embossed metal standing seam roof

Polyester powder coated aluminium fascias, soffits and rainwater down pipes  
(Colour RAL 7011)

Windows and Curtain Walling

Polyester powder coated aluminium double glazed windows and doors (Colour  
RAL 7011)

## DC.65 APPEALS

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

*RESOLVED*

*that the agenda report be received.*

## DC.66 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

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

One Member referred to the challenge of the Inspector's appeal in respect of the enforcement appeal against the building operations and erection of a new building on land east of Coxwell Road, Faringdon. He was concerned at the lack of progress with this case. In response to the concern raised the Officers undertook to pursue a response from the Planning Inspectorate.

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received.*

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 60/08 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.67 DRA/445/31 – ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS, LAND ADJACENT TO EAST PADDOCK, DRAYTON MILL, DRAYTON

Further to the report the Committee was advised that the applicant had provided correspondence between the former owner and Bloor homes regarding the upgrading and connection to the drainage system. It was noted that a condition was recommended to require details of the proposed drainage to be approved.

The Committee had regard to a model of the proposal which was available at the meeting and noted that a condition was proposed to require a Juliet type balcony in place of a projecting balcony on Plot 1.

One Member reported that he disagreed with the comments of the Parish Council in that he considered that the plans were good and easy to read.

In response to a comment made the Officers clarified the position regarding enforcement action on an adjacent site, explaining that the enforcement action related to materials stored on the site which had now been removed and to the bridge which had been there for more than 10 years and therefore was immune from enforcement action.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application DRA/445/31 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.68 NHI/3368/2 - PROPOSED CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING DWELLING (C3 USE) FOR USE AS A DENTAL SURGERY (D1 USE) WITH ASSOCIATED SPECIALIST OPERATING SUITES AND LECTURE ROOM. 95 WEST WAY, BOTLEY

Councillor Matthew Barber had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

The Officers reported that since writing the report, two further letters of objection had been received from neighbours which raised concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. In addition it was commented that Members had also received a statement in support of the proposal sent to them separately by the applicant's agent.

Eric Batts speaking on behalf of North Hinksey Parish Council made a statement objecting to the application. Whilst welcoming a dentist surgery in the parish, the Parish Council had concerns regarding the use of a private house in a residential area for business purposes in terms of impact on character of the area; the size of the proposal which was considered over large for the site; the adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours; car parking; the comments of the County Highways Authority

regarding car parking being within 200 metres of the site in that this was limited to 3 hours stay; on road parking and the likelihood that customers of the surgery would park in the nearby lay-by and on roads nearby for long periods; traffic movements and overdevelopment.

Mr H Venners, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application referring to the letter sent to Members of the Committee. He commented that less than 10% of the surgery's existing customers visited by car and staff would use the park and ride; customers would not require 3 hours parking and customers who traveled by car would be encouraged to park at West Way; there would be no adverse impact on neighbours or the character of the area; there was an adequate separation distance of between 8 and 10 metres to the neighbouring property; this area was not a quiet residential area; a dentist surgery was a quiet business use and would not be out of keeping; there was a need for a dentist in this area and there was local support for a local surgery.

One of the local Members expressed concern regarding the lack of parking commenting that just because car parks were nearby it could not be assumed that they were easily and readily available. He noted that only 10% of existing customers drove to the surgery now, but he was of the view that this was because the existing surgery was in the centre of Oxford. He considered that customers would travel by car and would park around the area and not necessarily in the car parks. He commented that this was a residential area, quiet or not, and that in his view the proposal was unacceptable and unneighbourly

One Member commented that dental surgeries were normal in residential areas and he referred to a number across the District. He noted the comments of the County Highways Authority and stated that there were no grounds to refuse the application because of lack of parking. In terms of design and the criticism that the proposal would be overbearing, it was commented that the applicant had provided drawings of the single story building which showed that it was far enough away from the boundaries with neighbours and therefore there would be no harm.

One Member referred to the Travel Plan commenting that when the surgery was being used for lectures, delegates should be directed to the public car parks nearby and that this should be included. The Officers undertook to take this comment on board.

By 12 votes to nil with 1 abstention and 1 of the voting Members having left the room and 1 voting Member not yet having arrived at the meeting, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application NHI/3368/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.69 WLS/5900/5 & WLS/5900/6-LB DEMOLITION OF DETACHED GARAGE, AND THE ERECTION OF A 3-BEDROOM COTTAGE IN THE GROUNDS OF BEECHTREE COTTAGE BEECHTREE COTTAGE, MARSH WAY, WOOLSTONE.SN7 7QL

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

DC.70 ABG/9747/1 ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND DORMER WINDOW. 54 FARM ROAD, ABINGDON OX14 1NE

Councillor Pat Lonergan had declared a personal interest in this item.

The Committee noted that amended plans had been received reducing the depth of the front extension. It was reported that Abingdon Town Council had now withdrawn its objection to the proposal.

One Member commented that the pair of semis would look odd but this was not considered so harmful as to warrant refusal.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/9747/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.71 LRE/10340/4 - PROPOSED POOL HOUSE, GARDEN ROOM, CAR PORT AND ALTERATIONS.3 OLD MANOR COURT, LETCOMBE REGIS

The Committee noted that the access was proposed to be altered as shown on an amended plan. It was explained that the trees to the front of the site were to be retained and that only one tree and some shrubs would be lost. It was reported that the Council's arboricultural officer had considered the tree and had determined that it was not worthy of protection and therefore he had no objection to its removal but had recommended more planting.

Further to the report, it was noted that the applicant's had submitted a letter expressing thanks for the opportunity to address the Committee but explaining that they had considered the comments of the Parish Council and had amended the proposal in the light of those.

In response to a question raised the Officers reported that the Conservation officer had not submitted any comments on the application. Furthermore, it was explained that the side extension would be fully glazed up to the ridge height but that this was a single storey elevation and it faced the car parking area and garage of the neighbouring property.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application LRE/10340/4 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*



DC.72 GFA/20309/1 - ERECTION OF A DWELLING, 6 STANFORD ROAD, FARINGDON

Councillor Roger Cox had declared a personal interest in this item.

It was reported that amended plans had been received to show the wall located adjacent to the site.

The Committee was asked to consider adding an additional condition to address slab levels.

Mr G Jones made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically commented that whilst he welcomed the amended plans showing the wall he had concerns regarding traffic; vehicle maneuverability in that his garage had already been damaged by a small delivery van and the proposal would make vehicle manoeuvring more difficult; the proposal being cramped and un-neighbourly; access for emergency and service vehicles being difficult; the 1.8 metre high fence being unwelcome; fenestration; the adverse living amenity for the residents of No.6 and potential water and sewage drainage and disposal problems.

One of the local Members spoke in support of the application disagreeing with comments regarding emergency and service vehicles. He noted that the proposal was modest. Another local Member expressed some concern regarding traffic movement and parking but considered that these were not sufficiently problematic to warrant refusal of the application.

One Member referred to the comment made regarding an extra condition to address slab levels and suggested that the condition should require that "there should be no construction above slab level until Officers have agreed that it has been built as agreed".

One Member referred to the slope of the garden referring to the 1.8metre fence. The Officers advised that in their view this was acceptable as the owners of the application site were also the owners No.6. It was explained that any future occupant of the dwelling would be aware of the situation between the two properties and would see the relationship between the two dwellings. Furthermore, it was noted that the fencing would be most effective in screening the main amenity area closest to the dwelling but that in going further down the garden there would be more overlooking.

By 13 votes to nil with 2 abstentions it was

**RESOLVED**

*that application GFA/20309/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition to require that there should be no construction above slab level until Officers have agreed that the slab has been built at the level agreed.*

DC.73 SAH/20358/1 - REQUEST FOR COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS FOR APPLICATION SAH/20358 (CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL LAND TO PLAYING FIELDS FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH SCHOOL).LAND SOUTH OF FARINGDON ROAD, SHIPPON

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the request for compliance with conditions for application SAH/20358/1 be approved.*

DC.74 WTT/20578 - RE-MODELLING AND EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING, DE LA RUE, ORCHARD LANE, BOARS HILL

Councillor Val Shaw had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she left the meeting immediately after having made a statement. She was not present during consideration of this application.

The Committee noted that one further letter in support of the scheme had been received.

Mr David Mostyn representing some of the neighbours made a statement objecting to the application. He raised concerns relating to matters already covered in the report and particularly commented that this was a site on one of the prominent corners of the cross roads in the middle of Boars Hill; there was a Grade II listed building within 100 metres of this site; a fence near to this property had had to be removed and replaced with a stone wall as the fence had been considered harmful to the setting of the listed building; if this was the case for a small fence then the proposal would similarly adversely affect the setting of the listed building and should be refused; this was an exposed and sensitive position; the proposal disregarded Local Plan policy DC1 in terms of requiring high quality, inclusive design, scale, height, mass, materials and an appropriate relationship with adjoining buildings and also contrary to policy DC9 in terms of loss of light, dominance and visual intrusion. He commented that the proposal was not visually comparable to any other property in the area; the design was out of keeping; and there was an issue with proximity to a party wall and the vulnerability of the neighbouring wall.

Mr Bevan, the applicant made a statement in support of the application commenting that he had purchased the property in October 2007 and that he had taken some time to consider its improvement. He explained that the property would be slightly lower than the existing house; the size would not be increased; the unattractive dormer element was to be removed; timber cladding was being considered but he would welcome suggestions on appropriate materials; there was a huge variety of styles of houses on Boars Hill and therefore the design would not be out of keeping; the terrace on the garage had been moved back; the garage would be piled and he was unaware of a dispute concerning the party wall; the distances to neighbouring properties were the same as at present and he could not see that Yew Cottage would be adversely affected.

Councillor Val Shaw made a statement commenting that the prospect of re-modelling this property was welcomed as it was currently unattractive and had been neglected. However, she considered that the design did not reflect the roof line of the house opposite; the design was very modern which did not reflect any other property locally; the proposal was contrary to Planning Policy G3 in terms of siting, design and scale which she reported were contentious. She noted that the overall height had not been increased but explained that the height was now to the front of the dwelling which would impact on the street scene, thus failing to preserve the openness of the character and appearance of the area. She expressed concern regarding parking and the current access commenting that notwithstanding the comments of the Highway Authority, the visibility at the access was restricted and was dangerous. She considered that the access should be re-sited.

Members spoke in support of the application considering that the design was excellent and of high quality and would be an improvement to the area. It was noted that the County Engineer had no objection to the proposal and that concern regarding the party wall was a private matter.

In response to a comment made regarding the access, the Officers explained that this was an application to replace an existing dwelling where the access already existed and an improvement could not be required as part of the application.

By 14 votes to nil, with 1 of the voting Members not being present it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application WTT/20578 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.75 ECH/20580 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY, ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND NEW CONSERVATORY. CEDARS, SARAJAC AVENUE, EAST CHALLOW

Councillor Anthony Hayward had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

Members supported the application.

By 14 votes to nil (with 1 of the voting Members not being present) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ECH/20580 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.76 CUM/20571-LB ALTERATION TO PARTY WALL DIVISION, NEW WINDOWS TO FIRST FLOOR TO FRONT, SIDE AND REAR, PLUS INTERNAL ALTERATIONS. FARM COTTAGE, 4A HIGH STREET, CUMNOR, OXFORD.

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that the applicant had responded to the concerns of the Parish Council giving examples of many properties in the locality with gables and as such the proposal would not be out of keeping.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application CUM/20571-LB be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

**DC.77 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME**

Councillor Val Shaw had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in part of this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee received and considered report 61/08 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which sought approval to take enforcement action in three new cases. Members considered each case.

In respect of the need to reduce the height of the unauthorised walling adjacent to a recently created access in Orchard Lane, Boars Hill, the Officers explained that the owner did not have planning permission and there were concerns regarding the height of the wall in terms of highway safety.

In respect of the removal of unauthorised engineering works, including motorcycle track, jumps and banked corners, and to restrict the use of the land for 'motor sports' to no more than 14 days per year at Bradfield Farm, Grove the Committee noted that Councillor Terry Cox had expressed support for the proposed enforcement action particularly having regard to the extent of the unauthorised activity on the site and noise nuisance being caused, which it was noted would be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation. It was noted that Councillor Cox had asked to be included in the delegation as Opposition Spokesman and this was supported.

*RESOLVED*

- (a) 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 Olive & Ms O'Donovan at Collyers House, Orchard Lane, Boars Hill, to reduce the height of unauthorised walling adjacent to a recently created access, if he considers it expedient to do so (agreed by 14 votes to nil with 1 of the voting Members having left the meeting during consideration of this case;*
- (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 take enforcement action against Mr & Mrs Day & Partners*

*at Alternative Veterinary Medicine Centre, Chingham House, Stanford in the Vale, to secure the removal of an unauthorised agricultural shelter and the cessation of the parking and storage of vehicles on agricultural land, if he considers it expedient to do so (agreed by 15 votes to nil); and*

- (c) *that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Development Control Committee to take enforcement action against Mr Alan Cottrell, land adjoining, and to the north of, sewage works at Bradfield Farm, Grove, to remove unauthorised engineering works, including motorcycle track, jumps and banked corners, and to restrict the use of the land for 'motor sports' to no more than 14 days per year (as permitted by Class B, Part 4, schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995), if he considers it expedient to do so (agreed by 15 votes to nil).*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 8.50 pm