

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber, Abbey House, Abingdon on
Wednesday, 4 January, 2012 at 6.30pm



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chair) Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Sue Marchant, John Morgan (Vice-Chair), Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Robert Sharp (Chairman), Eric Batts, Bill Jones, Sandy Lovatt, Helen Pighills and Kate Precious.

Substitute Members: Councillor Tony de Vere and Ron Mansfield.

Officers: Susan Harbour, Martin Deans, Laura Hudson and Mike Gilbert.

Number of members of the public: 60

PI.130 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman asked everyone to turn off their mobile phones; reminded everyone of the fire evacuation procedure, and reminded visitors of the committee's procedures and protocols.

PI.131 MATERIALS

None.

PI.132 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- Councillor Jenny Hannaby sent her apologies and named Councillor Ron Mansfield as her substitute.
- Councillor John Woodford sent his apologies and named Councillor Tony de Vere as his substitute.

PI.133 MINUTES

RESOLVED

To adopt the minutes of the committee meeting held on 7 December 2011 and agree that the chairman sign them, subject to the following amendments:

Pl. 113 Declarations of Interest

Vale Of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 4TH January, 2012

Change:

PI 122, The Hayloft Fernam, Councillor Anthony Hayward, prejudicial interest, agent for item, left meeting.

To:

PI 123, 2 Chestnut Ave, Faringdon, Councillor Anthony Hayward, prejudicial interest, agent for item, left meeting.

Add:

PI 125 – 6 Liddiard Close, Kennington, Councillor Bob Johnston, personal interest: member of Kennington parish council, but not on its planning committee

PI.134 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Item	Councillor/s	Nature of interest	Reason
PI 137 – 46 Newbury St, Wantage	Anthony Hayward	Personal	Knows Geoffrey Somerset, objector
	Bill Jones	Prejudicial	A close family member has a prejudicial interest
	Roger Cox	Personal	Knows Geoffrey Somerset, objector; also knows Steven Sensecall, the applicant's agent
	Robert Sharp	Personal	Knows Geoffrey Somerset, objector; knows owners of the site; knows some of the trustees of the neighbouring almshouses
	John Morgan	Personal	Member of Wantage Town Council, but has played no part in the discussion of this application
PI 139 – 101 Radley Rd, Abingdon	Jerry Patterson	Personal	Member of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England who objected to this application
	Sandy Lovatt	Personal	Member of Abingdon town council, but not on its planning committee
PI 141 – 15 Gloucester St, Faringdon	Helen Pighills	Personal	Member of Abingdon town council, but not on its planning committee
	Roger Cox	Personal	Member of Faringdon town council

Councillor Sandy Lovatt expressed his concern that two of the members for Wantage had been “excluded” from the meeting due to their prejudicial interest in one of the items. Councillor Robert Sharp, the chairman, reassured the meeting that the councillors in question had been offered advice in accordance with the code of conduct and had made a decision to stay away based on that advice.

PI.135 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A list of speakers for the agenda items was tabled at the meeting.

PI.136 STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON OTHER MATTERS

None

PI.137 LAND TO THE REAR OF 46 NEWBURY STREET, WANTAGE. DEMOLITION OF NO 46 NEWBURY STREET (WOODLANDS) AND ERECTION OF 23 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 14 MARKET AND 9 AFFORDABLE. 11/01520/FUL & 11/01521/ CON

Councillor Bill Jones left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and vote as he had declared a prejudicial interest.

The officer introduced her report and provided some updated information on the written report which she had submitted to the committee.

The county highways engineer now raised no objections with regard to the access to, and layout of, the proposed development.

Additional Section 106 payments to Vale of White Horse District Council were reported as follows:

- Ecology - £2,424
- Waste - £3,910
- Leisure - £16,380 for indoor facilities and £2,379 for outdoor facilities although this may change slightly as it is based on 23 dwellings and not the net increase in 22 proposed (demolition of 1 dwelling).

Roger Turnbull, a local resident, and Geoffrey Somerset, from the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE), spoke in objection to the application; their concerns were as follows:

- The proposed development is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a conservation area, which provides an important green area.
- Visibility from the access to the site is restricted; the objectors felt that it had been wrongly measured. They considered the access to be a danger to pedestrians as well as to vehicles and, in particular, to the children who used the local school.

- An application for a care home had previously been turned down at that site due to the impact on the character of the area and access concerns: a subsequent appeal had been dismissed on highway safety grounds. The objectors wanted this application to be refused on the same grounds
- The pressure on the Wantage infrastructure is enormous and the objectors did not consider that the Section 106 money would be adequate to offset these difficulties.

The applicant's agent, Steven Sensecall spoke in favour of the application.

- The plans have evolved over a six month period of consultation with planning officers.
- The county highways engineer is now content with the scheme following amendments and taking into account pedestrians as well as vehicles.
- It is an AONB but the development is well contained, there are no long distance views of the site and protected trees and other trees are to be retained on the site

Councillor John Morgan, one of the ward councillors, gave his view and those of his colleagues who had not attended the meeting due to their prejudicial interest in the application.

He was particularly concerned about the local school which had in excess of 450 pupils, most of whom walk to school. Vehicles turning out of the site will present a danger to children, and vehicles turning into the site will hold up traffic.

He said that a development on the site had previously been refused on appeal due to the inadequacy of the access, the access proposals had only been amended slightly compared to the previous proposal and there were likely to be at least 60 vehicles on the site leaving and returning once or more per day.

The committee discussed these applications at length.

It was considered that conditions should be added that units 15 - 23 should have communal satellite and TV aerials; and units 15 - 23 should be constructed using the same brick bond as the adjacent almshouses. There should be further conditions attached relating to digging round protected and other retained trees to protect the root structure.

Materials should come to committee for approval with a panel built and available to view on site.

There was a significant amount of S106 money attached to these applications which would help to mitigate pressure on Wantage's infrastructure.

Newbury Street is one of the main access roads into Wantage from the south.

The affordable housing was proposed in a single part of the site, rather than being "pepper potted" around the site as it should be.

The changes made to the access arrangements into the site since the previous refusal are minimal.

According to the report, the visibility from the access point met current government standards; however, members of the committee queried the way in which this had been

measured. In particular, it considered that visibility would be impaired by the proposed building right on the road frontage, which meant that a car would need to move out level with the pavement area in order to see down the road. This could be improved by setting the building one or two metres back from the front boundary.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of these applications the applicant and the county highways engineer to give further consideration to the proposed access arrangements, on being declared was carried. The county highways engineer should be at the meeting when this item comes back to committee.

RESOLVED (For 9; Against 5; Abstentions 0)

To defer consideration of these applications to enable the applicant and the county highways engineer to give further consideration to the proposed access arrangements.

PI.138 39 THE GREEN, STEVENTON. DEMOLITION OF REAR SINGLE STOREY LEAN-TO STRUCTURE. EXTENSION INCLUDING EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND CAR PORT. 11/01751/FUL & 11/01752/CON

Following the officer's introduction of the report, Michael Habermehl, the next door neighbour, spoke in objection to this item. His objections were that: the proposed extension would increase the building's footprint by 89 per cent; that the plan was poorly resolved; that the extension would be over dominant; that he would suffer a loss of daylight in his garden from autumn to spring, which would equate in a loss of amenity; the extension was unneighbourly.

The applicant's agent, Allistair Godfrey, spoke in favour of the application. He considered that the design was a positive and sympathetic one and that the loss of light to the neighbour would be minimal.

Councillor Bill Jones, the ward member, said that he considered there were clear overshadowing issues and an impact on the daylight to the neighbouring property and that the proposed extension was overdevelopment. Other members, however, disagreed.

RESOLVED (For 14; Against 1; Abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. TL1 – Time Limit
2. MC2 – Materials (Samples)
3. MC9 – Building Details (windows, doors, eaves etc)
4. RE11 – Garage Accommodation
5. RE6 – Boundary Details (including re-furbishing front railings)

and

RESOLVED (For 14; Against 0; Abstentions 1)

To grant conservation area consent subject to the following condition:

1. TL4 – Time Limit (Conservation Area Consent)

PI.139 LAND TO THE REAR OF 101 RADLEY ROAD, ABINGDON. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES. ERECTION OF ONE BEDROOM DWELLING. (RE-SUBMISSION OF REFUSED APPLICATION 11/02098/FUL). 11/02693

Following the officer's introduction of the report, Councillor Helen Pighills, ward member, spoke in favour of the application as she considered it would be an improvement on the existing use of the land.

The committee raised a concern about drainage issues on the site, but it was considered that the current problems were a maintenance issue and not a result of the sewerage system's lack of capacity.

RESOLVED (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. TL1 – Time limit
2. MC3 – Materials in accordance with application
3. HY7 – Car parking in accordance with specified plan
4. RE4 – Permitted development restriction

PI.140 6A MARKET PLACE, WANTAGE. CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE TO 4 X 1 BEDROOM FLATS ON THE FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS AND ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS. 11/01284/FUL & 11/01285/LBC

Following the officer's introduction of the report, Councillor John Morgan, ward councillor, spoke in favour of this application provided there was adequate sound proofing to ensure the use of the neighbouring pub would not cause noise disturbance to the residents. The committee considered that, as the property had been vacant for a considerable period of time, it would be good to use the building's upper floors for residential purposes.

RESOLVED (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. TL1 – Time limit
2. CN8 – Submission of details (windows on the front and rear elevations)
3. CN8 – Submission of details (works to the brick work, lead flashings and parapet on front and rear elevations).
4. CN8 – Submission of details (proposed ventilation)
5. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, works to increase the sound insulation of the building shall be carried out in accordance with the proposals outlined in Paragon Acoustic Consultants Report ref: 2593_ANI_1 dated 29 September 2011. On completion of the sound insulation works written confirmation that they have been carried out in accordance with the specification shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The sound insulation measures shall be retained and maintained at all times thereafter.

RESOLVED (For 15; Against 0; Abstentions 0)

To grant listed building consent subject to the following conditions:

1. TL4 – Time Limit

2. CN8 – Submission of details (windows on the front and rear elevations)
3. CN8 – Submission of details (works to the brick work, lead flashings and parapet on front and rear elevations).
4. CN8 – Submission of details (proposed ventilation)
5. CN8 – Submission of details (details of new internal partitions, doors and architraves)

PI.141 15 GLOUCESTER STREET FARINGDON. PROPOSED SOLAR PANELS ON SOUTH FACING REAR ROOF OF PROPERTY. 11/02530/LBC

Following the officer's introduction of the report; Ifor Phillips, the applicant, spoke in favour of this application. He said that he had been advised that the only parts of his property which were of historical interest were the front façade and an internal cupboard. He had already made some alterations to the rear, including replacement uPVC windows. The proposed site for the solar panels could only be seen from a courtyard car park and from his neighbour at no 13, who was fully in favour of his application.

Councillor Roger Cox, a ward member for this area, spoke in objection to the application as the entire building was listed.

The committee considered that it had a statutory duty to protect listed buildings and, although it shared the applicant's concerns about sustainable energy, it must protect listed buildings in accordance with its statutory duty.

RESOLVED (For 13; Against 2; Abstentions 0)

To refuse listed building consent for the following reason:

Due to their size, prominence and incongruous appearance, the proposed solar panels would harm the character and appearance of the listed building and so would detract from the significance of the historic asset. As such, the proposed works are contrary to policy HE5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and to the national guidance contained within PPS5.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm