

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday 17 December 2014 at 6.30 pm
in The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chairman), John Amys (In place of Margaret Turner), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Bill Jones, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Janet Shelley, Catherine Webber, Richard Webber, and John Woodford

Officers: Holly Bates, Steve Culliford, Martin Deans, Laura Hudson, Lisa Kamali, Brett Leahy, Derek McKenzie, Melanie Potter, and Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel

Also present: Councillors Gervase Duffield, Debby Hallett, Judy Roberts, and Alison Thomson

Number of members of the public: 52

PI.1 Chairman's announcements

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

PI.2 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

Councillor Margaret Turner sent her apologies; Councillor John Amys substituted for her.

PI.3 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations

None

PI.4 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the committee meeting held on 12 November 2014 as a correct record and agree that the chairman signs them as such.

PI.5 Urgent business

None

PI.6 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications

A list was tabled showing the members of the public that had registered to address the committee on planning applications.

PI.7 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters

None

PI.8 Materials

None

PI.9 P14/V1906/O - Land to the west of Didcot Power Station, Sutton Courtenay Lane, Didcot

The officer presented the report on an outline application P14/V1906/O for the redevelopment of existing buildings and to provide new buildings for storage and distribution (use class B8) on land to the west of Didcot Power Station, Sutton Courtenay Lane, Didcot. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Updates from the report: The officer reported that Sutton Courtenay Parish Council had also objected to the application on the grounds of likely increased traffic using village roads. Oxfordshire Badger Group had objected on the grounds of likely harm to badgers living in the area. The Forestry Officer had raised no objection subject to an additional condition to protect trees on the site. Oxfordshire County Council had no objection on highways grounds; there would be a routeing agreement for freight transport. Eight additional letters of objection had been received on the same grounds raised by other objectors. There had also been 18 letters of support for the proposed redevelopment. In addition, a petition had also been received with over 500 signatories in support.

Michael Jenkins, the chairman of Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, objected to the application, his concerns included:

- The proposed redevelopment was unsustainable; its impacts outweighed the benefits
- The reduction in height of the main building was immaterial as the visual impact was negligible and was close to neighbouring properties
- There would be an impact on Sutton Courtenay from additional traffic generation from staff commuting to the site

Rita Twiston-Davies, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application; her concerns included:

- The main building was only slightly lower than that previously refused
- There would be an impact on local people from the cumulative effect of development in the area
- The nearest houses were close to the development site
- There would be noise and traffic disturbance to local residents night and day
- The detail in the planning agreement was inadequate

- The controls to mitigate the development were ineffective

Nick Lyzba, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The proposed development was within policy
- This application took into account the four reasons for refusing the previous application
- The height and volume of the main building had been reduced
- The landscaping bunds would reduce the impact of the development over time
- There were no technical objections; no highway objections
- There was a routeing agreement for freight transport to and from the site and an enforcement plan
- There would be no severe impacts

Councillor Gervase Duffield, the ward councillor, spoke against the application. He believed that there had been insufficient changes to the application since the previous scheme was refused. He believed that the employment at the site was likely to be low paid, resulting in employees being unable to afford to live locally and adding more commuter traffic to the local roads. He believed that this was the wrong thing for this area.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Whilst there was some opposition to the application, the majority of the committee supported it, making the following points:

- There were no policy objections to the proposed development
- There would be some local impact but this would not outweigh the benefits
- The mitigation measures would overcome the issues raised
- This would be a sustainable development for this site which was ideal for such logistical operations
- The visual impact would be reduced as landscaping became more established
- The re-design of the building was more acceptable with a reduced height and volume
- The materials would help blend the development in to the background
- The development would create additional local employment
- The badger sett had been moved from the site
- The air quality data collection points were along the heavy goods vehicle transport routes, but resulted in no objections on air quality grounds from the environmental protection team
- An automatic number plate recognition system would be used to enforce the freight transport routeing agreement
- To ensure that the buildings were built to the correct height there should be a slab level condition

RESOLVED (for 10; against 4)

To authorise the head of planning in consultation with the committee chairman to grant planning permission to approve application P14/V1906/O, subject to:

(a) Legal agreements to secure:

1. Offsite highways works including funding towards the science bridge £350,000;
2. An automatic number plate recognition scheme to enforce the freight transport routeing agreement to be within the legal agreement with county council;

3. Public Art £60,000;
4. Parish fund towards village improvements, path clearance and maintenance, and a contribution towards the Environmental Education Centre - total sum to be determined;

(b) Conditions:

1. Commencement - Outline Planning Permission
2. Submission of Reserved Matters - General
3. Sample materials required (walls and roof)
4. New vehicular access
5. Cyclists Shower/Changing Facilities
6. No Surface Water Drainage to Highway
7. Freight Management Plan and a Construction Traffic Management Plan
8. Travel Plan.
9. Section 278 agreement
10. Standard Parking Condition and parking strategy.
11. Cycle parking facilities
12. No drainage to highway
13. Hours of shift pattern and hours of distribution (First Shift - 6:00am – 2:00pm; Second Shift - 2:00pm – 10:00pm; Third Shift -10:00pm – 6:00am) to be adhered to.
14. Lighting Condition (Luminance of Advertisements)
15. Boundary walls & fences
16. No additional commercial floorspace
17. Hours of Construction
18. Demolition schedule and methods
19. Archaeology following written scheme of investigation
20. Noise attenuation (internal noise)
21. Details of foul and surface water drainage, based on the Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) principles.
22. Surface water drainage scheme
23. Drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works
24. Car Washing and Petrol Filling Station to be for operator use only.
25. Unexploded ordnance desk study
26. No reversing alarms other than broad band reversing alarms
27. Contaminated land risk assessment (full)
28. Contamination remediation and validation
29. Unexpected contamination
30. No piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods other than with express permission
31. Habitat creation survey
32. Protection of species - mitigation strategy
33. Protection of species - no vegetation clearance or other site without express permission
34. Biodiversity protection
35. Employment & Skills Plan
36. Tree protection plan
37. Slab levels

PI.10 P13/V0139/O - Fernham Fields, land to the east of Coxwell Road, Faringdon

The officer presented the report on an outline application P13/V0139/O for residential development of up to 200 homes, public open space, associated infrastructure and access on land at Fernham Fields, east of Great Coxwell and adjacent to Faringdon. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Updates from the report: There had been a further objection from the local county councillor reiterating concerns at the impact on Great Coxwell and local facilities. Faringdon Chamber of Commerce had expressed concern at the lack of employment opportunities on the site. A further six objections had been received on issues previously raised. Development would be delayed, if permitted, until Thames Water had upgraded the drainage system or had approved the developer's drainage scheme. The officer also reported that the consultation period ran until 18 December. Therefore the recommendation was amended to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman, to approve the application subject to no further objections being received on material planning grounds.

Mike Wise, a representative of Faringdon Town Council, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- Although the development site was within Great Coxwell parish, it was adjacent to Faringdon, and with other housing developments, would result in a 28 per cent increase in the town's housing stock
- It was contrary to local plan policies
- It was not a sustainable development
- It would bring no jobs, just more cars
- The site was too far from Faringdon's services and would stretch infrastructure resources too far
- The site was beyond the ridge and would have an adverse visual impact and was too close to the A420
- It would have an adverse impact on Great Coxwell village

William Selby-Lowndes, from Great Coxwell Parish Council, made a statement objecting to the application, referring to:

- The report had not considered the cumulative effect of this and other housing developments
- The figures used in the assessments were out of date
- The environmental assessment referred to the wrong village: Little Coxwell not Great Coxwell
- The report was silent on the increase in traffic this development would bring
- The Great Coxwell village plan had been ignored

Stephen Tillman, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- There would be no significant adverse impact from this development
- The site had been allocated for housing in the local plan and had been acknowledged in neighbourhood plans
- All objections had been addressed
- There would be improvement works to the roundabout near the A420 junction

Councillor Alison Thomson, one of the ward councillors, spoke against the application, making the following points:

- This site was in a rural area and should not form part of the town
- It would lead to increased traffic congestion; road improvements in the surrounding area were needed before development took place
- Assurance was needed that the flooding problems had been addressed
- There was low water pressure in this part of town
- There needed to be improvements to Faringdon's facilities

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The site had been in the local plan for housing for many years and the proposal did not conflict with the neighbourhood plans
- There were no technical objections on highways or flooding grounds
- The planning agreement provided mitigation against the impacts on infrastructure

RESOLVED (for 14; against 0)

To authorise the head of planning in consultation with the committee chairman to grant planning permission to approve application P13/V0139/O subject to no new material planning considerations being raised by the close of the consultation period on 18 December 2014, and subject to:

- (a) the completion of S106 agreements with the County and District Councils to secure contributions to local infrastructure and affordable housing; and
- (b) to the following conditions:
 1. Standard Outline time limit – commencement within 2 years of reserved matters approval.
 2. Reserved matters to be submitted within 3 years of outline permission.
 3. Development in accordance with the approved plans.
 4. Visibility splays to be agreed
 5. Access, parking & turning to be agreed
 6. New estate roads to county council standard
 7. No drainage to highway
 8. Green travel plans to be agreed
 9. Submission of landscaping scheme
 10. Implementation of landscaping scheme
 11. Drainage details (surface and foul) to be agreed
 12. No dwelling to be occupied until sewage treatment work upgrade completed
 13. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed
 14. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed
 15. Works in accordance with flood risk assessment
 17. Tree protection to be agreed
 16. Wildlife protection as per submitted statements
 17. Refuse storage to be agreed
 18. Contamination - nickel survey to be agreed
 19. Contamination - further surveys to be agreed
 20. Noise mitigation as per submitted statement and environmental statement

PI.11 P14/V0428/FUL - Little Dene, Yarnells Hill, Oxford, OX2 9BG

The officer presented the report on application P14/V0428/FUL for the demolition of an existing dwelling and its replacement with eight two-bedroomed flats and access on land at Little Dene, Yarnells Hill, North Hinksey. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Updates from the report: The officer reported that the parish council had not formally responded as it believed the application had been withdrawn and therefore it had not considered the amended plans. The planning officer confirmed that the correct procedure had been applied and the parish council had been informed about the most recent application and the consultation deadline on the amended plans; the council's statutory obligations had been fulfilled. However, the officer revised the recommendation set out in the report, it now being to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the committee chairman, to approve the application subject to no further objections being received from the parish council on material planning grounds. The officer also reported that two further letters of objection had been received on the same grounds raised by other objectors.

Julia Hammett, a representative of North Hinksey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- The application should be deferred to allow the parish council to respond formally and to allow due process to be followed
- This would be overdevelopment of the site
- There was a flooding risk
- There were badgers present on site and they could be disturbed by pile-driving for the new building
- the mitigation strategy was inadequate

Charles Gent made a statement objecting to the application, referring to:

- There would be increased traffic on the narrow, unlit lane leading to the site
- There was no turning circle available in the lane
- There would be major disturbance to the badger sett on the site

Peter Uzzell, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The amended application had responded to the objections raised to the previous scheme
- A licence application to Natural England to close the badgers tunnels could only be sought after planning permission had been obtained
- There were no technical objections to the development, no material overlooking of neighbouring property

Councillor Debby Hallett, one of the ward councillors, spoke against the application, making the following points:

- This site was in a rural area with a narrow access lane
- There were badgers on site
- There were foul drainage problems in the area
- Although a new drainage scheme was soon to be completed, it was uncertain that Thames Water would adopt it, thereby taking on future responsibility

Councillor Eric Batts, the other ward councillor, expressed the following concerns:

- He believed that the parish council had not been consulted on the amended plans
- There were unresolved issues with the badger sett
- The narrow lane and the parking on site were not suitable for this many homes and there was no turning area

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- There no highways objections from the county council
- The drainage issue was covered by condition
- There would be no closure of the badger tunnels unless condition 18 was satisfied; the development could not proceed without such a licence
- Details should be submitted to and approved by the council for the kitchen window sill height under condition 7
- There should be a construction management plan
- Local members should be consulted as part of the delegation

RESOLVED (for 14; against 0)

To authorise the head of planning in consultation with the committee chair and the local ward members to grant planning permission to approve application P14/V0428/FUL subject to:

- (a) no further objections being received from the parish council on material planning grounds;
- (b) the completion of a section 106 agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the cost of refuse and recycling bins; and
- (c) the following conditions:
 1. TL1 – Time limit.
 2. Approved plans.
 3. MC2 – Samples of materials.
 4. CN8 – Submission of details of retaining and boundary walls.
 5. RE8 – Boundary treatments.
 6. RE17 – Slab levels.
 7. RE21 – Kitchen window sill heights 1.7m above floor level – to be approved by the local planning authority.
 8. RE28 – Obscure glazed bathroom windows.
 9. CN8 – Submission of details of balcony screening.
 10. MC29 – Sustainable drainage strategy in accordance with submitted details.
 11. MC26 – Grampian condition for drainage details for foul water.
 12. HY6 – Access, parking and turning as shown on plan.
 13. HY11 – Turning space in accordance with details to be submitted.
 14. CN8 – Details of scheme for refuse vehicles, including signage.
 15. RE5 – Restriction on erecting gate on the access.
 16. CN8 – Final details of bin storage.
 17. CN8 – The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in strict accordance with the Badger Survey Report and Mitigation Strategy Windrush Ecology, (November 2014). Any variation shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before it is implemented.

18. No development shall commence, including demolition, until the local planning authority has been provided with either a specific license issued by Natural England pursuant to the Protection of Badgers Act 1992, or a written statement from Natural England stating that a license is not required.

19. LS2 – Landscaping scheme, including tree protection, to be implemented.

20. The prior submission of a construction management plan and its approval by the local planning authority.

PI.12 P14/V1927/FUL - 9 West Avenue, Abingdon, OX14 1QP

The officer presented the report on application P14/V1927/FUL for the demolition of a bungalow and its replacement with two four-bedroomed semi-detached dwellings at 9 West Avenue, Abingdon. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Martin Buckland made a statement objecting to the application on behalf of Michael Reading. He referred to:

- All other houses in the avenue were single dwellings, not semi-detached
- The proposal would provide family accommodation whereas most residents in the area were elderly, bringing significant change for local residents
- He preferred bungalows or chalet bungalows

Paul Southouse, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The previous application had been withdrawn to allow a re-design to mimic other properties in the area
- The proposed dwellings would fit into the street scene

Councillor Sandy Lovatt, one of the ward councillors, believed that the main problem was that West Avenue was used as a through route and it would be better if it was closed off near South Avenue.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The committee had to consider the application before it, not alternative designs suggested by objectors
- The gap was large enough to avoid a significant loss of light to the neighbouring property 7 West Avenue

RESOLVED (for 11; against 1; abstentions 2)

To approve application P14/V1927/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1 : Approved plans.

2 : HY6[I] - Access, parking and turning as approved.

3 : MC3 - Materials in accordance with application submission.

4 : TL1 - Time limit - Full Application.

PI.13 P14/V2359/FUL - 19 Eynsham Road, Botley, Oxford, OX2 9BS

The officer presented the report on an application P14/V2359/FUL for four two-bedroomed flats and one one-bedroomed flat with parking and alterations to the access on land at 19 Eynsham Road, Botley, in the parish of Cumnor. The application was an amended design

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

to the permission received in September 2014. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Steve Viner, a representative of Cumnor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application; his concerns included:

- The application would increase harm as it was overdevelopment of the site, it would overdominate neighbouring properties, and an additional window to the rear would increase overlooking
- It would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area
- There was no visitor parking
- The parish council had concerns about water run-off from the site affecting other properties
- The proposed bin store location was inappropriate

Councillor Judy Roberts, one of the ward councillors, spoke against the application, making the following points:

- The proposed development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area
- The proposal amounted to overdevelopment of the site
- Car parking on site was inadequate, therefore a travel plan was needed
- There should be a water drainage condition; there needed to be careful exploration of the drainage at the site before development took place

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The proposed development was not out of keeping with the area and there would be no harmful overlooking
- There were no drainage objections but the condition could be expanded to include foul drainage
- There was no need for a travel plan as the site had good public transport links

RESOLVED (for 13; against 1)

To approve application P14/V2359/FUL subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Commencement three years – full planning permission.
- 2 : Approved plans.
- 3 : Submission of material details.
- 4 : Submission of surface water drainage and foul drainage details.
- 5 : Submission of boundary details.
- 6 : Submission of landscaping scheme.
- 7 : Implementation of landscaping scheme.
- 8 : Submission of waste and refuse storage details.
- 9 : Visibility splays in accordance with approved plan.
- 10 : Access, parking and turning space in accordance with approved plan.
- 11 : Provision of bicycle parking in accordance with approved plan.
- 12 : Slab levels in accordance with approved plans and inspection during construction.

PI.14 P14/V2387/FUL - Plot A2, Milton Gate (Area MP8), Milton Park, Didcot

The officer presented the report on an application P14/V2387/FUL for the erection of a one and two-storey pub/restaurant, with ancillary office and storage, access and parking on land at Plot A2, Milton Gate, Milton Park, Didcot. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

The committee considered this application acceptable.

RESOLVED (for 14; against 0)

To approve application P14/V2387/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans.
2. TL1 - Time limit - full application (Full).
3. Travel Plan.
4. External lighting – general.
5. Drainage strategy.
6. MC29 - Sustainable drainage scheme (Full).
7. LS1 - Landscaping scheme (Submission) (Full).

PI.15 P14/V2155/FUL - Costcutter supermarket, 17 - 19 Folly View Road, Faringdon, SN7 7DL

The officer presented the report on a retrospective application P14/V2155/FUL for temporary permission for 12 months to install seven wall-mounted condenser units and a timber acoustic enclosure on land at Costcutter Supermarket, 17-19 Folly View Road, Faringdon. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

The officer recommended changing condition 3 to require the prior approval of an improved acoustic enclosure and an implementation programme to demonstrate that the noise from the equipment does not exceed the background noise level at the boundary of the premises.

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- As this would be a temporary solution while a permanent solution was put in place, this application was considered acceptable
- The amended condition 3 was supported

RESOLVED (for 14; against 0)

To approve application P14/V2155/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. That the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans except as controlled or modified by conditions of this permission. Reason: To secure the proper planning of the area in accordance with Development Plan policies.
2. The acoustic enclosure and condenser units hereby permitted shall be removed from the site before 12 months from the date of this permission and the land shall

be reinstated to its condition prior to the erection of the building. Reason: Regard has been paid to the temporary nature of the building and/or the temporary period that the building is needed on the site (Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan).

3. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, within 28 days of the granting of this permission, details of an improved acoustic enclosure and an implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall demonstrate that once implemented, the rating noise level from the equipment does not exceed the background noise level at the boundary of the premises. Measurement and rating of noise for the purposes of this condition shall be in accordance with BS4142:2014 "Methods for Rating and Assessing Industrial and Commercial Sound". Reason: To protect the amenities of adjacent dwellings (Policy DC9 of the adopted Local Plan).

PI.16 P14/V0638/HH - 13 Norwood Avenue, Southmoor, OX13 5AD

The officer presented the report on an application P14/V0638/HH for single-storey rear extension and an extension to the side and front of the garage at 13 Norwood Avenue, Kingston Bagpuize. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda for this meeting.

Margaret Hockedy made a statement objecting to the application, referring to:

- The proposal was overbearing and out of character with the surrounding area
- The proposed extension did not conform to the design policy; there should be a 1m gap to the boundary
- There could be noise disturbance as well as odours, dust and vibration, which could affect neighbours' health
- There would be an adverse impact on the street scene as the extension would breach the building line

Ivan Hore, the applicant, spoke in support of the application:

- The extension had been designed following consultation with the planning officers to fit in with the street scene and meet neighbours' objections

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Whilst there was some support for this application, the officer's recommendation to approve the application was lost by 12 votes to 2. The majority of the committee was against the application, raising the following concerns:

- The proposed development was overbearing, with the garage extension resulting in an adverse impact on neighbouring properties and the street scene by breaching the building line
- The proposed extension was poorly designed, causing demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of the street scene and would have an adverse impact on sunlight and daylight to the neighbouring property

RESOLVED (for 12; against 1; abstentions 1)

To refuse application P14/V0638/HH for the following reasons:

- (a) The proposed front extension, by reason of its design and the length of projection forward of the main wall of the house, would be visually intrusive in the street scene, and would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such the

proposal is contrary to Policy DC1 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011; and

- (b) The proposed front extension, by reason of its height, length and proximity to the boundary, would cause harm to the amenities of the neighbours at no.11 Norwood Avenue through over-dominance and loss of light. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011.

The meeting closed at 10.35 pm