

Planning Committee

4 February 2015

Addendum Report

Item 9

Planning Reference P14/V1810/FUL Land west of Stockham Farmhouse, Wantage

Update

Additional objection received summarised as follows:

- The upgrade works to the main access onto Denchworth Road (required for phase 1) have not been completed and until the required vision splays are in place, permission should be refused.

Officers Response

The objection raised cannot be substantiated as the highworks are covered by a S278 agreement between the county council and the applicant. This agreement is legally binding. It can be confirmed that construction is currently underway to complete the access and associated upgrade works. The county highways team raise no objection to the application, and a refusal based on this, therefore would not be defensible on appeal as the required works will be completed shortly.

Amendment to report

Paragraph 3.6: Since writing the report, the planning agent and the county council have agreed a revised secondary school figure of £556,740.

All other figures are now agreed.

Item 10

Planning reference P14/V1964/FUL Land north of Portway Villas, East Hendred

Update

Additional comment received from a neighbouring property requesting a condition requiring the developers to fund the re-routing and maintenance of a private water supply pipe and raising concerns over its future maintenance. The email included a series of correspondence with the developer over the past year relating to construction damage to the pipe and the promise by the developers to re-route the supply.

Updated comments from Oxfordshire County Council Highways raising no objections to the application and that they are now satisfied with the level of parking on site, the proposed access, and the proposed controlled crossing on the A417 subject to conditions and the S106 Agreement.

Officer Response

The additional letter relates to an ongoing civil issue between the developers and a group of neighbouring properties. As long as there is a sufficient supply to serve the development in addition to existing residents, the responsibility for its maintenance is a private matter. There are no technical objections to the development in relation to water supply from Thames Water and therefore there are no reasonable grounds to object on this issue.

A requirement to re-route a private water supply in the interests of future maintenance is not something we could legally require under the planning permission. Whilst the developers can offer this in kind, a planning condition to this effect would not meet the legal tests as referenced under the (National) Planning Policy Guidance as it is not required to make the development acceptable.

Amendment to report

Paragraph 3.1 under OCC Highways – that the previous concerns have been addressed in relation to visitor parking and the site access and that no objections are raised subject to conditions and S106 Agreement.

Item 11

Planning reference P14/V2335/FUL Block 2, 66 Cumnor Hill, Oxford

Update

No updates to report.

Item 12

Planning Reference: P14/V2441/O Land adjacent to No. 4 Elmside, Fernham

Update

Additional representations received:

5 further neighbour objections – re-iterating the same issues. Terrace out of character; loss of mature trees; traffic and parking issues; extension to dwelling similar to others would be acceptable.

Highway officer(s) - two sets of comments have been received on the amended plans. Neither highway officer has any objection to the scheme. Both suggest conditions relating to the provision of vision splays, no drainage to the highway; construction of the parking; and to be SUDS compliant.

Officers Response

The substance of the objections has already been covered within the committee report. The mature vegetation/trees on the boundary is within the site and is not protected. A landscaping condition is suggested in the recommendation to ensure new more sustainable planting is achieved.

The amended plans are acceptable to the highway officers. It is suggested that the submission of details of the construction and surfacing of the parking is included within suggested condition 4, to prevent any loose material migrating onto the highway, and that an additional condition requiring details of the vision splays to be submitted for approval is included. Drainage will be covered by suggested condition 7.

Item 13

Planning Reference: P14/V2624/FUL The Croft, Barnards Close, Appleford

Update

Additional representation received from ward member Gervase Duffield:

“I cannot be with you tonight to speak as local member, but perhaps you could read out this note. I have no objection to this application but I note you have added an informative about the exit. It would be a lot better if the exit could be onto Barnards Close. Consider: as proposed it will mean no less than 5 exits onto the main road with a blind corner at one end where drivers regularly break the speed limit encouraged by the long straight to the east, and a hump back narrow bridge the other end, both of which are completely blind. Also 3 of these are increasingly busy exits (Chambrai, Church St., & Barnards). There are slopes involved, up from Chambrai onto main road and 2 more ups on the opposite side from private drives. I believe it would be a lot better and safer to have the exit of this house onto Barnards Close and move the garage.

I see you have marked the sight lines on p.85 but what is not made clear is that immediately after them as marked are totally blind busy main road areas (the bridge and the bend for Church St turn by the green).

Can I suggest that it be made a condition to look at this suggestion, and have OCC meet with say you and me to agree it all before an OCC final decision? I have lived in this area for 50 years and think I know its problems quite well!”

Officer Response

This issue is covered in the committee report; the local highway authority has assessed the proposal as submitted which proposes a new vehicular access onto Main Road and has concluded that the access is acceptable in highway terms. A condition requiring detailed drawings of the proposed access including visibility splays is recommended. The informative relates purely to the fact that the

applicant/agent will need to apply for consent directly to the local highways authority in addition to any permission granted.

Item 14

Planning Reference: P14/V2785/HH 5 Sutton Close, Abingdon

Update

No further representations received.

Item 15

Planning Reference: P14/V2578/HH 64 North Hinksey Lane, North Hinksey

Update

Additional representations received:

Drainage Officer:

“My only comment on this relates to the excavation to the rear of the existing building and the requirement for suitable drainage to accompany this. Details of this should be submitted and approved prior to development commencing.”

Officer Response

The requested condition will be added to any planning permission granted.

County Highways Liaison Officer:

“No change is being proposed in terms of the number of bedrooms or the current parking arrangement.

The Highway Authority notes the concerns from the local residents in terms of the application changing the dwelling into a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). However, the Highway Authority can only comment on applications it receives. Should the dwelling change into a HMO a separate application will have to be made. After reviewing the supplied plans and documentation, the Highway Authority has No Objection to the proposal on the basis of Highway Safety.”

Officer Response

The Highways Liaison Officer has no objection to the proposal, as such it is considered the proposal, complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policy DC5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Neighbours:

A petition from the neighbours re-iterating the same issues, such as:

- “ potential conversion of the property into a house of multi occupancy dwelling;
- harmful impact of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area;
- potential for extra traffic and vehicles being parked on the road.”

Officer Response

The substance of the objections has already been covered in detail within the committee report.

The submitted plans indicate that the proposed living room and the enlarged kitchen are to be used as a shared living space. There are no other indicators that suggest the dwelling would be used for multiple occupants. It is not considered in the officers opinion that the dwelling would be converted into a House in Multiple Occupation.

The proposal will be seen within the context of the existing property and the surrounding area. It is not considered that the proposed works and alterations appear incongruous or obtrusive, and the proposed development will not cause harm to the character or appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area. In addition the neighbouring properties have been extended and altered in a similar way.

The Highways Liaison Officer has no objection to the proposal, as such it is considered the proposal, complies with the provisions of the development plan, in particular policy DC5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Item 16

Planning Reference: P14/V0715/FUL 13-17 Coxwell Street, Faringdon

Update

No further representations received.