

Addendum Report

Item 9

Planning Reference: P14/V1663/FUL. Land to the south of Blenheim Hill, Harwell

Update

Paragraph 5.1 of the report should include reference to Policy NE10 of the adopted Local Plan which refers to the protection of important gaps between settlements. The policy is however referred to in Paras 6.7-6.10 of the report.

Paragraph 5.4 refers to paras 14 and 29 of the NPPF in reference to sustainable development. This should be paras 14 and 49.

Additional letters of objection have been received from two local residents raising the following concerns and issues with the Committee report;

- There is no reference to the land be grade 2 agricultural land.
- There are 67 letters of objection not 58 as reported.
- Omissions in relation to relevant paragraphs in the NPPF in section 5.4 of the report.
- The proposal will be visible from the wider area from Reading Road, The Holloway and Icknield Way.
- 85% of the houses will be higher than existing houses within 500m of the site.
- Buses passing on Blenheim would not be a rare occurrence.
- The site is poorly connected to the village.
- Disagree with conclusions of the report.
- The area is in a pluvial flood zone
- There is enough housing in the area.
- The local roads are already at capacity.
- The development is not in the local plan.

The Councils conservation officer has raised a late objection despite amendments to the plans to protect the setting of the adjacent listed building, on the following grounds.

- The applicant has gone a considerable way to addressing concerns in removing 2 units.
- Concerns remain in relation to the height and scale of the houses in the vicinity of the listed building given the relative heights and the impact on the openness of its setting.
- The nearest houses should be reduced in height to preferably bungalows.
- This harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.
- The proposal is contrary to Policy HE4 and therefore recommended for refusal.

Officers Response

Neighbours letters

The site is grade 2 agricultural land but has more recently been mown and utilised as garden land. Whilst the NPPF seeks to protect best and most versatile agricultural land, the site is not grade 1, is a relatively small parcel in agricultural terms and therefore of limited productive value, and in this instance the benefits of providing additional housing with a 5 yr supply deficit are considered to outweigh the loss of this particular parcel of land.

Reference in the report to 58 objection letters relate to the number of properties that have responded. In some instances we have received more than one letter from a property particularly in relation to amended plans.

Paragraph 5.4 of the report provides a summary of the most relevant aspects of the NPPF only.

It is considered that the other concerns raised are sufficiently covered in the report.

Conservation Officer Comments

It is important to note that the plans have been amended to address the conservation officer's original concerns by the removal of 2 units and the creation of an area of open space fronting the site to protect the setting of Blenheim House.

However, the conservation officer now has now raised an objection in relation to the relative heights of the dwellings compared to the listed building.

Planning officers acknowledge that the proposed dwellings will be higher than the adjacent listed building given the difference in modern construction. However, plot 78 is 58 metres away the far side of the site access, and plots 1 and 2 sit fully behind the listed curtilage being a considered distance away. The applicants have introduced a landscape open setting against the boundary of the listed curtilage. Consequently providing sufficient breathing space around the listed building where the backdrop and setting is unrestricted and protected being surrounded by a significant amount of open space. Overall, the amendments as originally advised by the conservation officer would not cause significant and demonstrable harm to the setting of the adjacent building. Refusal on these grounds would not be reasonable and could not be justified.

Conditions are recommended requiring boundary treatment details to ensure the common boundary between the open space and the listed building is sympathetic to the setting of this adjacent heritage asset.

Item 10

Planning Reference: P14/V2362/FUL. Land off Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay

Update

Paragraph 2.7 of the report should refer to a £91,035 contribution towards the expansion of the Sutton Courtenay C of E Primary School and not St Michaels CE VC Primary School.

The applicant's agent questions some of the conditions as follows:

- Conditions 10 and 11 relate to archaeology investigations but the County Archaeologist specifically states that there is no likelihood of archaeology and no conditions are requested
- Condition 12 relates to contaminated land, but this is simply a private garden with no reasonable likelihood of this being an issue
- In relation to Condition 19, we believe it is unnecessary to require the roads to be constricted prior to construction. Can you please change this to occupation, as per the wording use in Condition 19 used on Lindens site at Milton (14/0676/FUL).
- Condition 21, this is a potentially problem because it could make the delivery of the scheme a hostage to the County Council's implementation of the off-site works, which is something which could take longer than the 18 month permission. Linden had agreed a £10k contribution to these works. Could this Condition be deleted and an additional a clause added into the heads of terms for the 106?

Officer Response

Conditions 10 & 11 - The County Archaeologist does not have any concerns and does not request any conditions. It is recommended that proposed conditions 10 and 11 be deleted.

Condition 12 - The Council's health and housing team advise that "*The developer should ensure that the small area of burnt waste and remains of the demolished shed that appears to include asbestos containing materials are removed from site prior to redevelopment*". The proposed condition relates to this and should remain.

Condition 19 - The access roads need to be constructed to allow access to the site during the construction phase but they do not need to be constructed to a full specification until occupation of the dwellings. The condition can be worded appropriately and could follow the form provided in the approval granted under condition 19 of application no. P14/V0676/FUL which requires "*No dwelling shall be occupied until that part of the roads, footways and street lighting (apart from the wearing course) have been constructed in accordance with the specification in Oxfordshire County Council's Residential Road Design Guide. These works shall include a footpath to link all of the dwellings to the existing footpath on Sutton Road*".

Condition 21 - The off-site highway works relate to extending a chicane required as part of a 34 dwelling proposal on land to the west and which was permitted at appeal under application no. P13/PV0233/FUL. The Planning Inspector imposed a planning

condition requiring the off-site highway works. The chicane has not been provided to date. As the applicant's agent points out it may be the case that this off-site work might take longer than the 18 month permission recommended and leave them hostage to either another developer or the highway authority's provision of the chicane. It would be reasonable to deal with this through an agreed financial contribution as part of a s.106 and consequently condition 21 could be deleted.

Item 11

Planning reference: P14/V2830/FUL. Kings Lane, Longcot, Faringdon

Update

One additional response has been received from the council's Countryside Officer, raising no objections to the proposal as it would not have a significant impact on any protected species of biodiversity.

Officer Response

Officers therefore consider that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on ecology or biodiversity and would therefore comply with the provisions of the NPPF.

Item 12

Planning Reference: P14/V1411/FUL. Abingdon Lawn Tennis Club, Lambrick Way, Abingdon

Update

No updates to report.

Item 13

Planning Reference: P14/V2735/FUL. Greenacre, Stanton Road, Oxford

Update

Page 105 of the report showing the rear elevation of Courtenay House is incorrect. Amendment 4 dealt with the amended plans showing the hipped roof having been removed. Court2-Rear/Rev2 as shown in the presentation and appended to this report now shows this correctly.

After the member site visit it was noted that the enforcement report should be appended to this Addendum report for further clarification on the position of the dwellings as built. This can be seen attached to this report. In addition the Council's survey of the enforcement investigation is also provided.

Item 14

Planning Reference: P14/V2468/O. Land adjacent to the Poplars, School Lane, Milton

Update

No updates to report.

Item 15

Planning Reference: P15/V0027/HH. 15 Badswell Lane, Appleton

Update

No updates to report.

Item 16

Planning Reference: P14/V2654/FUL. Land west of Fawler Road, Uffington.

Update

No updates to report

Item 17

Planning Reference: P15/V0038/A. College Farm, Majors Road, Watchfield

Update

No updates to report.

Item 18

Planning Reference: P14/V2869/HH. Olde Willows, Great Coxwell

Update

No updates to report

Item 19

Planning Reference: P14/V2825/HH. 2 Rimes Close, Kingston Bagpuize

Update

No updates to report