

Planning Committee
Wednesday 17 June 2015

Addendum Report

Addendum Report

Item 8

Planning Reference: P14/V2704/FUL - Land at Abingdon Road, Steventon

Additional response from Parish Council

The parish council has circulated a further representation to planning committee members raising issues on a variety of matters. The officer response to each is as follows:

Cumulative impact

The issue of cumulative impact is addressed in the original report at paragraph 6.8. The NPPF expects housing to be boosted significantly and it does not suggest that populations of settlements should be restricted or limited by any particular figure. Officers remain of the opinion that there would be no justifiable grounds to refuse the application on this matter.

Education provision

The county council has acknowledged that the development will increase pressure upon existing community infrastructure and has requested a contribution towards the expansion of the primary school. Subject to this being received, officers do not consider there would be a justifiable reason to refuse permission on primary school capacity.

Transport impact

The Highway Authority are satisfied that the submitted traffic survey by the applicant is representative and therefore comments previously made by this Office still stand.

Foul water capacity and flood risk.

The issue of surface water / foul drainage and flood risk is addressed in the original report at paragraphs 6.31 to 6.33. The drainage engineer raises no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions. The proposal is thus considered to be acceptable in respect of floor risk and drainage.

Sustainability of the village

The village is considered to be a sustainable location in the context of the NPPF.

Item 9

Planning Reference: P14/V2877/FUL - Land at Cowans Camp Depot, High Street, Watchfield, SN6 8TE

Recommend that consideration of this application be deferred.

The reason for this is because the applicant has submitted a draft revised plan seeking to address officer concerns. To allow time to consider the changes proposed and consult on the amendments it is considered the application should be deferred with the application presented to planning committee at a future date. This would be in line with the expectations of the NPPF and the principles of the Development Management. To not consider these amendments would constitute unreasonable behaviour.

Item 10

Planning Reference: P14/V1952/FUL - Land at Barnett Road, Steventon

Additional response from Parish Council

Steventon Parish Council have circulated additional comments directly to Members raising the following issues:

- i) Concern over the cumulative impact of all the existing and pending development in the village amounting to an additional 224 dwellings.
- ii) Education provision in the village inadequate to cope with the additional development.
- iii) Concerns over the applicants transport submission given the conflicting results of the Parish Councils own traffic survey.
- iv) Foul water capacity and the capability of the local system to accommodate the needs of the development.
- v) Flood risk of the proposed development.
- vi) Sustainability of the proposed development given the current size of the village and limited facilities.

Additional letter from a local resident

An additional letter from a local resident has been received raising the following concerns:

- i) Foul and surface water drainage from the development given that the site is currently prone to surface water and the local sewer network is inadequate.
- ii) Concerns over the maintenance of the existing drainage ditch.
- iii) That some of the conditions on phase 1 have not been discharged.
- iv) That an EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) has not been submitted by the developers.

Officer Response

Cumulative Impact

The issue of cumulative impact is addressed in the original report at paragraphs 6.7 – 6.9. The NPPF expects housing to be boosted significantly and it does not suggest that populations of settlements should be restricted or limited by any particular figure. Officers remain of the opinion that there would be no justifiable grounds to refuse the application on this matter, particularly given the status of Steventon as one of the larger villages in the District.

Education provision

The county council has acknowledged that the development will increase pressure upon existing community infrastructure and has requested a contribution towards the expansion of the primary school. Subject to this being received, officers do not consider there would be a justifiable reason to refuse permission on primary school capacity.

Transport impact

The applicants have submitted a transport statement which the county council highways authority consider is sound and includes an assessment of cumulative impact. The submitted transport survey carried out by the Parish Council has been assessed by the County, as an independent and impartial consultee, and the following response has been received.

“Steventon Parish Council’s view that cumulative growth/development has not been considered in the Applicant’s submission is incorrect. The Applicant’s Transport Consultant has reflected future growth by use of TEMPRO, that takes into account growth factors, in this case till 2019. For reference, TEMPRO is a database produced by the DfT that utilises growth data at a local level and forecasts traffic generation growth; the system is recognised nationally by the transport industry in general together with the Planning Inspectorate.

From a traffic survey perspective, it is noted that Parish Council locations highlighted in their report, are not common with those in the Applicant’s submission. An example is the Miller Homes survey, which is taken some way to the north of the Hanney Road junction with both side roads and private access points in between, which will lead to differing flows, therefore comparing such surveys is incorrect and misleading. Furthermore, a departure has been made by the Parish Council from the standard peak hours of 0800-0900 and 1700-1800. For this to apply, there requires to be additional significant data to warrant this, which has not been submitted. It should be noted that if an earlier peak is assumed, the trip rate for the development traffic would have to be recalculated and would potentially be lower.

For there to be a material impact on a junction, the increase in traffic needs to be at least 10% (which is the normal daily variation in flow). With reference to the analysis of the Applicant’s submitted data/outputs, it is evident that there is no material impact

on the two key junctions and therefore not deemed as being severe with regard to the NPPF.”

On this basis it is not considered that refusal on traffic impact grounds could be justified.

Foul water capacity and flood risk.

Both the Parish Council and local residents additional comments raise the issue of flooding on the site and foul water drainage capacity. Whilst this is covered in the Committee report, the additional comments have been submitted to the Councils principal drainage engineer for comments and the following response has been received:

“The surface water drainage strategy has been assessed by Monson, on my behalf, and they have now found it acceptable subject to conditions being imposed for the detailed scheme to be submitted prior to any commencement of the development.. The site is located in Flood Zone 1 as depicted on the EA's Flood map and there is safe entry/exit to the site along Barnett Road to Hanney Road despite the photographs from July 2007. Flooding in this area in July 2007 was found to be caused by a blocked surface water culvert which was subsequently cleaned and cleared. Any discharge to existing watercourses is restricted to Greenfield run off rates with storage for the 1 in 100 year event plus climate change allowance. This applies to all new development sites so it has no detrimental impact on peak flows within the existing watercourses.

In respect to the foul water drainage strategy, Thames Water provide advice to the Council on the adequacy of the existing wastewater infrastructure to accept the flows from any proposed development. Thames Water has identified solutions within their sewer impact study report X4503-836 SMG1187 to cater for this development and will be subject to conditions being imposed for the detailed scheme to be submitted prior to any commencement of the development. Have other developments been taken into account when carrying out impact studies, this question has been raised with Thames Water and they confirm that when carrying out impact studies they take into account other proposed development sites as well as the proposed development site being considered.

The approved drainage strategies have to be implemented prior to occupation but there is no requirement for the systems to be proven. As you can imagine it could take months/years before the drainage system is truly tested against its design parameters.”

In relation to the ownership and management of the drainage ditch, the applicants have confirmed with the aid of land registry records that the majority of the ditch along the edge of Field Gardens falls within the control of the applicants, although along part of its length is within the ownership of adjoining residents. The red line of the application has been amended to reflect this. The application does not propose any changes to this ditch and the areas within the applicants control will be maintained by a management company and not individual residents. In relation to this aspect the Council drainage engineer has the following comments:

“With regards to ownership of ditches, unless proven otherwise from Land Registry Title Deeds, under Common Law the ownership of the ditches will be the responsibility of the adjacent landowners up to the centreline of the ditch. Therefore, future ditch maintenance will still remain with the respective landowners. The onus is on the developer to obtain any permissions to access any land to carry out work not within their land ownership and this doesn't preclude planning permissions from being considered/granted. It is normal for developers to appoint a management contractor to maintain the areas of land that are retained by the developer.”

On this basis it is not considered that refusal on traffic impact grounds could be justified.

Sustainability of the village

The village is considered to be a sustainable location in the context of the NPPF and this is set out in the report.

Discharge of Conditions

The compliance with conditions on the first phase are a separate matter and not relevant to the determination of this application. As far as officers are aware the requirements of these conditions have been met, however, should properties be occupied without meeting the requirements of the conditions this is a matter for planning enforcement to investigate separately. Refusal on these grounds could not therefore be justified.

Environmental Impact Assessment

Concern has been raised that an EIA should have been required for phases 1 and 2 together. When applications are screened for EIA we have to take into account the cumulative impact of the development together with any pending or approved applications in the vicinity.

The cumulative impact of phases 1 and 2 was considered however together the proposals amount to only 115 dwellings which, on a site which is not considered “sensitive” within the definition of the EIA regulations (i.e. it is not AONB etc), is not considered to constitute EIA development.

The regulations recommend a threshold of 1000 houses as an indicative threshold to require an EIA however the NPPG (National Planning Policy Guidance) states that a site could be over this and still not require an EIA or be under in a sensitive area and require one. The cumulative site area is above 5 hectares, also referenced in the regulations however this does not automatically trigger a need for an EIA.

Whether an EIA is required is a judgement call in each case. The application was accompanied by all the necessary supporting information including a landscape assessment, flood risk assessment and transport statement therefore these aspects were fully considered, just not within an EIA format.

Item 11

Planning Reference: P15/V0471/FUL - Chailey House, Bessels Way, Blewbury, Didcot, OX11 9NJ

No updates.

Item 12

Planning Reference: P14/V2822/O - Land at Bow Farm, Bow Road, Stanford-in-the-Vale, SN7 8JB

Typographical Error

There is a typographical error in paragraph 2.1 of the report, which mentions an additional 21 dwellings. This should read an additional 19 dwellings.

Additional Letters from Local Residents

One additional letter has been submitted by a neighbour raising objections regarding the safety of the proposed access, the impact on surface water drainage and the impact on protected species.

A submission has also been made by the Stanford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee regarding the ability to make provision, as part of the application, for access to the land to the south adjacent to the pond which may be identified in the neighbourhood plan for development and may otherwise become land-locked.

Officer Response

The issues raised by the neighbour are covered in the report. The neighbourhood plan is at a relatively early stage and there is no guarantee at this time that the land to the south will be identified as a development site. Consequently officers consider that it is not reasonable at this time to require an access from the application site to this land.

Item13

Planning Reference: P14/V0421/FUL - 13 Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9EU

Additional Letters from Local Residents

One additional letter has been received raising the following objections:

- Highways The comments of the county highways officer have not been available and the current on-street parking in Hurst Rise Road, adjacent to the site, has not been properly considered. The previous application for 14 flats had 21 parking spaces so the current proposal of 9 for 9 flats is too low.
- Landscaping The assessment of the impact on the existing trees and hedges is based on optimism rather than fact

- Architects Panel Comments. These were not available until recently and the amended plans arising from their comments are not on the agenda or on the website

One of the local councillors, Debby Hallett has written to query the status of the walnut tree on the south-east corner of the site, which she knows has a TPO on it.

Officer Response

The county highways officer is well aware of the parking in Hurst Rise Road and has come to his recommendation of no objection for the reasons explained in the report.

His comments were made late in the process but are summarised in the report. It is recommended that an additional condition is added to require the submission of a construction traffic management plan.

The assessment of the impact on the existing boundary planting has been made in light of the detailed report submitted with the application showing a detailed survey and protection plan in accordance with relevant British Standards. The council's forestry officer has made comments, which are attached as appendix 1 of this addendum report. This confirms that the walnut tree was recently made subject of a TPO.

The architects' panel comments were placed on the website late due to dislocation associated with the recent move of the planning service from Abingdon to Milton Park. Officers apologise for this. The architects' panel supported the scale and layout of the proposal and requested minor changes to some fenestration details which have been made. The panel's comments are attached as appendix 2 of this addendum report.

Item 14

Planning Reference: P15/V0125/EZ - Land at Library Avenue, Harwell Campus, Didcot, OX11 0RA

No updates.

Item 15

Planning Reference: P15/v0762/FUL Land at Meadow View, Longcot

No updates.

Item 16

Planning Reference: P15/V0174/FUL - 11 Lansdowne Road, Dry Sandford, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX13 6EA

No updates.

Item 17

Planning Reference: P15/V0721/FUL - Cotswold House, Cotswold Road, Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9JG

No updates.

Appendix 1

Comments of Arboricultural Officer in respect of application P15/V0421/FUL, 13 Cumnor Hill, Oxford

“Further to our recent conversation regarding the application for development at the above location, I have considered the submitted information and am able to offer the following comments.

I considered a proposal on this site in October 2013 (P13/V1860/FUL) and, after a number of amendments to improve the relationship with adjacent trees, I was satisfied that the implementation of that layout would successfully accommodate the retained trees. This latest scheme has less of an arboricultural impact than that considered previously and the applicant has presented an arboricultural implications assessment and tree protection plan (Venners Arboriculture dated February 2015) demonstrating that the long term health of the indicated trees is achievable.

The site has a number of trees and hedges within and adjacent to the boundaries. They vary in condition and life expectancy but the scheme allows for the retention of the better quality trees, such as the Walnut (T6) and the Norway Maple (T7), by establishing a construction exclusion zone beyond their root protection areas. The previous application included a sewer route that would have had an adverse impact on the Walnut but this has now been satisfactorily resolved by routing it outside the RPA. The long term protection of this tree is now secured with a tree preservation order (14V04).

The proximity between the east elevation of the building and the hedge boundary hedge is increased within the current application. The tree protection plan demonstrates that sufficient space around the hedge will be fenced to enable the construction of the building without detriment to the long term retention of the hedge.

A condition requiring compliance with all of the recommendations set out in the arboricultural report should be attached to safeguard the tree protection.”

Appendix 2

Architects' Panel Comments in respect of application P15/V0421/FUL, 13 Cumnor Hill, Oxford

“In principle the panel are supportive of the design approach, scale, density and site layout. However we have serious reservations about the attic unit no.7. The glazed dormer on the south elevation is out of scale and will appear very dominant especially at night. Also dormer to north elevation of unit 7 which is currently shown

full height is over-dominant. Re-planning this flat and dormers to reduce dominance is important. Panel also question mixture of window styles – better to keep constant.”