

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 25 November 2015 at  
6.30 pm

in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway,  
Wantage, OX12 9BY



### Open to the public, including the press

#### Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Stuart Davenport, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Chris McCarthy, Janet Shelley and Catherine Webber

Officers: Adrian Butler, Katie Cook, Steve Culliford, Martin Deans, Simon Dunn-Lwin, Sarah Green, Brett Leahy, Shaun Wells, and Josh Webley-Smith

Also present: Councillors Matthew Barber, Yvonne Constance and Elaine Ware (local ward members)

Number of members of the public: 168

#### **PI.177 Chairman's announcements**

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

The chairman also announced that due to the complexity of the first two applications on the agenda at East Hanney and the level of public interest in these, he had increased the time allotted to groups of public speakers to five minutes for these two applications, whereas public speakers would be limited to the normal three minutes for the remainder of the applications on the agenda.

The chairman read out a statement about filming public meetings.

#### **PI.178 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence**

None

#### **PI.179 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations**

Councillor Sandy Lovatt declared an interest in application P15/V1940/FUL as he knew the applicant and would not take part in the consideration nor voting on this item.

Councillor Roger Cox declared a non-pecuniary interest in application P15/V2198/FUL as he was a Cabinet member when Cabinet approved a long term lease of Tilsley Park and sought ongoing public access to its facilities and the planning application from the leaseholder sought improved facilities.

Councillor Bob Johnston declared an interest in application P15/V2089/HH as he was a member of the parish council, which had objected, but he was not present at the meeting when the application had been discussed.

Councillor Eric Batts declared an interest in application P15/V1893/HH as he lived opposite the site but confirmed that he had had no discussions with parties about the proposals.

## **PI.180 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to adopt as a correct record the minutes of the committee meeting held on 28 October 2015 and agree that the chairman signs them as such.

## **PI.181 Urgent business**

None

## **PI.182 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications**

The list showing 21 members of the public that had registered to speak on planning applications was tabled at the meeting.

## **PI.183 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters**

None

## **PI.184 Materials**

The committee considered materials for the development at 23 Wallingford Street, Wantage. The materials included two roof tiles, two contrasting colour bricks (one red, one grey), and render. The committee asked officers to seek a more textured surface for the grey brick. As such, the committee delegated authority to the head of planning to approve all the materials together.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the head of planning in consultation with the committee chairman to approve the materials for planning application P15/V2013/DIS at 23 Wallingford Street, Wantage.

## **PI.185 P15/V1616/FUL - Land south of Summertown, East Hanney, OX12 0JQ**

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V1616/FUL to demolish redundant agricultural buildings, erect 79 affordable dwellings and 118 open

market dwellings, with associated access roads, landscaping and public open space (as amended by drawings received 24 September 2015 and as amended by plans received 19 October 2015) on land south of Summertown, East Hanney.

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

Jim Triffitt, a representative of East Hanney Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- There were two planning applications for large housing developments adjacent to the village; the cumulative impact was an additional 400 homes and a likely tripling of the population
- The village could accommodate some additional housing but not two blocks of 200 homes
- This application would more than double the population alone, without facilities to cope, and would worsen the quality of life for existing residents
- There would be harm to the wider landscape setting and the visual impact of East Hanney from the south
- Without new infrastructure the development would be unsustainable
- The development would represent gross overdevelopment and would destroy the environment
- The adverse impacts outweighed the benefits to the village

Stephen McKechnie spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- This represented unsustainable development where the harm outweighed the benefits
- The application would harm the local ecology, it failed to acknowledge the importance of trees on the site, and would increase the flooding risk to the village by building on this site

Ken Dijksman, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The scheme would achieve sustainable development and would provide a new access to the village through the site
- Drainage issues had been overcome
- There would be a net ecological benefit with the introduction of a new community nature reserve with a long term management plan and public access

Councillor Matthew Barber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- Although the site was allocated in the local plan for housing, the planning inspector had yet to adjudicate on the site specifically and therefore this document carried little weight
- The ability to mitigate the issues arising from this development
- There was a flooding risk identified by the parish council's consultant; it was important that developments should not increase flood risk elsewhere; the mitigation scheme should be agreed prior to approval of the application
- This was a potentially significant archaeological site
- Thames Water had concerns at the capacity of both the local sewerage network and the sewage treatment works; the application should be deferred until a solution could be found

- The proposed distribution of section 106 funds does not adequately address the likely impact on the village from this development and there were inconsistencies with the proposed section 106 agreement proposed for the application on land south of Steventon Road, also under consideration by the committee at this meeting. The section 106 agreement should be determined by the committee
- The county council had concerns over the impact of this development on primary school provision. Although an expansion of the primary school was planned, it would only be adequate for one of the two major applications under consideration by the committee at this meeting
- There were sufficient grounds to refuse this application, despite it being on a site allocated in the local plan for housing.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Some councillors believed that:

- The council did not have a five-year housing land supply in place and had to follow the National Planning Policy Framework guidance
- The proposed development would fit on this site
- The new road access would be welcomed
- Thames Water would be upgrading the drainage network but not before 2017
- The proposed nature reserve could be a benefit but would need management
- The section 106 requests were tested against statutory requirements

Other councillors considered that:

- The density of the housing proposed on the site was too high
- There would be a loss of good quality agricultural land
- The 18th century barns on the site would be lost
- The proposed development would cause visual harm to the landscape
- The development was insufficiently integrated with the village
- There was a risk of flooding to other parts of the village as a result of this development
- This development would provide the school with capacity problems
- It was unsustainable as the village did not have the facilities to support it
- There was no bus service on the Steventon Road and the service to Oxford needed improvement
- This development failed to create a sense of village community cohesion
- The parish council's section 106 requests should not be ignored

In accordance with the committee's normal procedure, the chairman moved the planning officer's recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application. This was put to the vote but was lost by five votes to six.

It was then moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- Significant visual harm to the landscape
- The loss of heritage buildings on site
- The proposed density of the proposed development was not in keeping with East Hanney village
- The density should be lower in an edge of village location
- There was no signed section 106 agreement in place

The motion to refuse the application was put to the meeting and was carried.

## **RESOLVED** (for 6; against 5)

To refuse application P15/1616/FUL following reasons:

1. Policy NE9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 is consistent with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The site is located within the Lowland Vale landscape which is distinctive and valued for its own quality. The site is an area of open land beyond the southern extent of the village, extending into open countryside. It is highly visible from public viewpoints and the northern section contributes to the settling of listed Mill buildings and the conservation area. It is the council's opinion that the proposal, adversely impacts on the quality of this part of the Lowland Vale in respect of cultural heritage, townscape and setting of listed buildings and causes harm to the wider landscape, the settlement pattern and its landscape setting, and in particular a visual impact on the southern approach to East Hanney. The proposal is therefore, contrary to policies NE9, HE1 and HE4 of the adopted Local Plan and to the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Policy DC1 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and the adopted Design Guide (March 2015) require high quality design and this accords with criterion 4 of paragraph 17 and paragraphs 56, 57, 58, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the council gives great importance to the design of the built environment. It is the council's opinion that the density of the proposed development creates a cramped form of development that is not appropriate to this location, comprising a high density and urban character that is at odds with the low density and rural character of the existing edge of the village which in turn detracts from the open, rural aspect of the village. As such the proposal is contrary to policies DC1 and DC6 of the adopted Local Plan, the adopted Vale of White Horse Design Guide (March 2015) and to the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. In the absence of financial contributions to meet the needs generated by the additional housing, the proposal would result in a harmful impact on existing services and social infrastructure. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DC8 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and to the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **PI.186 P15/V1846/O - Land South of Steventon Road, East Hanney**

The officer presented the report and addendum on outline application P15/V1846/O for the development of up to 200 homes including associated infrastructure works and demolition of existing structures, provision of vehicular access to the site with realignment of the A338 and Steventon Road, landscaping and the provision of new public open spaces (as amplified by additional development access layout plan), on land south of Steventon Road, East Hanney.

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

Jim Triffitt, a representative of East Hanney Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The village had accommodated some new development but could not accommodate blocks of 200 homes as this would more than double the village's population
- The development would bring more tarmac and unsuitable housing
- The development might not be completed within the five-year timescale given the amount of work required to overcome the flooding risk and improve the local drainage network
- Residents would find it difficult to cross the road to get to the village
- This was unsustainable development as there was no infrastructure capacity to accommodate it
- There would be a loss of rural character

Stewart Scott spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- Thames Water had expressed concerns that the drains and pumping station were inadequate to cope with this proposed development
- Improvements to the drainage network were required before the development commenced
- The A338 cut the site off from the village
- The local school capacity was inadequate
- Requests for funding to improve the shop and village hall had been rejected, therefore this development was unsustainable
- It would spoil the character of the settlement

Judy Long spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- This development was contrary to the local plan's objectives as it brought housing but no jobs
- It would be to the detriment of the village's character
- East Hanney was already at saturation point
- The development would destroy the village

Steve Harley, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- There was significant and urgent need for housing in the district and this application would bring benefits to East Hanney
- The A338 would be re-routed to remove it being a barrier to this development and would integrate the site with the remainder of the village
- This would create new safe crossing points
- The housing design would be in keeping with the local vernacular and landscape, and would meet the council's design guide
- The open space exceeded the design requirements
- A parcel of land would be available to assist with education provision, if required
- Solutions to the drainage capacity had been submitted
- It contributed to the council's five-year housing land supply
- There were no outstanding planning objections to this application

Councillor Matthew Barber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- This development would increase the number of properties in East Hanney to an unacceptable level without adequate increase in facilities or infrastructure
- It was on the wrong side of the A338 to integrate with the village and would bring potential dangers to highway safety

- The application did not properly allow the consideration of the flooding impact on neighbouring property
- The concerns raised by Thames Water on the capacity of the local sewerage network would also apply on this site
- There was uncertainty as to whether the indicative road layout would be to the correct standards and whether consideration had been given to the impact on other changes to the A338
- There was little consideration given to the ecological impact
- The section 106 agreement was inadequate and inconsistent with that in the previous application (P15/V1616/FUL) considered earlier in the meeting—for example, there was no funding for the A338 road changes proposed
- The county council had concerns over the additional cumulative impact on education provision, especially on the primary school, and had no current capacity to serve this development

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate and made the following points:

- The National Planning Policy Guidance required outline developments to be able to be delivered within five years
- Delivery within the five-year timescale was unlikely given the amount of work required to overcome the flooding risk, bring improvements to the local drainage network, and change the A338 road layout
- The site was on the wrong side of the A338, divorced from the village
- It had an adverse impact on the landscape
- The development would have an adverse impact on the adjacent conservation area
- There was no signed section 106 agreement in place

In accordance with the committee's normal procedure, the chairman moved the planning officer's recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application. This was put to the vote but was lost by seven votes to nil with four abstentions.

It was then moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons.

**RESOLVED** (for 7; against 0; abstentions 4)

To refuse approve application P15/V1846/O for the following reasons:

1. Policy GS2 of the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan seeks to prevent development outside the built up areas of existing settlements whilst policy DC1 of the adopted local plan seeks to ensure development does not adversely affect attributes that make a positive contribution to the character of the locality. Policy NE9 of the adopted local plan will not permit development in the Lowland Vale if it has an adverse effect on the landscape. These policies accord with core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 17). The site is outside and divorced from the built up settlement of East Hanney. Moreover, the site is not allocated for development. The proposal would represent an exposed and isolated extension of development into open countryside. In turn this large scale housing development would be visually intrusive in this open and rural landscape and detract from the landscape qualities of the Lowland Vale and the rural setting of East Hanney. The harm is considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the scheme benefits. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policies GS2,

DC1 and NE9 of the adopted local plan and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Policy HE1 of the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan is consistent with criterion 10 of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. In accordance with paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework the council has identified and assessed the significance of heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal. The East Hanney conservation area adjoins the site and the application site makes an important contribution to the open and rural setting of the conservation area. Residential development on this site would unacceptably change and erode the open and rural setting of the conservation area and would significantly and demonstrably have an adverse impact on its setting. The benefits of the proposal are not considered to outweigh this harm. The proposal is considered contrary to policy HE1 of the adopted local plan and paragraphs 17(10), 131, 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. In the absence of a section 106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions towards community, leisure, recreation, open space and play area maintenance, public transport, education, and waste collections, the proposal would place increased pressure on these facilities and fail to provide the social, recreational, and cultural facilities and services the community needs. This is considered contrary to policy DC8 of the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan, policies CP7 and CP24 of the emerging local plan 2031 - Part 1 and paragraphs 17 and 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **PI.187      P15/V2222/O - Land at Longcot Road, Shrivenham**

The officer presented the report and addendum on outline application P15/V2222/O for residential development of up to 45 dwellings, with public open space, engineering works and associated infrastructure, access to be approved only, all other matters reserved (revision of application reference P13/V1514/O) on land at Longcot Road, Shrivenham.

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

Sarah Day, a representative of Shrivenham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The village would be lumbered with unsuitable development
- The site was too far away from the village primary school
- The density was stated as 16 dwellings per hectare but the plans suggested a density closer to 30
- Land to the south of the village was important to the community; this development would not preserve nor enhance its character

John Varney spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The access to the site would become dangerous and needed maintenance
- The road speed limit needed enforcement
- With school children crossing the road twice a day this would become unsafe
- This development would add to sewerage problems which would not be solved by the proposed condition
- The development would be unsustainable



Andrew Ross, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- This application addressed the council's concerns set out in the previous refusal on this site, now subject to an appeal
- It would not affect the availability of best and most versatile agricultural land
- The visual impact on the church would be negligible
- There were no council objections on landscape grounds
- This was a low density development appropriate for an edge of village location

Councillor Elaine Ware, one of the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application, his/her concerns included:

- The village could not sustain another speculative development
- The primary school was a full capacity and there was no plan to increase it
- This latest application only superficially addressed local concerns
- There must be deliverable infrastructure for water supply, sewerage and education provision
- The land to the south of the village had not been allocated for housing in the local plan due to landscape impact

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

- The application did little to overcome the reasons for refusing the previous application on this site
- The same three reasons were still relevant planning objections

The officer's recommendation to grant outline planning permission, was declared lost on being put to the vote by ten votes to nil with one abstention.

It was then moved to refuse planning permission.

**RESOLVED** (for 10; against 0; abstentions 1)

To refuse application P15/V2222/O for the following reasons:

1. Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land to be taken into account and where significant development of agricultural land is necessary, planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality. According to the council's land classification survey parts of the site are grade 1 and grade 2 agricultural land which are the highest classifications. The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 0.8 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land and compromise the ability to farm approximately 0.5 hectares of grade 1 agricultural land. It is considered there is no overriding justification for this development particularly as poorer quality agricultural land exists in the district including elsewhere at the edges of Shrivenham. The council gives weight to the economic and other benefits of best and most versatile agricultural land and considers this proposal contrary to paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Policy HE4 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 is consistent with criterion 10 of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. In

accordance with paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework the council has identified and assessed the significance of heritage assets that may be affected by the proposal. St Andrew's Church is a grade I listed building and its tower is clearly visible and prominent in views north across the site from the public footpath at the southern boundary of the site. The application site makes an important contribution to the setting of the church. Residential development would obscure vital and important views of the church and would significantly and demonstrably have an adverse impact on the setting of this grade I listed building. The council has given significant importance and weight to protecting the setting of this grade I listed building and the harm to its setting is considered substantial. The proposal is considered contrary to policy HE4 of the adopted Local Plan and paragraphs 17(10), 131, 132 and 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Policy NE9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 is consistent with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The site is located within the Lowland Vale landscape which is distinctive and valued for its own quality. This is an area of open land clearly beyond the edge of the village. It is highly visible from the public footpath on the southern boundary of the site and also from Longcot Lane and Stainswick Lane south of Glebe Close. Viewing the site from the south it appears as part of the wider patch work of fields on the village edge. It is also part of the open vistas available at the edge of the village which users of the footpath at the very least enjoy. It is the council's opinion that the proposal is insensitively located, detracts from important views and impacts on the quality of this part of the Lowland Vale. The proposal is therefore, contrary to policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan and paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy DC1 and Policy DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and the 2015 adopted Design Guide require high quality design and this accords with criterion 4 of paragraph 17 and paragraphs 56, 57, 58, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework the council gives great importance to the design of the built environment.
4. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that up to 45 dwellings could be adequately accommodated on this site. The Vicarage Lane housing is low density with large back gardens which help soften the edge of the village. On the contrary this development is an overdevelopment of the site comprising a density of development at odds with the low density character of development on this edge of the village which in turn detracts from the open, semi-rural aspect of the village. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan, the 2015 adopted Vale of White Horse Design Guide March 2015 and paragraph 17(4), 56, 57, 58, 61 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. In the absence of a section 106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions towards recreation, village hall improvements, open space and play area maintenance, public transport, education, and waste collections, the proposal would place increased pressure on these facilities and fail to provide the social, recreational, and cultural facilities and services the community needs. This is considered contrary to policy DC8 of the adopted Local Plan, policies CP7 and CP24 of the emerging Local Plan 2031 - Part 1 and paragraphs 17 and 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **PI.188      P15/V1940/FUL - Orchard Way, Harwell, OX11 0LH**

Councillor Sandy Lovatt declared an interest in this application as he knew the applicant and left the meeting room during its consideration.

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V1940/FUL to remove conditions 5 (travel information), 6 (OCC Manual for Streets), 8 (refuse), 12 (non-motorised users audit), 13 (biodiversity offsetting scheme), 14 (retention of trees), 15 (windows to Plots 1 & 6) and 17 (footway), and variation of condition 3 (drawing numbers) of planning permission P14/V2286/O, and a residential development of up to 9 dwellings, with all matters reserved except for access on land off Orchard Way, Harwell.

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

Jeremy Hawthorne, a representative of Harwell Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The parish council was still opposed to the removal of condition 17 (the footway)
- Why was the council proposing the removal of conditions in a previous application when their removal had not been requested by the applicant (conditions 16 and 18)?
- Condition 18 should not be removed as this would cause parking problems

Jeremy Hawthorne spoke objecting to the application, this time as a local resident:

- He objected to the council removing condition 18 as parking was already limited
- This proposal would adversely affect his property, which was adjacent to the application site

Councillor Janet Shelley, one of the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- Conditions 17 and 18 should not be removed

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

- The committee had to approve or refuse the application as applied for and a motion to approve the application was carried by nine votes to one
- Conditions 16 and 18 were retained by nine votes to one

### **RESOLVED** (for 9; against 1)

To approve application P15/V1940/FUL to vary Condition 3 of P14/V2286/O and remove conditions 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, subject to retention of the following conditions:

1. Time Limit
2. Reserved Matters Application to be submitted
3. In accordance with approved plans (VARIED TO REMOVE 286.101 A)
4. Drainage scheme to be submitted, approved implemented in accordance with details agreed
5. Construction Management Plan to be submitted to, agreed and implemented in accordance with details agreed
6. Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation submitted and approved in writing prior to commencement of development.

7. Following the Written Scheme of Investigation a staged programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation shall be carried out in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation, archive to be produced and submitted to local planning authority.
8. Recommendations in Ecological Assessment October 2014 to be followed.
9. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the development shall not exceed 1000 square metres total gross floorspace. (previously condition 16)
10. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved two parking spaces shall be provided within the site, laid out and marked for the sole use by the owner/occupier of 33 Orchard Way to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall be retained in perpetuity for the sole use by the owner/occupier of 33 Orchard Way. (previously condition 18)

**PI.189 P15/V2198/FUL - Tilsley Park Leisure Centre, Dunmore Road, Abingdon, OX14 1PU**

Councillor Roger Cox declared an interest in this planning application as he was a Cabinet member when Cabinet approved a long term lease of Tilsley Park and sought ongoing public access to its facilities. The planning application from the leaseholder sought improved facilities. He left the meeting room during its consideration.

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V2198/FUL to provide a field sports throw area with seven floodlighting columns of 15 metres in height, safety fencing and ancillary works on land at Tilsley Park, Dunmore Road, Abingdon.

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

Robert Garrett spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The floodlights could cause light pollution to nearby residential property
- He queried the light pollution figures in the planning officer's report

Steven Sensicall, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- He had relied on lighting experts to assess the impact of the application and they had found that the proposal would give an acceptable level of light pollution, which would be less than street lighting levels
- There was extensive tree cover between the site and the nearest houses
- This would bring improved facilities to the park

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

- The application would bring improved facilities
- The committee had to rely on the lighting experts' views
- Condition 5 should be amended so that the floodlighting was switched off at 22:00 hours

**RESOLVED** (for 9; against 0; abstentions 1)

To approve application P15/2198/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – three years.
2. Approved plans.

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 25 November 2015

**PI.12**

3. The use of the flood lighting shall be restricted to between 08:00hrs and 22:00hrs Monday to Friday and between 08:00hrs and 18:00hrs on Saturday to Sunday.
4. The flood lighting shall be designed, constructed and installed in line with the Technical Report dated 3.11.2015 by Abacus Lighting Ltd and Abacus Challenger 1 lighting specifications.
5. The flood lighting shall be switched off by an automatic cut-off system between 22:00hrs to 08:00hrs Monday to Friday, between 18:00 hrs to 08:00hrs on Saturday and Sunday and at all other times when the area is not in use.
6. No development shall commence until details of the protective fencing to be erected around the throws area, to include location, height, type and materials and justified by a risk assessment have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority [after consultation with Sport England]. The fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details before the throws area is first brought into use and thereafter the fencing shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

**Informatives:**

1. The throws area permitted should be constructed substantially in accordance with Sport England's Design Guidance Note, Athletics (2008):  
[\(http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/other-design-guidance/\)](http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/other-design-guidance/)
2. Guidance on preparing Community Use Agreements or Schemes is available from:  
<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/community-use-agreements/>

**PI.190 P15/V0584/FUL - Orchard Gardens, West Challow**

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V0584/FUL to erect two dwellings with associated works, re-design to include reduced height of the proposed dwelling at plot 2 (amended plans received 16 October 2015), consolidate two separate accesses to a single shared access, reduce in scale the dwelling at plot 2, and remove roof lights to external slopes, at Orchard Gardens, West Challow.

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

James Vaughn Fowler spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- There were no services in West Challow to support this development
- The site was in the open countryside
- It would bring additional traffic
- The properties would be much higher than those surrounding it
- It would have an adverse impact on the character of the village, be overbearing and visually intrusive

Matthew Green spoke in support of the application:

- This was a modest development in a village that had grown slowly

Councillor Yvonne Constance, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- This was a small village with no facilities
- The proposal was in the open countryside, and would have an adverse impact on the landscape and would set a precedent for further development beyond the site

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

- The there was no demonstrable harm caused by this proposal
- A slab level condition should be added

**RESOLVED** (for 7; against 2; abstentions 2)

To approve application P15/V0584/FUL subject to the following conditions:

- 1: Time Limit
- 2: Approved Plans
- 3: Materials to be submitted
- 4: Joinery details to be submitted
4. Sustainable surface water and foul water drainage strategy to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5: Approved foul and surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation.
- 6: First 5m of driveways will accord with standards in terms of construction, gradient and no surface water discharge to adjacent highway.
- 7: Development shall not be occupied until visibility splay provided, and relocation of telegraph pole.
- 8: Accommodation over carports to remain ancillary/annexes to units approved and not to be used as separate residential units.
- 9: Slab levels

#### **PI.191      P15/V1974/FUL - 1 Coulings Close, East Hendred, OX12 8JQ**

The officer presented the report on application P15/1974/FUL for one dwelling at 1 Coulings Close, East Hendred.

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

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

- The application had been amended to move the property back to the building frontage in line with neighbouring homes
- There was no material planning reason to refuse this application

**RESOLVED** (for 11; against 0)

To approve application P15/1974/FUL subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Time limit - Commence within three years from the date of permission
- 2 : Development must accord with approved plans
- 3 : Materials in accordance with application
- 4 : Access details to be submitted prior to commencement for both existing and proposed dwellings
- 5 : Car parking space details to be submitted prior to commencement for both existing and proposed dwellings
- 6 : No drainage to be discharged onto adjacent highway
- 7 : Sustainable Drainage Scheme to be submitted prior to commencement
- 8 : Boundary details to be submitted prior to commencement

**PI.192      P15/V2281/FUL and P15/V2282/A - Stratton Court, 1 Kimber Road, Abingdon, OX14 1RZ**

The officer presented the report on application P15/V2281/FUL and P15/V2282/A for the change of use from B1 use class (Office) to D2 use class (Gymnasium) at Stratton Court, 1 Kimber Road, Abingdon.

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

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

- There was no material planning reason to refuse the application

**RESOLVED** (for 11; against 0)

(a) to approve application P15/2281/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission
2. Works in accordance with the approved plans
3. Submission and approval of parking management plan
4. Submission and approval of cycle parking details
5. Noise mitigation measures to be implemented

(b) to approve application P15/2282/A subject to the following condition:

1. Approved plans

**PI.193      P15/V1305/FUL - Land between "The Furrows" and 26 Stonebridge Road, Steventon, OX13 6AS**

The officer presented the report on application P15/V1305/FUL for a detached dwelling with integral garage on land between 'The Furrows' and 26 Stonebridge Road, Steventon.

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

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

- There were no material planning reasons to refuse this application

**RESOLVED** (for 11; against 0)

To approve application P15/1305/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – Full permission
2. Planning condition listing the approved drawings
3. Materials (Details)
4. Prior to the commencement of development, a fully detailed sustainable drainage scheme for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwelling to which the scheme relates.

5. Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, prior to the commencement of the development full details of the boundary treatment to be installed on the south-east boundary of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved boundary treatment shall be installed prior to the occupation of the new dwelling.
6. Prior to the use or occupation of the new development, the driveway shown on approved drawing numbers 03 rev.A and 04 rev.C shall be constructed. The driveway shall be constructed to prevent surface water discharging onto the highway. Thereafter, the driveway shall be kept permanently free of any obstruction to such use.
7. The development shall be carried out in accordance with slab levels shown on approved drawing number 04 rev.C.
8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or the equivalent provisions of any order revoking and re-enacting that Order), there shall be no extension to the dwelling hereby permitted and no ancillary buildings or structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling without the prior grant of planning permission.

#### **PI.194      P15/V2089/HH - 60 The Avenue, Kennington, OX1 5PP**

The officer presented the report on application P15/V2089/HH for a front and rear extension, with a new roof and bedroom in the attic, at 60 The Avenue, Kennington.

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

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

- There were no material planning reasons to refuse this application

**RESOLVED** (for 11; against 0)

To approve application P15/2089/HH subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit - full application
2. Approved plans
3. Materials in accordance with application details
4. New vehicular access – details to be submitted and approved
5. Close existing access – full details to be submitted and approved
6. Vision splay details to be submitted
7. Turning area and car parking details to be submitted
8. No surface water drainage to highway
9. Rooflights on South elevation to be no lower than 1.7m above floor level

#### **PI.195      P15/V1893/HH - 13 Cherry Tree Close, Southmoor**

The officer presented the report on application P15/V1893/HH to demolish redundant agricultural buildings, erect 79 affordable dwellings and 118 open market dwellings, with associated access roads, landscaping and public open space (as amended by drawings received 24 September 2015 and as amended by plans received 19 October 2015) on land south of Summertown, East Hanney.



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

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

- There was no material planning reason to refuse this application

**RESOLVED** (for 11; against 0)

To approve application P15/1893/HH subject to the following conditions:

1. Application in accordance with the approved plans.
2. Materials in accordance with those specified in the application.
3. Time limit – full application.

The meeting closed at 11.05 pm