

**Planning Committee**  
**Wednesday 8 June 2016**

**Addendum Report**

## **Item 9 – P16/V0652/O – Land at Park Farm, East Challow**

### Consultation Updates

#### Highway Authority

No objection.

The essential footway works to connect the site to King Alfred's school and Wantage, to provide a safe and convenient route for pedestrians and cyclists, will be delivered as part of the development. The County Council therefore removes its objection.

#### Landscape Officer

No objection subject to a smaller scale solution to site access that would help reduce impact on village character, as the roundabout is considered too large.

In brief summary the landscape officer advises the impact would be localised in nature with a moderate to minor landscape impact on the Character of the Lowland Vale (policy NE9) with a slightly lower impact on the Important Open Land between East Challow and Wantage (policy NE10).

#### Local Resident

A fourth letter of objection has been received and may be summarised as follows:

- The applicant's traffic assessment is fundamentally flawed as it does not accurately represent traffic movements on the A417 as Mill Street (A417), Wantage was closed to traffic at the time of the applicant's traffic counts.
- The A417 has over 1,000 traffic movements per hour not 600 or so
- The A417 is at capacity

#### Officer Comment

The highway authority does not object on traffic movement grounds. The County Council's annual average daily traffic flows indicate that in 2015 some 6,700 vehicles used the A417 south of the B4001. In its response to the application the highway authority advise that there is a 2-way peak hour (PM) flow of 635 vehicles per hour. The applicant's traffic assessment suggests some 46 two-way movements will be generated by the dwellings at the AM and PM peaks. The addition of this level of traffic onto the A417 is not considered severe.

#### Update

The applicant's agent has written to confirm that the scheme is viable with the roundabout, footway additions and widening, financial contributions recommended by officers and 40% affordable housing.

#### Report Correction

Paragraph 2.8.1 of the applicants transport assessment includes a table providing figures for peak hour AM and PM traffic flows on the A417. It provides total figures of 613 and 617 two way movements in the AM and PM peaks and I mention these figures in paragraph 6.43 of my report. However, there is an addition mistake in the applicants transport assessment and the PM figure should be 677 two way movements. This has been taken into account.

## Item 10 – P16/V0370/FUL – Land off Colton Road, Shrivenham

### Response from Ward Members

Councillors Elaine Ware and Simon Howell, have provided the following written statement as they are unable to attend the meeting:

*“We formally object to this application on the basis that this is another change to the original **FULL** application that was agreed P/14/V2757/FUL. Surely when a full application is approved there should be no reason to keep changing?”*

*This particular amendment is to change the four bungalows into so called chalet bungalows which for all intent and purposes are houses. When the original plans were approved there was no suggestion that these four dwellings should be any different to those already built in Farleigh Road i.e., single storey bungalows. For some reason better known to Linden Homes it is now necessary to convert them into houses. The question has to be asked why now? A previous amendment changed the style of houses to Linden’s standard but did not include the replacement of the bungalows! The changing of bungalows to houses will change the character of the area, decrease availability and disadvantage potential purchasers who may have mobility issues and would ideally wish to live in single storey accommodation.*

*The village of Shrivenham has an aging population and there are a number of family homes that are occupied by either single people or couples who wish to downsize but availability is limited. Linden Homes, like so many developers wish to maximise their income but in this case no consideration is given to those existing residents that would welcome the opportunity to downsize and live in a brand new single storey bungalow.*

*Reference is made in the officer’s report to concerns about the impact on neighbouring properties and recognises that the relationship between old and new is rather awkward but surprisingly the application is recommended for approval.*

*The report also states that Conditions 9 and 10 have still not been resolved although Thames Water has informally agreed to the drainage strategies. Drainage is a particular concern and written confirmation is vital to ensure that the right arrangements are in place to deal with these issues.*

*There is a ransom strip of land between the edge of the development and Farleigh Road. There was an issue with land ownership – is it known if this has been resolved?*

*When considering this application the Committee is asked to consider the benefits to the community of this proposed change (**none**) v the developer, and that in the eyes of residents that the Committee uphold the credibility of the planning process and refuse this further amendment and be seen to take a positive position particularly for the existing residents of Farleigh Road and the surrounding area.”*

### Additional Neighbour comments

The council has received two further emails from objecting residents, both highlighting that the new house types will not be as suitable for elderly people as the approved.

### Officer Response

Officers acknowledge that the Design and Access Statement submitted in support of the original application, states at Paragraph 5.84 that one of the benefits of the scheme is, “[It] includes four new bungalows, which improves the relationship of the scheme with existing neighbouring properties and also provides accommodation well suited to the elderly or retired residents of Shrivenham.”

However, it is important to note that single storey dwellings are not the only way to provide suitable accommodation for the elderly. Rather, it is about providing buildings that can be easily adapted for those with mobility issues and this is covered by Part M of the Building Regulations, which has been recently expanded by the Housing Standards Review to include the “Lifetime Homes” standard.

Policy H16 is relevant as it requires 10% of the dwellings on this site to meet Lifetime Homes standards. These standards were previously included in the Code for Sustainable Homes. However, the Code has now been abolished and Policy H16 has very little weight as it does not refer to Part M of the Building Regulations, which is the most up-to-date legislation on this matter.

Furthermore, there is no condition or legal obligation within the original consent for these particular dwellings to be offered as specialist housing for the elderly. Nonetheless, Linden Homes will be required to accord with Part M across the entire site to ensure enough of the completed houses are adaptable for future residents that are less mobile.

Given this, officers consider little weight can be given to the objection that this material minor amendment will reduce the suitability of this development for elderly or less mobile residents.

### **Item 11 – P16/V0527/O – The Bungalow, Townsend, Grove, OX12 0AZ**

No updates

### **Item 12 – P16/V1858/FUL – Linden House, 20 Market Place, Faringdon, SN7 7HU**

#### Update

Officers have received the following comments regarding the Officers report. These are as follows to which the Officer has provided an update below:

- The height of the houses has not been reduced from previous schemes, as claimed (at least not on the published plans)
- The number of objections was 5 not 2 as stated in the summary

- One of the recurrent objections was that neighbours were not notified and so had little chance to object
- The site is not infilling of the existing town, it is part of a green corridor
- Church View house and The Crown Inn are also listed buildings that border the North of the site, not only Astley house, Faringdon house and the Church of All saints, as stated.

#### Officers Comments

- The amended plans, drawing No:C4962.16.264, as published within the report shows a proposed ridge height of 7.65m. This has been reduced from the previously proposed two-house scheme in which house 1 was 7.83m tall and house 2 7.81m tall.
- The number of neighbours objecting is 5 and not 2 as stated within the report.
- For such an application the Council will notify those neighbours immediately adjoining the site and place a site notice at the front of the site to notify the general public, both of which have been undertaken as part of the statutory process. Having checked the original consultee list an extensive list of neighbours were automatically consulted which included Astley House, Church View, Faringdon House and Camden House and a number of dwellings within Regent Mews.
- This point is dealt with within the officer's report at paragraphs 6.6 (principle) and paragraphs 6.15-6.19 (Design & Layout).
- Church View and The Crown Inn also border this site and are listed.

#### **Item 13 – P16/V0345/FUL – 41 Sutton Wick Lane, Drayton, Abingdon, OX14 4HH**

No updates

#### **Item 14 – P16/V0734/FUL – The Pack Horse, Abingdon Road, Milton Hill, Abingdon, OX13 6AG**

#### Update

Objections have been received from one neighbour regarding a change that was made to the description of the application during its consideration. Following the submission of the application it was noted that the application description was partly incorrect. The description did state accurately the nature of the proposed works but the stated location of the works relative to compass points did not concur with the submitted Block Plan. This error also applied to the annotations on the original elevation plans. The application description and plan annotations were corrected in this aspect alone and, as this was a relatively minor change, it was not the subject of further consultation with neighbours. The neighbour has complained that this has created confusion and that the change should have been the subject of further consultation.

#### Officer Response

Although the original description and plan annotations were inaccurate in respect of the location of the work relative to compass points, the location of the proposed works relative to neighbours are clearly shown on the original block plan.

Consequently officers consider that anyone looking at the original application would have clearly understood where the proposals are located on the site. Officers consider the objections that have been received from neighbours regarding increased noise and disturbance demonstrate that they have clearly understood the proposal and its potential impacts upon them.

**Item 15 – P16/V0694/HH – 68 Howard Cornish Road, Marcham, OX13 6PW**

No updates.

**Item 16 – P16/V0911/HH – 40 Stonhouse Crescent, Radley, OX14 3AF**

Consultation Updates

Additional comments have been received from the county highways officer who has no objections to the application.