

Planning Committee
Wednesday 6 July 2016

Addendum Report

Item 8 – P15/V1504/FUL – Land north of Grove Road, Harwell

Additional Plan

The applicant has submitted an additional plan detailing external materials for the dwellings. The external walls of the houses are proposed to be built in either:

- Hanson Cheshire red multi bricks, or;
- Forterra Village sunglow bricks
- Monocouche render – colour off white
- Eternit timber style boarding

A detail brick comprising Forterra Atherstone red is proposed

Proposed roofing materials comprise either:

- Redland mockbond mini stonewold tiles in slate grey or farmhouse red

These materials are considered acceptable. Consequently condition 3 should be deleted with the materials plan forming part of the plans approved under condition 2.

Report Updates – Financial Contributions

The proposal for 207 dwellings amounts to an 18% increase to Harwell which has some 1,140 households existing or permitted¹. The contributions sought towards Harwell community centre and British Legion (page 27 of the agenda) are based on a 21% increase and therefore, need to be revised downwards to £234,000 and £18,000 respectively.

In the table on page 26 of the agenda I make reference to a health and fitness contribution (£47,087). This is a mistake and this contribution should be deleted, as at paragraph 6.51 of the report I advise that this request is prevented due to pooling restrictions (Reg. 123 of the CIL Regulations).

The Oxfordshire County Council contribution requests towards Didcot library and monitoring need to be revised downwards to £52,822 and £8,923 respectively. This change accords with their latest consultation response.

The total amount of contributions now sought amounts to £2,384,388 which equates to £11,518 per dwelling.

¹ 979 dwellings in Harwell according to the 2011 census plus 161 dwellings from the Blenheim Hill, Greenwood Meadows and 16 Reading Road schemes permitted.

Item 9 – P15/V2560/FUL – Land to east of Portway Cottages, East Hendred

The following consultation responses on the most recent amendment have been received subsequent to the publication of committee papers:

East Hendred Parish Council

“In our response dated 15th June East Hendred Parish Council pointed out to you that there were significant differences in the location of the Toucan crossing on

drawings submitted by the applicant. There was subsequently a response from Glanville on behalf of the applicant revising the drawing (appendix C) and this was added to the Vale's planning website as late as June 20th. In accordance with the deadline, all comments submitted were made before this, and several residents are concerned that their comments were based on a different position for the pedestrian crossing from that which will now be considered by the Planning Committee. Given the busy nature of the A417, the position of the crossing with respect to the White Road junction is important, with serious safety implications, both from general visibility issues and any pedestrian waiting on the south side will not be easily visible to cars pulling out of White Road.

The Parish Council does not believe that the new alignment of the A417 which is being proposed to accommodate the pedestrian crossing is practical or that adequate visibility of pedestrians to motorists emerging from White Road and turning to the east can be achieved. The Parish Council has made its own measurements of the space available in front of Portway House (the most easterly of Portway Cottages). Assuming a small verge is left in front of Portway House (currently only 1.3m) the remaining width is only 8.0m which clearly cannot accommodate the 9.4m required for the road and footway. The latest drawing does not show sufficient detail to make clear how the full 9.4m is to be achieved and how any sort of verge would be included outside the Portway House property. We are happy to meet with the Applicant or OCC Highways to demonstrate this point.

The Parish Council believes that the details of the highway changes are not sufficiently clear for the Planning Committee to take a properly informed decision on the safety of the proposed road layout, We are also concerned about the 20th June amendment not being circulated to those who have already commented on this application and we would welcome your views on these matters. Finally, we are aware of a detailed response from one of our residents, Mark Beddow, which has been sent to you on this issue, which amplifies the made above."

Officer Response – The Parish Council concerns about the position and achievability of the pedestrian crossing are noted. Officers are clear that this crossing is an essential part of the mitigation necessary to make this scheme acceptable in planning terms.

The re-alignment of the A417 and the position of the pedestrian crossing have been negotiated between the applicant and OCC Highways. Whilst aware of the local concern, OCC has no objections on this point, and have confirmed to officers that they consider the upgrades are achievable within highway land.

Regarding the consultation on the amendment, the application plans attached to members' papers have been through a full public consultation, the third such consultation on this application. These plans show the new position of the crossing. One drawing within an appendix in the Transport Statement (TS) was not updated to reflect the new arrangement and the amended TS was placed on the website once the error was uncovered.

Condition 8 of the recommendation requires further details of all highway upgrade works to be agreed prior to work commencing on site and those upgrades to be implemented prior to first occupation. This condition will be agreed in consultation with the County Council.

Officers have also secured a Section 106 financial contribution to allow OCC to carry out public consultation on the signalised crossing. Therefore, officers are satisfied appropriate safeguards are in place to ensure that a safe signalised pedestrian crossing will be provided as part of any approved scheme on this site.

Neighbour Representations

Letter from Mr Beddow received raising similar issues relating to the position of the pedestrian crossing as summarised in the Parish Council response. Key points are copied thus;

“Glanville’s Transport Statement Issue 4 drawing TR 840983/03 Rev G details the proposed adjusted carriageway width as 6.3 metres and southern verge including pavement as 3.1 metres: 9.4 metres total. The whole carriageway has to be moved 2 metres North. Tim Foxall of Glanville may make the weasel statement that this is a “minor realignment”. It is not; carriageway works at this point will have a major detriment to travel on the A417, particularly from East Hendred. Further this cannot be achieved with a “sinuous realignment”. There is no “sinuous realignment” on the drawing. The carriageway would take frontage from Portway Cottages.

Visibility to the right when emerging from Portway cottages is severely restricted. This would further reduce visibility and increase the risk of accident for their occupants.

The revised crossing position also substantially reduces the visibility of eastbound traffic to pedestrians crossing from the North and the braking distance to them. The pedestrian’s visibility to the west is also substantially decreased. Site line visibility for drivers from the west is justified using the southern crossing indicator. Should a child cross without activating and waiting for the light change, stopping would be beyond the capability of a fast west moving HGV. And who has not crossed without waiting for the crossing lights.

Referring to the Transport statement, Glanville predict 245 traffic movements per day. This is an increase to the existing daily A417 traffic flow of 2.2% on the current A417 movements per day (11140). I would further point out that the north end of Featherbed lane and the Rowstock roundabout are OCC designated traffic hot spots.”

Officer Response – Noted, these points are discussed above and in the report

Item 10 – P16/V0290/RM – Land at Besselsleigh Road, Wootton

The following consultation responses on the most recent amendment have been received subsequent to the publication of committee papers:

Wootton Parish Council

“The Parish Council welcomes the improvements made to the internal layout to address parking and the access for emergency vehicles, but is unsure if they go far enough and considers these areas will continue to pose problems. Parking places are likely to be used by the two commercial offices on the site for which no additional parking has been provided.

The Deerhurst Park development has demonstrated that real, and life endangering, problems can occur for emergency vehicles due to commercial vehicles being parked overnight.

The ground water contamination problems need to be fully addressed before any works take place

There is still a need for a roundabout at the entrance; failing this the access needs to be adapted to allow the No 4 buses to turn around. This both provides a service to the new development and avoids the present unsafe requirement for buses to turn round by reversing into Sandleigh Road.

The plots in the vicinity of the existing Thames Water Foul pumping station are within the 15m exclusion area required by Sewers for Adoption 6th Edition. This affects plots 24-26. The same plots are accessed by the existing emergency access which is substandard in width and will require widening to a minimum of 3.7m or 4.1m if it is to be adopted.

The Design and access statement highlights the need for passive surveillance in particular over the existing children's play area, an area where anti-social behaviour is already an issue. This is an opportunity to put this into practice possibly by turning plots 18/19 through 90 degrees to face this area and create a village green effect and to integrate the layout into the existing area. A window in the flank wall does not achieve the essence or genuineness of the Design and Access Statement.”

Officer Response – These concerns are noted and discussed in the report, as they have all been raised previously by the Parish Council and others. Contamination investigations are on-going as part of the associated discharge of conditions application P16/V0291/DIS.

OCC Highways

“Previous concerns regarding on-street parking, the internal junction arrangement and service vehicle access have been addressed.”

Officer Response – Noted

Forestry

“Further to my previous memos (23 March and 13 May 2016), the applicant has now largely addressed the outstanding arboricultural issues in this latest amendment. The relationship between the adjacent trees and the proposed

plots 4, 5 and 6 is acceptable and the provision of new trees across the site has increased sufficiently to ensure that there will be a long term contribution to the visual amenity for future residents.

Conditions will need to include presentation of an arboricultural method statement that successfully addresses the removal of the concrete pad and construction within the RPA of T1 as highlighted in my memo of 13 May."

Officer Response – Noted, tree protection condition attached to recommendation.

Countryside Officer

"No further comments on the amended layout."

Officer Response – Noted, ecology conditions are being discharged under reference P16/V0291/DIS

Environmental Protection Team

"I have no comments on the reserved matters"

Officer Response – Noted

Query from Councillor Johnston on site visit

During the site visit, Cllr Johnston queried whether a semi-mature Lime tree would be retained in the approved layout.

Officer Response – This tree will not be retained but this part of the site will benefit from increased planting – in particular a group of 4 Red Oak (*Quercus Rubra*). This is achieved due to the removal of the roundabout

Item 11 – P16/V0755/RM – Land adjoining Drayton Road, Milton

The following consultation responses on the most recent amendment have been received subsequent to the publication of committee papers:

OCC Highways

"The revision is considered an improvement, in highways terms over the previous proposals with a turning area inbuilt into the layout and more likely to stay parking free."

Officer Response –noted.

Neighbour Representations

The neighbour to the north of the site at Courtfield House, Drayton Road, considers the revised design to be a "mishmash of styles" and "most unattractive". He believes

the design should be more similar to the houses recently built on the eastern edge of Milton village on the Sutton Road.

Officer Response – the design approach is considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the surrounding context. The proposed palette of materials is simple to avoid a fussy appearance and officers are confident the development will not appear a ‘mishmash’. A condition relating to external materials is proposed.

Report Update – Condition 1

At Section 8.1 of the officer’s report, Condition 1 (commencement) is to be amended to read six months, not two years as started. This is to accord with the time limit set within the outline permission.

Minor revisions to plans

The applicant has submitted plans which make two minor amendments as follows:-

1. An additional window is now shown to the side of Plot 4, to provide additional overlooking of the open space area.
2. The eastern boundary of Plot 12 has been moved to provide the affordable houses on Plots 13 to 16 with larger gardens.

Officer Response – these amendments are improvements and are therefore welcomed. They will not result in any harm to residential amenity within the site. Due to the very minor nature of the changes it was not considered necessary to reconsult.

Item 12 – P16/V0721/FUL – 82 Cumnor Hill, Oxford

Update to Report

Cumnor Hill is identified as a lower density residential area within the adopted design guide. The following design guide principles also apply to the application in addition to those listed in paragraph 5.3 of the report:-

Landscape character and setting (DG76)

Landscape (DG77)

Scale form and massing (DG79)

Facades and elevations (DG80)

Boundary treatments (DG81)

Parking (DG82)

Principle DG81, Boundary Treatments, does specify that boundary separations of at least 2 – 5 metres (depending on the location) should be retained. Officers wish to correct the first sentence of paragraph 6.22 of the report in this regard. The distances from the proposed building to its boundaries is 4.5 metres to the north and 3 metres to the south. Officers consider these distances comply with the design guide.

Consultation Responses

The following consultation responses on the most recent amendment have been received subsequent to the publication of committee papers:

Cumnor Parish Council

“The minor amendments to the proposal does not address some of the Councils previous objections:

- *Although the windows on the East and West elevations are to be glazed with obscure glass, there are terraces at the third floor level infringing on the privacy of residents of 80 and 84 Cumnor Hill.*
- *The scale and mass of the proposal is not in keeping with the existing traditional Cumnor Hill properties. The Design Guide Supplementary Document states that there should be sufficient space between buildings and boundaries which Council believes is not the case. The Design Guide is a supplementary planning document which does have weight and should be taken into consideration to give a balanced view when considering the application.*
- *The Badger and Bat survey highlights the Strategy and Method Statement for the live badger setts and identifies tunnels in the garden of 82 Cumnor. The disturbance to the badgers during construction has not been addressed apart from stating that the badgers will have the ability to re-colonise the garden area when construction is completed. The Vale has an obligation to protect habitats and protected species and must ensure that the method statement be rigorously enforced if planning permission is to be granted.*
- *Council has concerns that the proposed access to the site is via a private driveway from Breeches End. There is no information as to who owns the driveway and how it will be maintained. It is proposed that the existing access is to be closed and Council would request that if permission is to be granted a condition should be set to grant right of access for 84 Cumnor Hill.*
- *Council requests that if planning permission is to be granted that construction vehicles where possible should park on site and be considerate of existing residents, pedestrians and vehicles travelling along Cumnor Hill.*

Although it would appear that the drainage issues have been addressed by the installation of an attenuation pond located at the adjacent care home. Council still has concerns that this may not be an adequate solution to the run off and surface water problems experienced on this part of the hill and request that an appropriate condition be applied.”

Officer Response –

- The proposed terraces are to be screened with 1.8m high obscure glazed balustrades to protect the privacy of neighbours. An additional condition requiring obscure glazing to be retained permanently is recommended.
- The scale and mass of the proposal is acceptable on balance given the large plot size and other similar developments approved near the site. The application has been assessed with reference to the council’s design guide.

- The applicant will need to obtain a licence from Natural England prior to works commencing to ensure badgers are safeguarded. A conditions is proposed to ensure the badger method statement is followed.
- The access road via Breeches End is owned by the care home to the rear. Ultimately the management of the access will be a private matter between the care home and the other properties that utilise that access.
- A condition for a construction traffic management plan is proposed to ensure construction traffic is considerate to neighbours and others.

Oxfordshire Badger Group

Three additional responses have been received from the Oxfordshire Badger Group. Many of the issues they have raised have been covered in the committee report. The new issues not already covered in the committee report are summarised as follows:-

- The (prior or expected) granting of development licences by Natural England (NE) should not be a factor in the Vale's decision. Natural England guidance is clear that the Planning Office is responsible for assessing the impact on badgers.
- It is not acceptable to extrapolate that because these badgers have survived successive intensely disturbing and continuing development that they will tolerate the development proposed.
- The cumulative impact of the developer's proposals is to close the main sett piecemeal and that the badgers are clinging on because they have no viable alternative. The main sett is not confined to 84 Cumnor Hill, it extends into 82 and the development will require further partial closure.
- The suggestion that it is possible to prevent significant movement, light and noise pollution by careful design is unrealistic given the expected increase in human activities.
- The artificial sett shows no sign of being used by badgers and is an irrelevance.
- The conditions proposed to protect the badgers are inadequate and they seek to pass responsibility for decision making to Natural England and the developers ecologists. If planning permission is given the badgers will be harmed. We request that the application remain on hold pending provision of a landscape proposal developed in consultation with an appropriately qualified ecologist.

Officer Response – The applicant has provided a badger survey and method statement, which accepts that there will be some short term disturbance to badgers, but states that this can be minimised by following a mitigation strategy. The council's countryside officer is satisfied the mitigation proposed is sufficient and has no objection subject to conditions. Natural England are likely to grant a licence therefore there would be no basis on which to form a planning objection to the application on the grounds of impacts to badgers. The council's countryside officer has seen the additional comments from the Oxfordshire badger group and he stands by his original comments and recommended conditions.

Highways Liaison Officer

"I reiterate comments dated 15/06/2016".

Officer Response – Noted.

Council Drainage Engineer

Had some outstanding concerns regarding groundwater impact. The applicant has recently provided additional information, which appears to address the issues raised. The drainage engineer is likely to be satisfied with the response given, however no formal response has been received yet. Members will be verbally updated on this issue at committee.

Waste Team

No objections to the revised bin store location adjacent to Cumnor Hill. Requested street elevations, which have been provided and demonstrate that refuse collection from Cumnor Hill is possible. Waste team has not commented further.

80 Cumnor Hill (neighbour to the north)

Responded again to make the following points:-

- The enormous mass of the building remains unchanged and totally unacceptable.
- The proposed development is still next to and, indeed, over the boundary of our property.
- The proposal to include an obscure screen to avoid the issue of overlooking is irrelevant, because any purchaser of the flats concerned could, for very little cost, simply replace this with standard railings.
- The artificial sett is not being used now, but it might be used in the future.
- The proposal to install a pipe to take surface water from the site to connect with the retaining pond installed for the care home would be largely ineffective, inadequate in capacity and, ultimately, simply transfer potential flooding further down the hill, where it is well known that issues already exist.

Officer Response –

- The proposed building, whilst large and significantly larger than the current house on the site, is considered acceptable given the large plot size and the size and scale of other buildings recently permitted in the area.
- The proposed building is shown to be 4.5 metres from the boundary of 80 Cumnor Hill at its closest point. The proposed bike shelter is within a metre of the boundary however this is a small structure which will not be largely not visible beyond a boundary fence and planting.
- An additional condition requiring obscure glazing to be retained in perpetuity is recommended.
- The council's drainage engineer requested information to demonstrate that the site can be effectively drained. This information has recently been provided. The drainage engineer is likely to be satisfied with the response given, however no formal response has been received yet. Members will be verbally updated on this issue at committee.

Other neighbour objections

Two additional neighbour objections have been received, which largely reiterate objections already set out in the committee report. The new issues raised are summarised as follows:-

- The Design and Access Statement is disingenuous as it describes the building as it states the building will complement the surroundings when it will destroy the natural sylvan character of the site and surrounds.
- It is disappointing to read that the Planning Officer seems to have already made up her mind about the plans as she is quoted as saying to the developer, " I am satisfied with your amendments. Also the proposed number of apartments would be acceptable in principle"
- Drainage report: if there is any risk of flooding then this is unacceptable. There are indications that the remedial work carried by Thames Water is already failing and more work needs to be done.

Officer Response –

- The Design and Access Statement submitted is adequate for the purposes of assessing the application.
- The Council has previously issued pre-application advice to the applicant regarding this proposal and in that advice the officer stated the proposal was in their opinion acceptable. The comments given were however caveated to indicate that the comments therein represent an informal opinion given without prejudice to the assessment of any future application.
- The Councils drainage engineer has requested further information to demonstrate the risks are acceptable and the applicant has provided this. The information is likely to be acceptable. Members will be updated verbally.

Additional Conditions

In response to concerns raised by the neighbour regarding the potential loss of trees and loss of privacy, two additional conditions are proposed as follows:-

1. Pre-commencement condition requiring an arboricultural method statement to ensure the protection of trees on the site during construction.
2. Obscure glazing to be provided and permanently retained.

Item 13 – P16/V0234/O – Springfield Farm, Bullockspit Lane, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor

Updates

Planning history

Members are advised that planning history noted in the committee report does not apply to the site in question but has been automatically pulled through by the GIS system as it is in close proximity.

Correction to affordable housing

Paragraph 6.15 of the committee report refers to 35% of the dwellings being affordable, and paragraph 6.16 indicates that this would be 10 units.

This is incorrect. The correct figure is 9 units, and this has been agreed with the agent for the application as being acceptable. This would be split 75% rented and 25% intermediate, as stated in the report.

Housing mix

The housing mix set out at paragraph 6.17 is incorrect; the correct proposed market mix is:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	Total
Proposed	0	2	5	8	15
SHMA Expectation	1	3	6	5	15

The change is minor – one additional two bed and one less three bed. Officers remain of the opinion that the proposed mix is acceptable, as it helps to keep the lower density nature of the area and will retain the sense of spaciousness, which is a key characteristic of this part of the village.

Drainage conditions

Thames Water has commented on the application to indicate that with the information provided in the application, they have been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this application. They recommend that a Grampian style condition is imposed.

In a statement submitted with the application, Thames Water confirm in a letter dated 7 March 2016 that no off-site maintenance works are necessary, nor are any diversionary works.

Therefore contrary to the committee report at paragraph 6.33, Thames Water have not identified a potential inability for the existing waste water system to accommodate the proposal or a lack of capacity in the sewer system.

The conditions requiring a drainage strategy to be submitted (conditions 9 and 10) are still considered to be reasonable and necessary to condition given that while capacity is not in question, a fully detailed scheme has not been submitted to the approval of the council's drainage engineer or Thames Water.

The council's drainage engineer has also required the conditions be attached.

Public open space

A contribution for the maintenance of the public open space is not required because a management company will be set up by the applicant/developers to manage the open spaces – which will be secured via the S106 legal agreement.

The contribution in the table at paragraph 6.55 is therefore included incorrectly and should be omitted. The correct table is as follows:

Vale of White Horse District Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
Public Art contribution	£7,500
Waste collection	£4, 250
Outdoor Tennis	£2,525
Youth Sport	£1,398
Indoor bowls	£1,401
Oxfordshire County Council	
A420 Bus Route	£25,000
Primary Education	£93,891
Parish	
Replacement scout hut	£10,000
Bus shelter	£3,000
TOTAL	£148,965

Item 14 – P15/V2397/FUL – The Barn Park Farm, East Challow, Wantage

There are no updates for this item.

Item 15 – P16/V0982/FUL – 13 Cumnor Hill, Oxford

There are no updates for this item.