

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 27 July 2016 at 6.30

pm

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



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Sandy Lovatt (Chairman), Janet Shelley (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Stuart Davenport, Debby Hallett (In place of Catherine Webber), Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Dudley Hoddinott (In place of Bob Johnston), Monica Lovatt, Ben Mabbett and Chris McCarthy

Officers: Emily Hamerton, Susan Harbour, Penny Silverwood and Stuart Walker

Also present: Councillor Matthew Barber

Number of members of the public: 40

PI.53 Chairman's announcements

There was no chairman elected at the start of the meeting, so the clerk called for the election of a chairman.

Councillor Sandy Lovatt was proposed and seconded as the chairman, and was unanimously voted in by the committee.

Councillor Sandy Lovatt thanked the committee for voting him as the chairman. He also thanked Councillors Robert Sharp (the previous chairman) and Roger Cox (the Cabinet member for planning) for their many years of service on the planning committee, as they had now stepped down to pursue other roles within the council.

There was now a vacancy for the vice chairman of the committee (a role previously occupied by Councillor Sandy Lovatt). Councillor Janet Shelley was proposed and seconded and voted in (unanimously) as vice chairman.

The chairman reminded the committee that the media were present at the meeting and were filming. They had been asked to focus on the participants, but anyone not wishing to be filmed was advised to leave the room.

The chairman outlined the role of the committee and expected behaviours from the public and councillors, and gave housekeeping announcements.

Items 11 and 12 would be heard in reverse order.

The chairman outlined the new way of debating motions: after all of the public speakers, he would look for a motion from the floor to be proposed and seconded. The committee would then debate this item.

PI.54 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

Apologies were received from councillors Catherine Webber and Bob Johnston. Councillors Debby Hallett and Dudley Hoddinott were their substitutes.

PI.55 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations

Item 15: Jenny Hannaby would leave the room as she owned the application site.

PI.56 Minutes

RESOLVED

To adopt the minutes of the committee held on 6 July 2016 and agree that the chairman sign them as a correct record.

PI.57 Urgent business

None.

PI.58 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications

The speakers list was tabled at the meeting.

PI.59 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters

None.

PI.60 Materials

None.

PI.61 P15/V1304/O - Land at former Didcot A Power Station, Purchase Road, Didcot

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V1304/O. This is a mixed use redevelopment comprising up to 400 dwellings (C3), 110,000ms of Class B2/B8 units, 25,000m² of Class B1 units, 13,000m² Class A1 units (includes 1,500m² convenience food store), 150 bed Class C1 hotel and 500m² of Class A3/A4 pub/restaurant, including link road, related open space, landscaping and drainage infrastructure, together with reservation of land for link road and Science Bridge. This is a

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

major cross boundary application between Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire for a mixed use site.

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

Both Sutton Courtenay Parish Council and Didcot Town Council had objected.

The application is for outline development and access to the site with all other matters being reserved.

Update: paragraph 6.69 correction, updated in the addendum report.

This is not a site under the current local plan but is proposed under the emerging local plan.

The officers had agreed a 32 percent affordable housing rate with the applicant to effect viability.

James Hicks (Pegasus Group) the agent for the application spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Janet Shelley, one of the ward members, spoke to support the views of Harwell Parish Council.

The committee asked the officers matters of clarification.

- Housing and employment needs were worked up through the local plan, and were not specific to this application.
- Issues of cycle and road network would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage, but county council highways department were content with the outline highways proposals.
- There is no plan for a development forum.
- The proposed science bridge is not required particularly for this site.
- Air quality: the railway would be electrified and there were conditions to protect residents in terms of noise protection and mitigation and a site wide construction environmental management plan. Environmental health officers are satisfied with the conditions.
- The housing will be general market housing with the 32 percent affordable housing.
- Contaminated land investigation: the developers are currently confident of the clean up costs and, therefore, the viability costs.

A motion was proposed and seconded to accept the officer's recommendation.

The committee debated the motion and raised the following:

- This is on a brownfield site.
- The balance of housing compared to the number of people employed on the site.
- SHMA number includes housing requirements for economic growth.
- This development is contained within the emerging local plan.
- It is a in a sustainable location.

- The importance of the science bridge was raised.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To delegate the authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning subject to:

1. Referral to National Casework Unit.
2. A section 106 Agreement to deliver the infrastructure package.
3. The following key conditions (others may be added or removed).
 - i. Approval of reserved matters.
 - ii. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.
 - iii. Time limit for implementation.
 - iv. Approved plans and documents.
 - v. Environmental statement.
 - vi. Site wide construction environmental management plan.
 - vii. Sample materials required (all uses).
 - viii. Biodiversity enhancement strategy.
 - ix. Update surveys before any phase of development.
 - x. Phasing plan to be submitted.
 - xi. Tree protection.
 - xii. Proposed building levels.
 - xiii. Noise protection.
 - xiv. Noise mitigation.
 - xv. Hours of operation details.
 - xvi. Contaminated land investigation and remediation.
 - xvii. Verification of remediation.
 - xviii. Culverted watercourse.
 - xix. SUDS.
 - xx. Foul drainage.
 - xxi. Water supply.
 - xxii. 22 – 25. Retail use restrictions.
 - xxiii. Ventilation of A3 use.
 - xxiv. Boundary treatment provision prior to occupation.
 - xxv. Connection links prior to occupation of final unit.
 - xxvi. Restriction on outside storage.
 - xxvii. Community employment plan.

PI.62 P15/V2887FUL - Land off School Road, West Hanney, Wantage

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V2887/FUL for the erection of 15 dwellings and associated works (as amended by drawings and information accompanying agent's email of 22 March 2016 and further amended by location, site and landscaping plan drawings 2925.100B, 101D, 102F, 113A and 115B and design and access addendum received 31 March 2016 and as clarified by updated flood risk assessment accompanying agent's email of 23 June 2016) on land off School Road, West Hanney, Wantage.

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

Chris Surman, representative of West Hanney Parish Council spoke objecting to the application. His points included the following:

- The entrance to the development is not safe.
- There are few facilities in the village.
- The school is over subscribed.
- Footpaths proposed are inadequate.
- There is a risk of coalescence between East and West Hanney.

Trevor Page spoke objecting to the application, his points included the following:

- Visual domination of existing properties.
- Density is too great for the surrounding context.
- Buffer zones are inadequate.
- Did not believe that proper processes had been followed.
- Creating anxiety amongst existing residents.

Ken Dijksman, agent for the applicant, spoke in favour of this application; his points included the following:

- Low density, modest scheme on the edge of the village which would not harm the character, form or density of the village.
- Scale is in keeping with the settlement.
- Facilities: very close to primary school and close to a larger village give it good sustainability credentials.
- Environmental impact will not be materially harmful on the greater landscape and will not lead to coalescence with East Hanney.
- Six affordable houses of which two would be shared equity.

Matthew Barber, the ward councillor, spoke in objection to the application; his points included the following:

- The school is full even though close by, this will put additional pressure on it.
- The character is relevant, the access road moves closer to East Hanney, residents risk a phase 2 based on the layout.
- The density is greater than elsewhere in the village.
- Poor use of land when considering the access road.
- Would make a very small contribution to meeting housing need.

The committee asked questions of clarification to the officers, and received responses:

- Affordable housing is only 35 percent, not 40 percent as the most recent evidence base suggests that 35 percent is supportable and sustainable.
- The primary school is full, but the county council believe that it can be expanded on the current site.
- Registered housing providers prefer to have properties on smaller plots together for ease of management.
- The rest of the field is also owned by the developer and could be subject to a further application which would be judged on its own merits.
- Ridge height made the properties more visible, but the design access statement would have looked at the context of the local village and would confirm the approach taken.

- Officers do not formally minute every meeting with developers but the outcomes are summarised in emails.
- This is a minor contribution to the 5 year housing land supply, but there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. And there is not “significant and demonstrable harm” in a district which doesn’t have a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply.

A motion, to approve the officer’s recommendation was moved and seconded and put before the committee for discussion:

- The development is minor and there were not strong grounds for approving it.
- Coalescence between East and West Hanney
- Plot sizes do not relate to the current area and has a negative impact on the character of the housing.
- No school places locally and no contributions to that.
- Officers report says that the harm cannot be mitigated by financial contributions.
- Footpaths and roads are inadequate.
- The affordable housing is contrary to our existing policies as it is not fully integrated with the other housing and it can easily be identified from the rest of the site.
- Difficult to distribute housing across smaller sites.
- The issue of school places has been undermined by the county council’s position on this.

RESOLVED (For 5; against 3, abstentions 2)

To delegate the authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the head of planning subject to:

1. A S106 agreement being entered into with both the county council and district council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
2. Conditions as follows:
 - i. Commencement within one year.
 - ii. Approved plans.
 - iii. Highway works to be agreed – including provision of pedestrian crossing.
 - iv. Internal road layout specification to be agreed.
 - v. Car parking to be agreed.
 - vi. Slab levels for all dwellings to be agreed.
 - vii. Sample materials to be agreed.
 - viii. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
 - ix. Travel information pack to be agreed.
 - x. Sustainable urban drainage scheme to be agreed.
 - xi. Landscaping scheme to be agreed – hard and soft – including link to footpath.
 - xii. Implementation of landscaping scheme as stated.
 - xiii. Boundary details to be agreed.
 - xiv. Bicycle parking and bin storage to be agreed.
 - xv. Ecology mitigation measures to be agreed.
 - xvi. Visibility splays as specified.
 - xvii. Turning space as approved.
 - xviii. No drainage to highway.

- xix. Garage accommodation to be retained.
- xx. Obscured glazing and fan light only in first floor window of Plot 6.

PI.63 P16/V0635/FUL - Land adjacent to Church Farm, West Hanney

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V0635/FUL for the demolition of an existing building and the erection of 11 dwellings with associated outbuildings and access.

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

Chis Surman, from the parish council, spoke in objection to this application

Matthew Barber, the ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application as it would not be feasible now that the previous application had been granted.

The committee asked questions to the officer and received responses.

- There was no obligations on developers to make their properties accessible to the disabled, but officers had regard to relevant legislation.
- There is no outright definition of small scale development within the village as it relates to the size of the village in which it is sited.
- The highway officer has no objections to this level of development.

The following motion was proposal and seconded:

To refuse the application having regards to the established and spacious character of the area, the location and design and the number of units which would represent a cramped and denser form of development which would be out of keeping and detrimental to the character of the area. The development would be contrary to Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan 2011, Policy 37 of the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Design Guide 2015.

The committee debated the motion.

RESOLVED

To support the motion as put (6 for, 4 against, 0 abstentions).

PI.64 P16/V0637/FUL - Land adjacent to Church Farm, West Hanney

The officer presented the report and the addendum on application P16/V0637/FUL for the demolition of an existing building and the erection of eight dwellings with associated outbuildings and access at Land adjacent to Church Farm, West Hanney.

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

Chris Surman from West Hanney Parish Council spoke in favour of the application, he considered that it was not out of character with the village

- A piece of wild flower woodland would be passed to the parish council and used as a wild nature area.

- The site was not considered suitable for affordable housing and felt that the benefit of a commuted sum of £400K for offsite housing was more suitable.

Katherine Jones from Kemp and Kemp the agents spoke in favour of the application

- The proposed development would provide much needed housing for the district, plus the 7.5 acres of land to the village and the commuted sum for offsite housing.

Matthew Barber, the ward member, spoke in favour of the application.

Alison Trowel spoke in favour of the application.

The committee asked questions of clarification to officers and received responses:

- It was acceptable to accept the commuted sum of money in lieu of affordable housing in exceptional circumstances in line with the NPPF.
- The gift of land to the parish council has not been given weight in this application and the vale has no policy on it, and the NPPF is silent.
- There is no restriction on where the affordable housing can be placed when the commuted sum is given.
- The “exceptional circumstances” relate to the character of the area.
- £400,000 should be equivalent to 3 affordable units.

A motion was proposed and seconded to grant planning permission, contrary to the officers’ recommendation, but with conditions to secure the open land as offered by the developer and the commuted sum of £400,000, as a payment equivalent to affordable housing provision on site. Also to add the following conditions and to delegate to the Head of Planning the s106 agreements which would secure the commuted sum and the land.

This would give added benefit to the community.

The committee debated the motion.

RESOLVED (7 for, 3 against, 0 abstentions)

To support the motion as put: to grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Slab levels to be submitted.
4. Details of materials, including boundary walls and hard landscaping to be submitted.
5. Landscaping/planting to be implemented.
6. Retention of existing hedgerow.
7. Tree protection to be implemented.
8. Boundary details to north and west with neighbouring properties to be submitted.
9. Wildlife protection- recommendations of habitat and bat survey implemented.
10. Wildlife protection - orchard creation scheme to be submitted.
11. Archaeology – preparation of written scheme of investigation.
12. Archaeology – implementation of scheme.
13. Access, parking, visitor parking, footpath links, turning to be implemented.
14. Bicycle storage to be implemented.
15. Construction traffic management plan to be submitted.
16. Travel information pack to be submitted.
17. Surface water drainage details to be submitted.
18. Foul drainage details to be submitted.

19. Garage accommodation to be retained for parking at all times.

PI.65 P16/V0531/FUL - Land to the south of Longcot Road and to the east of Silver Street, Fernham

The officer presented the report and the addendum on application P16/V0531/FUL for a change of use of land to public open space, allotments and a community orchard and the construction of four new family dwellings on land to the south of Longcot Road and to the east of Silver Street, Fernham.

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

Paul Butt, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the development; his points included the following:

- The development would make a small but positive contribution to the five year housing land supply and is sustainable, partly by being close to Faringdon.
- The maintenance could be conditioned.
- The application would enhance the village and follows discussions with the Parish Meeting.

The committee asked the officers questions of clarification, and received responses:

- Bin collection arrangements had yet to be resolved and needed to be conditioned.
- The Parish Meeting is in support of the scheme.
- The "Milk Path" was being conditioned to remain and be maintained in its current format.

A motion was proposed and seconded to support the officers' recommendation to grant planning permission.

The committee debated this motion.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to commence within three years of the decision date.
2. Development to accord with approved plans.
3. Access, parking and turning to accord with approved plans.
4. Visibility splays to remain unobstructed.
5. No temporary obstructions of public rights of way.
6. No route alterations to public rights of way.
7. No construction access across public rights of way.
8. No residential access across public rights of way.
9. Gates to be set back from public rights of way.
10. Improvements to the public rights of way.
11. Details to be submitted: Landscaping scheme – hardstanding and boundaries.
12. Details to be submitted: External material and finishes.
13. Details to be submitted: External lighting.
14. Details to be submitted: Drainage strategy for Thames Water (Grampian).
15. Details to be submitted: Sustainable drainage scheme.
16. Pertains to waste collection from the highway. The condition requests the applicant indicates where the bins will be stored on collection day. This will enable

officers to ascertain the implications of additional waste bins left for collection adjacent to the highway.

17. Relates to the management and maintenance of the land. The condition requests that, prior to the commencement of development, the applicant provides details of:
- The design and layout of the public open space, allotments and community orchard;
 - The management of the land and who will undertake this; and
 - Maintenance arrangements for the future.

PI.66 P16/V0117/FUL - 76 West Way, Botley, Oxford

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V0117/FUL to retain the first floor flat and to convert the ground floor into residential use. To raise the single storey element in height to accommodate two flats with 1.5 storeys. To remove existing garaging and reconfigure car parking at 76 West Way Botley, Oxford.

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

This item has come to committee because of neighbour objections, not the parish council objections as stated in the original report as the parish council support the application.

Councillor Debby Hallett, the local ward member, spoke in favour of the application, but raised concerns about the minimalistic amount of community space, and the impact on the next door resident who would be overlooked.

Members of committee asked the officers questions of clarification and the responses are below:

- No permitted development rights for the flats.
- The landscaping condition can cover the boundary treatments on the land to the front (south-east elevation) in order to prevent parking in this location.

A motion, proposed and seconded, to support the officer's recommendation was put before the committee.

The committee debated this item.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – development to commencement within three years of permission.
2. Approved plans – development to be completed in accordance with approved plans.
3. Materials in accordance with application – use of materials to be as shown on plan.
4. Permitted development restriction on dwellings – extensions and outbuildings – restriction of Part 1, Class A, B, C, D and E of general permitted development order.
5. Rooflight sill height - not less than 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the rooms in which they are fitted.
6. Boundary details – details of internal and external treatments to be submitted for approval.

7. Landscaping at the front of the property – as amended to include boundary details.

PI.67 P16/V117/FUL - Old Yeomanry House, 27 Wallingford Street, Wantage

Councillor Jenny Hannaby left the meeting.

The officer presented the report on application P16/V1171/FUL for a change of use. Changing property from C1 to residential (family home).

Listed building matters would be subject to a separate application.

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

It came to the committee's attention that the Red Cross shop appears on the plans and should not do, as it would be giving permission for the Red Cross shop to have a change of use. The planning officer suggested that this item was deferred for the site boundary to be changed.

A motion, moved and seconded for approval, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To defer this application and seek further clarification on site boundary and to bring it back to committee at the earliest opportunity.

PI.68 P16/V0955/HH - Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course, Carswell

The officer presented the report on application P16/V0955/HH to erect new one bed guest accommodation and walling at Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course.

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.

There were no public speakers for this item.

A motion, moved and seconded for approval, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To authorise the head of planning to grant planning permission, in consultation with the chairman of the committee, subject to:

1. A S106 agreement being entered into with the district council in order to secure that the ancillary accommodation hereby approved is retained as such; and
2. Conditions as follows:
 - i. Commencement three years.

- ii. Approved plans.
- iii. Materials in accordance with the application.

Informative:

This planning permission needs to be read in conjunction with an agreement made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This agreement will take effect when the planning permission is implemented.

PI.69 P16/V0922/HH and P16/V0923/LB - Beaulieu Court Cottage, Sunningwell, Abingdon

The officer presented the report on application numbers P16/V0922/HH and P16/V0923/LB for:

1. Extensive repairs to single storey roofs
2. Repair and make good main roof where necessary
3. Remove slender chimney stack to southern single storey lean to.
4. Insertion of 2 x conservation roof lights to the east lean to.
5. Removal of cement render to internal walls of the ground floor.

Further amended plans received since the addendum report to confirm that a larger portion of the chimney stack would be retained.

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

A motion, proposed and seconded for approval, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

To grant planning permission for application P16/V0922/HH subject to the receipt of amended plans and subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development – three years.
2. List of approved plans.
3. Details of the capping of the lowered chimney stack.
4. External materials in accordance with the application.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

Subject to the receipt of amended plans, to grant listed building consent, for application P16/V0923/LB, subject to the following conditions

1. Commencement of development – three years.
2. List of approved plans.
3. Details of the capping of the lowered chimney stack and of the new internal lime plaster mix.
4. External materials in accordance with the application.

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm