

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday 28 September 2016 at 6.30 pm  
in 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, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Monica Lovatt, Ben Mabbett, Chris McCarthy and Catherine Webber

Officers: Holly Bates, Peter Brampton, Katie Cook, Steve Culliford, Sarah Green, Emily Hamerton and Penny Silverwood

Also present: Councillor Mike Murray

Number of members of the public: 47

### **PI.110 Chairman's announcements**

The chairman advised of the procedure to be followed and of emergency evacuation arrangements.

### **PI.111 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence**

None

### **PI.112 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations**

Councillor Anthony Hayward declared a pecuniary interest in application P16/V0955/HH at Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course, Buckland, as he was the applicant's agent.

Councillors Jenny Hannaby and Bob Johnston both declared that they knew Mr Dijkman, the applicant's agent speaking to application P15/V2560/FUL on land east of Portway Cottages, Reading Road, East Hendred, as Mr Dijkman was a former council employee.

### **PI.113 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to adopt as correct records the minutes of the committee meetings held on 3 and 17 August 2016 and agree that the chairman signs them as such, subject to minute PI.94 from 17 August 2016 relating to The Manor Preparatory School, Faringdon Road, Shippon being amended in paragraph seven to read 'Councillor Catherine Webber, the local ward member, put forward issues relating to this application but spoke neither in favour nor against it.'

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 28 September 2016

**PI.1**

## **PI.114 Urgent business**

None

## **PI.115 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications**

The chairman referred to the list of public speakers tabled at the meeting.

## **PI.116 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters**

Dair Farrar Hockley made a statement on two procedural points. Firstly, he believed that the committee's minutes were not detailed enough and had not included a number of points when the application at East Hendred had previously been discussed. Secondly, he believed that all parties that showed an interest in a planning application should be consulted, including a parish council neighbouring an application site. He asked the chairman to give these points further consideration.

## **PI.117 P15/V2560/FUL - Land to the east of Portway Cottages, Reading Road, East Hendred**

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P15/V2560/FUL for 46 dwellings on land to the east of Portway Cottages, Reading Road, East Hendred.

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. Updating the report, following the response by Thames Water, the officer recommended an additional condition requiring a drainage strategy.

John Sharp, a representative of East Hendred Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The proposed development would disproportionately extend the village to the north into the open countryside changing the character of the area
- This would have an impact on the landscape and harm the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, eliminating views from the A417
- With development of the adjacent site there would be continuous development north of the A417 eastwards along to Featherbed Lane
- The previous two developments were allowed by a planning inspector on appeal, but this site had a different nature
- The pedestrian footway along the A417 was unsafe

Mark Beddow spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The A417 was used by heavy goods vehicles and this made using the footpath and crossing unsafe
- The sight lines westwards from the site access over the frontage of Portway Cottages
- He questioned the acceptability of this development

Tim Roberts spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 28 September 2016

- The council was very close to achieving a five-year housing land supply and this application should not be approved
- Approving the application could lead to judicial review of the decision; the council should follow its own local plan, which excluded this site from development
- The Planning service had a duty to serve the public

Dair Farrar Hockley spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The majority of local people objected to this application
- Serious shortcomings had been identified in the report to the committee's last meeting
- Road safety concerns were sufficient to refuse this application
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act said that building in a location that adversely affected an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was sufficient reason to refuse an application
- He questioned why the committee could only give little weight to its local plan when it was published on the council's website

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

- Land south of the A417 was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and, therefore, the proposed development to the north of the A417 was a more suitable location for housing
- This was a visually contained site and would not cause real harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- The applicant had tried to overcome the objections and issues raised at the last meeting: a road safety audit had revealed that the access to the site was safe and the crossing deliverable; garden sizes were acceptable and the apartment block had been removed
- The landscape buffer along the northern boundary would be a mixture of indigenous species, the same as on the site to the west

Councillor Mike Murray, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The local plan was emerging but was at a significant stage
- Once the local plan inspector confirmed his acceptance of part 1 of the plan, this would give the council a seven-year housing land supply
- The inspector's confirmation was expected soon and, therefore, the local plan should be given more weight
- This site in the open countryside did not meet the local plan's long term strategy
- It would adversely affect the character and appearance of the landscape and have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Officers responded to the committee's questions:

- The council did not have a five-year housing land supply until the local plan inspector confirmed his acceptance of part 1 of the plan and the council formally adopted it
- The officer's report set out the material considerations the committee should take into account
- The application at Greensands was refused on landscape impact grounds but the committee had to consider each application on its merits, balancing benefits against harm
- In the emerging local plan this was an unallocated site

- Affordable housing was grouped in one location in the proposed development but this was not considered a matter that warranted objection by officers
- The county highways team had not objected to this application

A motion, moved and seconded to refuse the application was put to the meeting on the grounds that the site was an extension of the village into the open countryside and would have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. While the motion received some support, other committee members believed that the reasons for deferring the application on 6 July 2016—to allow the applicant to address the design and amenity issues and clarify the arrangements for the pedestrian crossing and visibility for Portway Cottages—had been overcome. Following the debate, the motion to refuse the application was declared lost on being put to the vote.

A motion was then moved and seconded to delegate authority to approve the application in line with the officer's recommendation. This was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the head of planning to approve application P15/V2560/FUL subject to:

- (a) a Section 106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
- (b) conditions as follows:
  1. Commencement three years.
  2. Approved plans.
  3. Slab levels for all dwellings to be agreed.
  4. Samples of all materials to be agreed.
  5. Boundary details to be agreed.
  6. Landscaping scheme to be agreed.
  7. Tree protection to be agreed.
  8. Off-site highway works to be agreed.
  9. Travel information pack to be agreed.
  10. Construction traffic management.
  11. Sustainable urban drainage scheme to be agreed.
  12. Bicycle parking and bin storage to be agreed.
  13. Archaeology written scheme of investigation to be agreed.
  14. Programme of archaeology mitigation to be agreed.
  15. Noise assessment and mitigation to be agreed.
  16. Windows in western elevation of Plot 17 to be agreed.
  17. Landscaping scheme implementation.
  18. Access and visibility splays as approved.
  19. Parking as approved.
  20. Roads and footpaths prior to occupation.
  21. Hours of work.
  22. No drainage to highway.
  23. No first floor windows in western elevation of Plots 1 & 11.
  24. Foul Drainage strategy to be approved.

## **PI.118 P16/V1243/O - Land north of Manor Close, Chilton**

Councillor Janet Shelley stood down from the committee as she was one of the local ward members.

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1243/O for 18 dwellings with access, car parking, areas for landscaping and other associated works on land north of Manor Close, Chilton.

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. The officer reported that a tree preservation order had been served to protect the trees around the outside of the site.

Chris Broad, a representative of Chilton Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- This should be classified as a 'major' development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- The local plan adoption was imminent and the council would soon have a seven-year housing land supply
- The would have a significant adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- The western edge of the historic part of the village had an equine character, with many fields being used as paddocks, as this site had been; this development would change that
- This would increase the housing stock in the historic part of the village by 5 per cent

Peter Oliver spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- Since the last permission on this site had lapsed, the circumstances had changed
- Chilton was a small downland village suitable only for minor infill development; this was a 'major' development
- It was outside of the village curtain and would intrude on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- The application was for more homes than had previously been permitted on this site
- The council would soon have a seven-year housing land supply
- This site was adjacent to areas that had previously flooded and would worsen problems with the local sewerage system

Henry Venners, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- Chilton had greater connectivity now with the A34 junction improvements
- This site previously had planning permission for housing
- The site was screened by trees from the A34 and views from the Ridgeway
- New homes were needed
- The design guide had been followed
- The scheme was for 18 homes, some smaller than the 15 homes previously permitted

Councillor Janet Shelley, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application, relaying the concerns expressed by the previous ward member to the earlier application in 2015:

- The site was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and outside the settlement boundary
- The planning officer had said the proposal was contrary to the local plan but the council had no five-year housing land supply

- Only in exceptional circumstances should there be development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- This would be a 'major' development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- There had been concerns over the density of the earlier proposal; the latest application would have an even higher density
- There was no room for open space

Officers responded to the committee's questions:

- An appeal inspector would consider planning policy relevant at the time of his decision, not at the time of the committee's decision
- 18 homes could be accommodated on the site within the design guide's parameters
- This was not considered a 'major' site in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with comparison to the application at Lower Road, Chilton that was for 40 homes and was the subject of a recent appeal, as the Lower Road site had a greater impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and was considered by officers to be major development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- The parish council's response to its requirements for the section 106 agreement had not been received at the time but negotiations would take place subsequent to the meeting if the application were approved

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application was put to the meeting and was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the head of planning to approve application P16/V1243/O subject to:

- (a) a Section 106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
- (b) conditions as follows:
  1. Reserved matters for landscaping submitted within 18 months, commencement 6 months after approval.
  2. Approved plans.
  3. Sample materials to be agreed.
  4. Sample panel of wall materials to be agreed.
  5. Tree protection to be agreed.
  6. Access and visibility splays to be agreed.
  7. Traffic calming on estate roads to be agreed.
  8. Car parking to be agreed.
  9. Turning space to be agreed.
  10. Bicycle parking to be agreed.
  11. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
  12. Travel information pack to be agreed.
  13. Sustainable urban drainage to be agreed.
  14. Foul drainage strategy to be agreed.
  15. Refuse storage to be agreed.
  16. Biodiversity enhancement to be agreed.
  17. Noise protection as agreed.
  18. New estate roads to highway authority specification.
  19. Obscured glazed first floor window – east elevation of Plot 12.
  20. Garage accommodation to be retained.
  21. No drainage to highway.

## **PI.119 P16/V0446/FUL - Crossroads Garage, Faringdon Road, Southmoor**

Councillor Eric Batts stood down from the committee as he was the local ward member.

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V0446/FUL for the demolition of Crossroads Garage showroom and sales offices, retaining workshops at the rear, with one being altered to act as new reception/office, and for a new local supermarket with associated storage/office space, plant, refuse area and parking, four flats above the supermarket with associated amenity space and shared refuse/bike storage, all on land at Crossroads Garage, Faringdon Road, Southmoor.

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. Updating the report, the officer reported that a traffic regulation order could be made to control parking on site, if the committee required.

Brian Forster, a representative of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the village environment and scene
- The design did not respect the old cottage opposite and was out of keeping with the village
- There would be a shortfall of parking on site that could lead to traffic problems at an already busy crossroads
- Air conditioning units would mean noise disturbance to nearby residents
- The increased opening hours compared to the former use would give rise to long hours of disturbance for local residents
- This was the wrong location for the proposed development

Patrina Effer and Sarah Lewis spoke objecting to the application, their concerns included:

- The proposed development was contrary to local plan policies DC1, DC5, DC9, and DC20
- It was too large, out of keeping with the street scene, and detrimental to the village's street scene
- The parking arrangements and deliveries gave rise to safety concerns
- The crossroads was already a hazardous junction, this development could make it worse
- The extra hours of operation at the site could result in noise disturbance for local residents
- There would be overlooking of adjacent property from the first floor flats
- Lighting of the site would have an adverse effect of the character of the area

Councillor Eric Batts, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- A supermarket was not a suitable use for this site, located next to a busy crossroads, and would bring increased traffic to the junction
- The design was also inappropriate in this location and out of keeping with the village

Officers responded to the committee's questions:

- Each application should be considered on its merits in the context of its design and surroundings
- If the committee was opposed to the design due to the building's height or location, the application should be refused, not deferred to negotiate a different design that would substantially change the proposal
- The hours of operation were suggested by the council's Environmental Heath team and were in line with similar uses elsewhere in the district
- The county highways team had not objected to the application nor suggested any pedestrian crossing

Contrary to the officer's recommendation, a motion, moved and seconded to refuse the application was put on the grounds that the application was contrary to policy DC1 due to its design and impact on the surrounding area as well as not being in keeping with the council's design guide. The motion was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse application P16/V0446/FUL for the following reason:

"That having regard to the scale, mass, contemporary design, and prominent corner location, the proposed building would be incongruous with the surrounding development. It would result in a visually harmful development that would be inappropriate and not sympathetic to the established character of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan 2011, policy 37 (design and local distinctiveness) of the emerging Local Plan 2031 Part1, and advice in the Design Guide 2015."

### **PI.120 P16/V0955/HH - Metisse House, Carswell Golf Course, Buckland**

Councillor Anthony Hayward declared a pecuniary interest and left the meeting during consideration of this application as he was the applicant's agent.

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

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.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application was put to the meeting and declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to approve application P16/V0955/HH subject to the following conditions and informative:

1. Commencement three years.
2. Approved plans.
3. Materials in accordance with the application.

Informative:

As outlined within the description of development and the associated documentation submitted with the application, the additional residential accommodation is to be used only as ancillary annexe accommodation to the main house. Planning permission would be required to use the accommodation as a separate dwelling.



## PI.121 P16/V1101/FUL - Horseshoe Cottage, Bourton

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1101/FUL for the change of use and alteration to form holiday accommodation at Horseshoe Cottage, Bourton.

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.

Bob Buckley spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The design of the proposal included a glass frontage and increased height that would lead to a loss of privacy to his and other properties
- There would be a sunlight reflection from the glazed surfaces
- Bourton was a hamlet with no facilities
- Could the applicant guarantee access to the neighbour's property and emergency access?
- It would cause harm to the visual amenity of his property and the Conservation Area
- The siting of gas tanks could create a fire risk blocking the neighbour's only means of escape

Helen Sanderson, the applicant, spoke in support of the application:

- As a holiday let property, the use of the site would be reduced
- There was parking on site for two cars and turning space for one car
- The design was sympathetic to its surroundings and respected the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- There would be no over-shadowing or over-dominance
- The design could be reviewed to prevent overlooking

The Democratic Services Officer read the joint statement submitted by Councillors Simon Howell and Elaine Ware, the local ward members, objecting to the application. Their concerns included:

- The conversion to a two-storey holiday let would increase the height of the building and cause overshadowing, particularly to No6 The Almshouses, which would be most affected by the side wall
- The front of the building would be replaced by a fully-glazed façade that would not be in keeping with its surroundings
- Parking problems would also increase as the allocated area was tight

A motion, moved and seconded to defer consideration of the application was put to the meeting to allow for a re-design of the proposal to stop overlooking to neighbouring property. The motion was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to defer consideration of application P16/V1101/FUL to allow for a re-design of the proposal to stop overlooking of neighbouring property.

The meeting closed at 10.45 pm