

Planning Committee

22 March 2017

Addendum Report

Item 6 – P16/V0254/FUL – East West, All Saints Lane, Sutton Courtenay

Additional Plans

An additional section plan was submitted by the agent for the application and this has been circulated to the parish council and neighbours, and is on the council's website.

Additional representation

A neighbour (from Slidery Beg) who will speak at the meeting has written to councillors to make further detailed comments. The additional representation states:

“Dear Councillor,

On Wednesday, you will be considering the revised planning application P16/V0254/FUL. This includes a request for retrospective permission for Bund A, which surrounds half of our property, and stands as close as 4 metres from our bungalow. We are contacting you because we are very concerned that your site visit has not included viewing of the terrible impact of Bund A on our residential amenity (despite our requests to the Planning Officer that you should visit our house), and because important information may not be clear from the submitted application and Planning Officer's report:

- Bunds do NOT benefit from deemed consent under GPDO 2015 (Class A, Part 2, Schedule 2). Refused appeals have legally established that they are NOT minor operations for enclosure comparable to gates, fences, or walls (Shoreham 11/03/2014: APP/Y9507/X/13/2202668; Chelmsford 09/02/2012: APP/Z1585/C/11/2162125).
- Bund A is higher than the claimed 2 metres (c. 230 cm to the north of our house).
- Bund A is still topped by a laurel hedge with the potential to exceed 10 metres in height. In summer, vegetation on the bund has already exceeded 6 metres in height.
- Bund A is closer to the boundary than the depicted 50 cm. It is mostly directly against the party fence, and in places is flowing through it.
- The sides of Bund A are even steeper than depicted. This, in combination with the proximity to the fence, makes maintenance impossible.
- The Vale's Drainage Engineer DOES object to Bund A. His submitted report states: 'There is a high likelihood of runoff of rainwater (and with it potentially loose material) from a bank of such a height and steepness, adversely affecting the properties here'. Our garden is now regularly waterlogged, leading to previously non-existent problems with moss.
- The Vale's Landscape Officer originally objected to Bund A because of the unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties from the 'height, appearance and density of this bund', describing it as 'out of character with the local rural edge character' (DC1, DC6, DC9). Since the revised plans do not change the shape of Bund A, this objection must stand. It is incomprehensible that elsewhere on the site, the maximal recommended height for bunds is around 1 metre, and yet 2.30 metres is being proposed for approval just 4 metres from our house.
- The core of Bund A has been constructed from material excavated from the pond into which effluent was pumped from the station which treated the water piped

into the Thames from the Harwell reactor. The laurels planted in this sludge quickly died. To dismiss contamination concerns on the basis of paper 'information' rather than actual testing is unacceptable.

The entire development, which has been conducted without permission for two years, has adversely affected the surrounding area, and we would prefer outright rejection. If you feel compelled to approve it, we implore you to consider the following conditions PRIOR to granting any permission (given the previous mistreatment of planning procedures):

1. Removal of Bund A; or at least re-profiling to the c. 1 metre with shallower slopes proposed for the other bunds;
2. Removal of all existing vegetation, with installation of a membrane to prevent further growth;
3. Re-positioning of Bund A to c. 1 metre from the boundary, with a French drain installed around the fence;
4. Independent testing for contaminants in the core of Bund A.”

Officer Response

These matters are covered in detail in the committee report. There are no objections from technical consultees to the application. The planting on the retrospective bund is required to be removed by way of condition; and a condition is also recommended regarding the submission of a surface water drainage scheme including a timescale for implementation.

Item 7 – P16/V2868/RM – Land to the west of Longcot Road, Shrivenham

Additional Representations

A neighbour who will speak at the meeting has written to make further detailed comments. Issues raised may be summarised as follows:

- Scheme needs a good level of mitigation to address loss of amenity
- Class C be added to the permitted development restrictions and extended to cover plots 18 to 30 and 33. Likewise side windows should not be permitted in plot 33
- Buffer landscaping needs improving with mature trees (4.5m to 6.5m tall), a mix of ornamental and native species, and the buffer should be widened to 8m-10m.
- A wall should be built along the rear boundaries of proposed plots backing onto the buffer. The wall should be in single ownership e.g. the Management Company which will ensure its retention and maintenance
- There has been no dialogue between the developer and neighbours
- A landscape and biodiversity management scheme should be agreed now
- A parking space should be relocated to the side of plot 28 to protect the buffer
- Street lighting, a construction management plan and phasing plan need to be approved prior to granting permission
- Design needs to be better
- House types are 'off the shelf' and not unique to the character of Shrivenham
- Single storey dwellings should be at the western end of the site close to existing single storey dwellings

- Views and vistas through the site should be provided
- Inadequate parking – garages will be used for storage
- Concerned that the open spaces will not be maintained if the Management Company of Taylor Wimpey default. There is no finance ring fenced in case this happens. S106 needs review

Since the report was included on the agenda two further local residents have written to reiterate their concerns which are summarised in the report.

Councillors Howell and Ware ask that the statement below be included in the addendum report:

“As local members we continue to receive concerns from residents regarding this development. The concerns are primarily regarding the lack of consultation and local engagement. This has been a particular issue with the amended plans.

The main issues relate to:

- *The buffer between the development and existing properties in Vicarage Lane*
- *The maintenance of the buffer*
- *The preferred boundary to be a brick wall rather than a wooden fence which will have a limited life span – who will replace it when it fails?*
- *A better design and layout to ensure that the development is more in keeping with the local area*

We expressed our own concerns earlier in the planning process and wish to re-iterate the need for a robust Construction Traffic Management Plan. This is vital in order to restrict traffic going through the village. Access to and from the A420 must be via Majors Road and Longcot Road”.

Officer Response

Class C can be added to the permitted development restrictions. Adding restrictions to other plots is not considered necessary to make the scheme acceptable. Plots 28 to 30 do not face existing neighbours in Vicarage Lane and plot 33 is over 21m from the northern site boundary.

A management plan for open spaces and construction management plan are the subject of conditions on the outline permission. Those conditions will need to be discharged before development commences. A phasing condition should be added with the aim being to protect living conditions for existing residents.

The main streets proposed are to be adopted in which case street lighting will need to be to County Council specifications and accord with the relevant British Standard.

A wall at the rear of dwellings backing on to the buffer is not considered necessary to make the scheme acceptable. If Members disagree it can be secured by condition.

The s106 agreement was secured through the outline permission. This is not an opportunity to review or amend it.

Other matters are addressed in the report.

Item 8 – P16/V1705/FUL – Manor Farm, Drayton

Additional representations

Since the publication of the planning committee agenda additional comments from a local resident have been received. In summary the points raised relate to:

- Whether policy P-LF4 will be applied to Manor Farm
- Traffic impact would be a sufficient reason to minimise the development on the site.

Officer Response

Neighbourhood plan policy P-LF4 is referenced in the original report at paragraph 5.16. Officers consider the application has been assessed against this policy through the analysis in paragraphs 5.17 to 5.22.

Traffic impact is assessed in the original report at paragraphs 5.26 to 5.31. The county council raise no objection to the proposed quantum of development in respect of highway safety of traffic generation grounds.

Item 9 – P16/V3010/HH – 29 Norreys Road, Cumnor

No updates.

Item 10 – P16/V3069/HH – 11 Finmore Road, Botley

This application has been withdrawn from the agenda.

Item 11 – P16/V2827/HH – 129 Poplar Grove, Kennington

Additional Representation

A neighbour who is unable to speak at the meeting has written to make further comments, which read as follows:

We object to the development on two main grounds:

- Over-development
- Harm to the character and appearance of the areas

Over-development

The Planning Officers' report for committee reminds us that the house was built in 2009-2013, with the condition that extra conversions or extensions would require planning permission to prevent over-development of the site or a cluttered appearance.

The report goes on to state that the proposed development is at the maximum possible size that would be allowed under permitted development were the site not already subject to restrictions on the amount of development that is allowed. These plans, therefore, represent significant over-development of the site. If the purpose of original condition was to prevent over development of the site, then permission should be refused and the scale of the dormer reduced significantly.

Furthermore, we note that the Vale of White Horse adopted design guidelines state that a dormer

should be small and set well below the ridgeline (principle DG11). This application is for a very large dormer that is set very close to the ridgeline and to the full width of the walls of the existing property. We contest that this is outside of the design guidelines and should cause permission to be refused.

Harm to the character and appearance of the area

The proposed development by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the character of the neighbourhood.

1. The Planning Office notes that the proposed dormer is to the rear of the dwelling and therefore “will not be visible from Poplar Grove”, and that it will not be over-prominent or have a detrimental effect on street scene character.

a. We would respectfully disagree with this statement, and would “impress” that due to the elevation of the site the structure would be clearly visible from the street, both from multiple angles and some distance away (see image 1).

b. Furthermore, the proposed development is out of character with surrounding dwellings, all of which retain their pitched roofs.

2. The PO mentions that a similar development has been permitted on a nearby site, however we would respectfully draw to the committee’s attention to key differences that render this comparison invalid:

a. The dormer to the rear of 54 meadow View Road is not visible from the street by virtue of the location of this dwelling.

b. No. 54 Meadow View Road is part of a semi-detached dwelling, and therefore the impact of the dormer is reduced as it’s stuck onto a bigger house.

c. Footprint of 54 is also larger



Image 1 - dormer visible from street

The proposed extension, by reason of its scale and bulk, would be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling, and would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area as a whole. In fact, it amounts to a large box stuck onto the back of a small house. We note that this issue has also been raised by other parties.

Because this application represents Over-development of the site and harm to the

character and appearance of the area, we ask committee to refuse this application.

Drs. Tim Stephens and Claire Inness
68 Meadow View Road
Kennington

Officer Clarification

The officers report at paragraph 5.3 states that “the proposed dormer is to the rear of the dwelling and will not be visible from along Poplar Grove.” The proposed dormer will not be visible from the front elevation of the dwelling but a side elevation of the dormer will be visible from along Poplar Grove.

Item 12 – P16/V2820/FUL – Cumnor Pre-school Nursery, Oxford Road, Cumnor

No updates.

Item 13 – P16/V3123/FUL – Public Toilets, Abbey Meadow, Abbey Close, Abingdon

No updates.