

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 8 July 2020 at 5.00 pm



This was a virtual live event

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Bob Johnston (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Jerry Avery, Ron Batstone, Eric Batts, Amos Duveen (substituting for Councillor Max Thompson) and Diana Lugova

Officers: Adrian Butler, Adrian Duffield and Steven Corrigan

Also present: Councillor Matthew Barber

Number of members of the public:

PI.121 Chairman's announcements

The Chair had no announcements but ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to a virtual meeting.

PI.122 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Robert Maddison, Janet Shelley and Max Thompson. Councillor Amos Duveen substituted for Councillor Max Thompson.

PI.123 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on Wednesday 24 June 2020, were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting. It was agreed that the Chair sign them as such.

PI.124 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

PI.125 Minutes

There was no urgent business.

PI.126 Public participation

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 8 July 2020

Statements made by the public and duly received within a published deadline had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting and had also been published on the Council's website.

PI.127 P18/V1498/FUL - Land off School Road, West Hanney, Wantage, OX12 0LA

The committee considered application P18/V1498/FUL for the variation of Condition 3 - Highway works to be agreed to application ref P15/V2887/FUL to swap the provision of a pedestrian crossing for a new footpath, to enable the provision of a safer pedestrian route to the nearby primary school that will not require children cross and recross school road (as amended on 17 January 2020) on land off School Road West Hanney Wantage, OX12 0LA.

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 the meeting. At the meeting the planning officer provided projected plans of the works previously permitted in connection with condition 3 of application no. P15/V2887/FUL and the route of the new footpath and pedestrian routeway to the primary school and details for the upgrading of a public footpath.

The planning officer advised the Committee that the application was brought to the planning committee as it could represent a significant departure from the views expressed by the highways authority. Planning permission had been granted for 15 dwellings on this site under planning application P15/V2887/FUL. Condition 3 of that permission required, prior to development commencing: 1. the submission for approval of an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing in the immediate vicinity of the access junction, to allow safe pedestrian travel across School Road onto the existing footway on the southern side of School Road and 2. the upgrading of the West Hanney footpath number 5 from the site to its junction with School Road. The reason for the condition was in the interests of highway safety and to promote sustainable methods of transport. The applicant had explained to the Council that the crossing to the existing footway on the south side of School Road could not be secured as the embankment on the southern side of the road was common land. The planning officer informed the committee that work on the development of the dwellings had already commenced.

In response to a question from the Committee, the planning officer reported that there was no defined width to the public footpath. It was noted that some local residents, in their statements in response to the application, had suggested that the 1.5 metre-wide public footpath requested by the highways officer could not be achieved, as the public footpath was only up to 1.2 metres wide. He advised the Committee that the provision of a 1.5 metre-wide public footpath could encroach into neighbouring gardens and could result in the removal, or part removal, of adjacent hedges which provided privacy for adjacent residents. The current proposal was for upgrading the footpath between existing timber edging strips which were approximately 1 metre apart. This was below the highways officer's recommended width, but would restrict the space available to pedestrians, and those with pushchairs, or wheelchairs, to pass. The Committee considered that irregular width footpaths were a common feature in the district and that the Council should support reasonable workable proposals.

In response to a question from the Committee, the planning officer confirmed that public footpath was not known to have flooded, whilst according to local residents School Road

did occasionally flood. The proposed new surfacing to the footpath would assist in repelling water and preventing it from becoming muddy. The planning officer also advised the Committee that with the addition of a pedestrian guardrail at the School Road junction with the public footpath, the proposal represented safer conditions than those already in existence and approved.

The planning officer reported that in the event of planning permission being granted, a new condition would be required to ensure that works were implemented and provided prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.

From a planning perspective and given the limitations to the public footpath in terms of width, the works now proposed provided an acceptable upgrade to public footpath no.5. The planning officer also reported that visually the footway to the primary school would have an acceptable impact. It would be reflective of the raised footway and embankment on the south side of School Road. In terms of policy validation, the proposal was considered compliant with core policy 37 of the LPP1 (Design and Local Distinctiveness) and emerging policy RS1 of the Neighbourhood Plan (Village Character and Design).

Councillor Matthew Barber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application, and considered that the highways authority's disagreement with the proposal was correct. He was of the view that the application could lead to further urbanisation and was not in the interests of keeping separate the identities of the East and West Hanney communities.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission, with additional condition 2 relating to completion of works prior to first dwelling occupation, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P18/V1498/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions
2. Prior to the first occupation of any dwellings the footway to East Hanney and works to public footpath no. 5 shall be implemented.
3. Road and footways implemented prior to first occupation of each dwelling in accordance with details approved under P17/V1850/DIS. Wearing course prior to occupation of the penultimate dwelling.
4. Slab levels in accordance with approved details application no. P17/V1850/DIS).
5. Materials in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V1851/DIS.
6. Construction traffic management plan in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V1852/DIS.
7. Travel information pack to be provided to each first occupant in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V2003/DIS.
8. Drainage in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V1850/DIS prior to occupation of each plot.
9. Landscaping to be implemented prior to occupation of penultimate dwelling in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V1898/DIS.
10. Boundary treatments implemented prior to first occupation of each plot in accordance with details approved under application no. P17/V1898/DIS
11. Ecology mitigation to be implemented prior to occupation of penultimate dwelling in accordance with details approved by application no. P17/V2019/DIS

12. Prior to the use of the new vehicular access, visibility splays shall be provided in both directions measuring 2.4 metres by 43 metres.
 13. Turning spaces in accordance with approved plans prior to the occupation of each plot.
- Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions
14. Retention of garages.
 15. Obscure glazing to first floor window in western elevation of plot 6.

The meeting closed at 5.40pm