

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 2 June 2021 at 6.00 pm  
at 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, Milton,  
OX14 4SB



**Open to the public, including the press**

### **Present:**

Members: Councillors Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley

Officers: Paul Bateman, Martin Deans, Katherine Canavan, Emily Hamerton, Susannah Mangion and Susie Royse

Also present: Councillor Simon Howell and Councillor Elaine Ware

Number of members of the public: 5

### **PI.35 Chair's announcements**

The chair ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to an in-person meeting which was being simultaneously broadcast.

### **PI.36 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cheryl Briggs and Councillor Ben Mabbett.

### **PI.37 Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meetings, held on Wednesday 10 March 2021 and Wednesday 31 March 2021, were agreed to be a correct record of the meetings. It was agreed that the chair sign them as such.

### **PI.38 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **PI.39 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 2 June 2021

## **PI.40 Public participation**

The committee noted the list of members of the public registered to speak at the meeting. The committee had received, prior to the meeting, copies of the statements which had been made.

## **PI.41 P19/V1728/RM - Land at Appleford Road, Sutton Courtenay (Former Amey Works)**

The committee considered application P19/V1728/RM for a reserved matters application for details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed development following planning permission P18/V0069/O (amended plans received 1 October 2020 and 4 December 2020 to show amendments to design, housing mix and layout, and landscaping and as amended by plans received 1 March 2021) (Residential development of 91 dwellings Amey Works).

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.

The planning officer reported that at its meeting on 27 January 2021, the committee had resolved to defer consideration of the application to facilitate a site visit and to allow for further negotiations between the developer and council officers. A site visit, attended by members of the committee, took place on 24 May 2021.

The planning officer reported on the detailed reasons for the deferral. Firstly, members wished to see the site in context, hence the site visit. Secondly, further discussions were required in respect of providing a link from the site to Millennium Common. Thirdly, further work was required on public open space, play provision and garden sizes. Lastly, the committee requested an increased number of electric vehicle charging points.

The planning officer reported that discussions had taken place between the Millennium Common trustees and the developer, and every effort had been made to obtain agreement to a link. The Trust could not agree to any additional access onto its land from the site, as this would compromise the biodiversity of the Common. Although the council would support the inclusion of a link to increase connectivity between Sutton Courtenay to the west, the development site and the neighbouring development to the east, there were no planning grounds to insist on a link to third party land.

The planning officer, with the assistance of a slide presentation, also reported that the provision for public open space had been increased to 16.4 percent, which was in line with the policy requirement of 15 percent of usable open space. The provision of a local area for play (LAP) and a local equipped area for play (LEAP) also met council policy requirements. In respect of garden sizes, the original proposals did not fully meet design guide space standards. The private amenity space had been increased to the point that only 9 plots out of 91 (9.9% of the development) were below the recommended size in the council's design guide document. When taken as a whole, the amount of amenity space per dwelling is acceptable in the revised proposal. The planning officer offered to put the changes into context. In the adjoining site, 43 percent of gardens were below standard. Additionally, in a recent appeal decision on a site in the district, the inspector concluded that although 25 gardens were below the size standard, in conjunction with the full amount of public open space being provided, this would offset this 'minor shortfall'. In the planning

officer's opinion, these were significant improvements in space provision on the site and it would be unreasonable for the council to require further changes.

Paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required developments to be designed to enable the charging of plug-in vehicles. There was no local plan policy to provide guidance on how this would be done or requiring a certain percentage of housing to have access to charging points. The proposed number of electric vehicle (EV) points had now increased from 12 to 38, plus 2 'pay as you go' points adjacent to the play area.

The planning officer, with the assistance of a slide presentation, also reported on the concerns of residents in respect of the management of the bunds and land transfer. The bund behind 1-7 Amey Close would remain as open space within the development. The bund backing on to numbers 5, 6 and 7 would become part of the private gardens of those properties. As the land backed directly onto the gardens of the new dwellings, it was agreed that it would not be practical for a management company to be involved in the maintenance of this land. In respect of the bund backing onto numbers 1, 3 and 4 Amey Close, this faced onto front gardens of the new dwellings and a new public footpath. If this were incorporated into the private gardens, a dividing fence would be required up to the footpath and this would create an imposing barrier in front of the new dwellings and thus would not be practical. This area would remain as public open space, and be accessible for public use and maintenance from within the development.

The planning officer concluded by stating that since the January 2021 committee, all concerns regarding the proposal had been reviewed by council officers and the developer, resulting in a development which would be highly accessible, with good connectivity, a good provision of private and public open space, and which encouraged the use of electric vehicles.

Mr. Norman Griffiths had been registered to speak to the committee but was not present. However, his statement had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Ms. Caroline Green, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

A statement by Mr. David Hignell, Chairman of the Millennium Common Management Committee, had been sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

A statement by Mr. Ian Bush, a local resident, had been sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

The committee concluded that the proposal represented a good use of a brownfield site. With the amended details relating to LAP and LEAP provision, public open space, garden sizes, the bund and electric vehicle charging points, the proposed development was most acceptable. The Trust's position on declining the request for the link to Millennium Common in the interests of preserving biodiversity was wholly understandable.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P19/V1728/RM, for the following reasons;

## Conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Materials
3. Estate roads and footpaths
4. Landscaping and S278 works
5. Car parking
6. Cycle parking
7. Visibility splays
8. Landscaping
9. Electronic vehicle charging
10. Maintenance and upkeep of the site

## Informatives

1. Planning Obligation
2. CIL- reserved matters approval
3. Superfast broadband - 30 plus dwellings
4. Advance payments code – private street works
5. Public highway works
6. S38 / Private streets agreement
7. Thames Water

## **PI.42 P20/V1279/FUL - Land at Townsend Road, Shrivenham**

The committee considered application P20/V1279/FUL for the redevelopment of the site to provide 10 new dwellings (a net gain of 9 units) and associated parking, gardens, access improvements and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing workshops and bungalow (as amended by details received 28 October 2020 and 4 November 2020 and visibility details 7 May 2021) on land at Townsend Road, Shrivenham.

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.

The planning officer reminded the committee that this application had been deferred at the committee meeting of 21 April 2021, as further information was required from the applicant in respect of the proposal addressing local housing need and supporting local employment, services and facilities. The applicant had now submitted this information in the form of a statement which had been the subject of a re-consultation with the parish council. The planning officer also reported the latest situation regarding the Shrivenham Neighbourhood Plan; it was now afforded full weight. The parish council had expressed concerns regarding the effect upon the character of the local area and an apparent lack of evidence to justify extra housing of this nature in Shrivenham. The planning officer advised the committee that the proposal was acceptable from a planning perspective, as it was for an acceptable use and was on a brownfield site. Trees would be retained along the western edge of the site and the local highway authority, the Oxfordshire County Council, had required an amendment to the site's access, which was now satisfactory. There were no technical objections to the proposed development and drainage and diversity arrangements were acceptable.

A statement by Ms. Angela Brickell, a local resident, was sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Councillor Richard Bartle, a representative of Shrivenham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Councillor Bartle on behalf, of the parish council, was sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Ms. Sarah Hockin, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Elaine Ware, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. Statements by Councillor Ware were sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

In response to a question regarding the commercial viability of the site and any efforts to market it, the planning officer advised the committee that an independent assessor had examined the site's viability using government approved methodology. The conclusion of the study was that the site was not viable for re-development for employment purposes. A further question was asked about privacy and the potential overlooking of existing bungalows by the development. The planning officer reported that obscure glazing would not be suitable for habitable rooms, which were mainly bedrooms, as most would be side facing. With the incorporation of two lines of boundary fencing, there was an intention to have a walkway to service the properties from the rear, which would be 'secure by design'.

Responding to a question regarding housing need, the planning officer reported that if permission was given to the proposal, it would contribute to local and district-wide housing needs being met. This location was classified as a 'windfall site' and would contribute to Vale's total housing supply requirement. In response to a question regarding total housing unit 'caps', the planning officer confirmed that there was no such maximum figure for housing in Shrivenham or similar villages, a principal factor being the unpredictable availability of windfall sites.

The committee accepted that the site was not viable for commercial purposes and the proposal would provide a reasonable number of dwellings to the local area and to the district on a brownfield site.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P20/V1279/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

#### Conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Materials
3. Estate roads and footpaths
4. Landscaping and S278 works
5. Car parking
6. Cycle parking
7. Visibility splays
8. Landscaping
9. Maintenance and upkeep of the site

#### Informatives

1. Planning obligation
2. Reserved matters approval
3. Superfast broadband – 30 dwellings
4. Advance payments code – street works
5. Public highway works
6. S38/private streets agreement
7. Thames Water

### **PI.43 P20/V1706/FUL - Lock Farm, Buscot, Faringdon**

The committee considered an application P20/V1706/FUL for a change of use of agricultural buildings to office space use and associated works and infrastructure (Heritage Impact Statement received 9 September 2020) (proposed layout plan rec 14 Sept 2020) (amended plans, arboricultural information, flood risk assessment and landscape proposals received 17 March 2021) at Lock Farm, Buscot, Faringdon.

The planning officer reported that the buildings were owned by the National Trust, who were applying for a change of use of agricultural buildings to office, co-working and meeting space. The site was within the wider setting of a grade I listed building, the Church of St. Mary and the Old Parsonage, a grade II listed building. The application site shared an access with these buildings and the planning officer considered that vehicular traffic to and from the development would not have an impact upon these assets. Concerns by local residents at the application included increased traffic generation, harm to the setting of the listed buildings, impact upon wildlife and possible unacceptable overflow car parking. The planning officer reported that there were no technical objections to the application and that the drainage arrangements were satisfactory. The scheme also incorporated tree protection measures, hedgerow reinstatement and landscaping.

Mr. Guy Jordan, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Christian Walker of the National Trust, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Elaine Ware, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. A joint statement by Councillor Ware and fellow local ward councillor, Simon Howell, had been sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

A statement by Ms. Ellen Hopkins, a local resident, had been sent to committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

The committee considered that the proposal represented a sympathetic re-use of a non-designated heritage asset and was satisfied that the proposal would bring into active use a redundant agricultural building to the benefit of the rural economy.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P20/V1706/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

Standard:

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 2 June 2021

1. Commencement
2. Approved plans

Pre-Commencement:

3. Archaeology – written scheme of investigation
4. Tree Protection
5. Biodiversity enhancement plan
6. Surface water drainage
7. Foul water drainage
8. Levels for car park
9. Contamination
10. Security entrance gates
11. External lighting
12. Obtain derogation licence for bats
13. Obtain derogation licence for great crested newts

Prior to Occupation:

14. Specified visibility splays
15. Access parking and turning in accordance with plans
16. Turning space for emergency/servicing vehicles
17. Vehicle swept paths and passing places
18. Bicycle parking provision
19. Refuse storage
20. Electric vehicle charging points

Compliance:

21. Restricted use – offices only
22. Archaeology – publication of findings
23. Landscaping implementation
24. Development in accordance with Ecological reports
25. Development in accordance with Flood Risk Assessment
26. Materials in accordance with application
27. Hours restriction

The meeting closed at 7.35 pm