

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 20 October 2021 at

6.00 pm

in the First Floor Meeting Space, 135

Eastern Avenue, Milton Park, OX14 4SB



Present in the meeting room

Members: Councillors Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Diana Lugova, Ben Mabbett, Robert Maddison (as substitute for Jenny Hannaby), and Mike Pighills

Officers: Michael Flowers and Emily Hamerton

Remote attendance

Officers: Sally Appleyard, Paul Bateman, Anthony Bubb (Oxfordshire County Council), Adrian Butler, Bertram Smith, Stuart Walker, and Tim Williams

1 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

2 Apologies for absence

Councillors Jenny Hannaby and Janet Shelly tendered apologies.

3 Declarations of interest

Councillors Ron Batstone and Ben Mabbett stood down from application P21/V1096/FUL as they were local ward members.

4 Urgent business

None.

5 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting. Statements received from the public were circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

6 P20/V1388/O - Land South of A415, Marcham

The committee considered application P20/V1388/O for outline planning permission for residential development of up to 90 dwellings (Use Class C3) including means of access into the site (not internal roads) and associated

highway works, with all other matters (relating to appearance, landscaping, scale and layout) reserved (as per the updated air quality assessment received on 11 November 2020, drainage technical note 29 March 2021, Frilford Lights technical note 31 March 2021 and Frilford lights mitigation 23 July 2021).

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 provided the context of the application's return to the committee, explaining that the committee had deferred the application on the 8th September 2021 in order to receive further clarification and new information on;

1. School capacity
2. Foul water flooding
3. Primary care
4. Air quality
5. Frilford junction
6. Cycle access
7. A Members site visit

The planning officer went through each category and provided the committee with an update to what new information had been collected and how they would contribute to the overall impact to the local area, should planning permission for the application be granted. The committee were also told that all reasons for a deferral had been solved and that while some collisions had occurred on the A415, that there was no particular pattern to the collisions. Additionally, it was noted that while there had been a fatal collision six years prior involving a cyclist, there had been no recorded fatal collisions since. The planning officer therefore held the view that subject to the conditions proposed and a Section 106 agreement, officers were satisfied with the application and recommended that planning permission be granted.

Michael Hoath, representative of Marcham Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

A question was asked about the level of traffic passing the site and whether any arrangements had been proposed for entrances, crossing points, and a widening of the road and footways. The response was that an entrance had been added to the east of the site. Mr Hoath explained that there were five exits to a similar site within 300 metres and that a better layout would have been to have a north-east exit and mini-roundabout. The parish council therefore considered the site layout to be poor in design.

Ed Barrett, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

In response to questions from the committee regarding electric vehicle charging points, Mr Barrett explained that the majority of houses would have electric vehicle charging points. Mr Barrett also responded to a question on discussions with Thames Water that talks were ongoing, but that he expected this to be completed towards the end of the year and confirmed that houses would not be occupied until Thames Water work had been completed.

The committee asked the planning officer whether based on the number of technical issues raised, did the application have a significant cumulative risk which put the application at the borderline of acceptability. The planning officer responded that the technical issues raised were standalone for consideration, and that all technical consultees were not in objection. While some aspects of the application were tight, they were currently considered to be at an acceptable level.

The committee raised questions regarding speeding traffic, safety for users of the cycle / footway beside the A415 and sought clarification from the Highways Officer on what modelling took place to analyse the safety of the proposal should planning permission be granted. The committee were told in response that no modelling had been done, but the layout had been in full compliance with the relevant guidance. In addition, a controlled pedestrian crossing would be determined by the speed limit of the road. It was also clarified that the 30mph speed limit would be extended eastward of the site, but enforcement of the speed limit would be a Thames Valley Police responsibility. The access arrangement itself complies with guidance and had been subject to an independent safety audit that did not raise any issues with the pedestrian crossing.

A question was asked by the committee on whether there would be an increased flood risk to surrounding properties during construction. The planning officer advised construction would not impact on foul water drainage, and there was no evidence that it would result in flood risks.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P20/V1388/O, subject to the following conditions;

1. A S.106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure, management of public open spaces and to secure affordable housing; and

Conditions as follows:

1. Reserved matters (internal access arrangements, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) to be submitted
2. Application for approval of reserved matters within three years and development to commence within two-years of approval of final reserved matter
3. Approved plans

Pre Commencement Conditions

4. Tree and hedge protection to be approved
5. Levels to be agreed
6. Construction Management Plan including wheel washing, HGV delivery route, dust suppression and deliveries outside the hours of 7.30 to 9.30 and 16.00 to 18.00
7. Surface water drainage to be approved
8. Archaeological written scheme of investigation
9. Staged programme of archaeological investigation
10. A construction environmental management plan for biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) to be approved

Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

11. Foul water drainage to be approved
12. Drainage compliance report to be submitted and approved
13. Noise mitigation to be set out as part of the reserved matters application
14. Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) to be submitted to and approved
15. Access to A415, pedestrian crossing point, foot/cycle way provision beside the A415, relocation of speed limit and gateway in accordance with approved plan and prior to occupation of any dwelling.
16. Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application details of pedestrian and cycle access to the A415 to be submitted
17. Travel plan and travel information pack
18. Active electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling
19. Details of hedge planting behind vision splays as part of reserved matters submission
20. Market housing mix to be agreed
21. Space standards - policy DP2 compliant

Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions

22. Maximum two storeys dwellings only
23. No more than 90 dwellings permitted

Informatives

1. Broadband provision
2. Bird nesting
3. Protection of Thames Water underground assets
4. S106 obligation

7 P20/V0855/O - Rogers Concrete, Sandshill, Faringdon

The committee considered application P20/V0855/O for outline planning application with all matters reserved (other than access into the site) for the proposed mixed use development of up to 95 residential dwellings and business space (Use Classes B1 and B8) (totalling 1,500 sqm), open space, landscaping, drainage measures and all other associated 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 explained the background to the current application, explaining that the committee originally considered the application on the 18th August 2021, but had deferred the application in order to receive further information that had been requested. Since the deferral, the applicant had amended their proposal to increase employment opportunity from increased commercial floor space. It was confirmed that the site would include fifteen percent of the site area as public open space. The planning officer also explained that the proposed link for public transport, cyclists, and private motor vehicles were deemed acceptable, and that the amended application would maximise viable commercial space on the site, with a mixed use scheme not undermining the sustainable provision of possible employment opportunities.

Dr Mike Wise, representative of Faringdon Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

The committee asked Mr Wise whether he had a preference towards what pedestrian crossing the parish would prefer to be added to assist pedestrians using the A420. Mr Wise stated that the parish would be satisfied with any form of crossing added, as their view was that the current road was not safe for pedestrians, although of the options, a bridge or subway tunnel would be most preferable.

Sarah Allen-Stevens and Richard Anstis, local residents, spoke in objection to the application.

The speakers were asked by the committee what businesses would be operated if the site was owned as an eco-business park. Mrs Allen-Stevens confirmed it would not be logistical businesses but would likely focus manufacturing.

Tim Burden, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

David Grant, local ward member, spoke in objection to the application.

The committee raised a question on what conditions the local ward member would seek for the application to improve the safety concerns. Councillor Grant explained that for the bridleway crossing, there needed to be a safer designated crossing area. Councillor Grant also requested further clarification pedestrian and cycle links which would be added to other access areas. A further question was raised by the committee to the speaker on core policy 29 of the local plan, and the discussions that took place between the ward member and planning officers. Councillor Grant explained that the policy had not been well written and there had been a difference in interpretation of the policy between himself and officers. Councillor Grant explained that they had not reached an agreement on the interpretation of the wording of the policy.

In response to a question from the committee on the history of the site and its place within the Local Plan, the planning officer explained that the site was allocated in part 1 of the Local Plan which was adopted in December 2016, and so the evidence base for the employment land review and local plan review would have taken place prior to 2016 before the adoption of the local plan.

The committee asked a question surrounding the availability of other employment space on the land within the application site. The planning officer confirmed that some of the land would be retained and would be available for future development. Additionally, in response to a question surrounding Thames Water's statement that the site could not be connected to the grid, and would require its own foul water maintenance, the planning officer confirmed that the planning conditions would be sufficient for handling independent management of these utilities as an isolated activity.

The committee asked a question on the provision of a crossing on the A420. Officers advised such a facility was not necessary to meet the needs of the development and could not be secured, as third-party land outside the applicant's control would be required.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P20/V0855/O, subject to the following conditions;

Reserved matters and timings

1. Commencement – Outline Planning Permission
2. Commencement – Outline with Reserved Matters
3. Approved plans
4. Maximum number of dwellings (no more than 95)
5. Quantum of employment floor space to be 1,500sqm
6. Employment use restricted to Class B1/B8 use only

Concurrent with the submission of the reserved matters

7. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
8. Landscaping (S38 and S278 works)
9. Landscaping management
10. Landscaping – details
11. Market mix
12. Space Standards
13. Foul water network capacity
14. Water supply network capacity

Pre-Commencement

15. Slab levels

16. Construction environmental management plan for Biodiversity
17. Contaminated Land
18. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)
19. Tree Protection (Detailed)
20. Surface water drainage
21. Foul water drainage
22. Environmental Agency Condition – Contaminated land remediation strategy
23. Community Employment Plan
24. Piling method statement

Pre-Occupancy

25. Noise Mitigation
26. Environmental Agency Condition – Contaminated land verification report
27. Environmental Agency Condition – SuDS Infiltration of surface water into ground
28. Visibility splays
29. Travel Plan
30. Car parking spaces, turning spaces and roads
31. Cycle parking

Informatives

1. Contaminated Land Informative
2. Highway Informatives
3. Superfast broadband – 30 plus dwellings
4. Illustrative Drawings
5. Planning Obligation

8 P21/V1096/FUL - Recreation Ground, Cane Lane, Grove

Councillors Ron Batstone and Ben Mabbett, local ward members, stood down from the committee for the duration of the item.

The committee considered application P21/V1096/FUL for the reconstruction and enlargement of scout hall (as amended by plans and additional information received 24 June 2021, 1 July 2021 and 8 September 2021).

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.

Councillor Ben Mabbett, local ward member, spoke in support of the application.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P21/V1096/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

Standard

1. Commencement of development within three years
2. Development in accordance with approved plans

Pre-Commencement

3. Details of materials to be submitted
4. Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted
5. Foul water drainage scheme to be submitted
6. Tree protection details to be submitted
7. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
8. Phased contaminated land risk assessment to be submitted

Pre-Occupancy

9. Compliance with remediation report and submission of validation report
10. Installation of bat box on site

Compliance

11. Restriction on usable floor space

The meeting closed at 8.17 pm