

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Tuesday, 7 December 2021 at 6.00 pm in
First Floor Meeting Space, 135 Eastern Avenue,
Milton Park, OX14 4SB

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Ben Mabbett, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley
Officers: Michael Flowers and Emily Hamerton
Other: Councillor Andrew Crawford

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Helen Pighills
Officers: Paul Bateman, Martin Deans, Bertie Smith, Stuart Walker, and Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel

16 Chair's announcements

The chair informed the committee that from January 2022 onwards, meetings of the Vale of White Horse District Council Planning Committee would convene at a new start time of 7pm.

17 Apologies for absence

None.

18 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2021 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

19 Declarations of interest

Councillor Cheryl Briggs stood down from applications P20/V3043/FUL and P20/V3044/LB as she was a local ward member.

Councillor Mike Pighills stood down from applications P20/V3043/FUL and P20/V3044/LB due to predetermination.

Councillor Val Shaw stood down from application P21/V0477/FUL as she was a local ward member.

20 Urgent business

None.

21 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.

22 P20/V3043/FUL - 25-27 Stert Street, Abingdon

The committee considered application P20/V3043/FUL for refurbishment, alterations and extensions to separate commercial unit from existing flat, and provide 2 x 1 bed flats. (As amended by additional plans and information received on 28.4.21, 29.7.21 and 10.11.21).

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 updated the committee that the Friends of Abingdon had removed their objection to the application, but had subsequently requested a condition for the recording of any historic fabric to be removed, although officers did not see this condition as necessary. The committee were also presented with an update that the neighbour at 29 Stert Street had recently written in to reiterate previous objections.

In addition, the officer recommended replacing condition thirteen with a compliance condition for all unauthorised works to be agreed and rectified within six months of any permission being granted. The officer subsequently provided the context of the application, detailing the layout of the existing site, the proposal that was being considered at the meeting, and the impact planning permission would have on the listed building. The planning officer concluded by confirming there had been no objection from the environmental officer nor county engineer, and that the application was recommended for both planning permission and listed building consent.

Councillor Helen Pighills, local ward member, spoke in objection to the application.

The officer was asked whether any construction work had already begun on the site before planning permission had been considered by the committee. The officer confirmed that they were aware work had commenced on-site, but the work was not connected to the application, and instead was thought to be restorative work to the rear of the property.

The committee asked for clarification on where the bin storage would be for the site. The response from the officer was that they would be located towards the north of the site. Additionally, upon a further question on whether the window would be blocked by the iron stairway, the officer explained that it was deemed that the provision of an escape route was desirable and would mitigate any concerns on a blocked window view.

The committee sought clarification on whether the iron walkway would be the main access point for the first floor of the development or whether this was an additional access point for emergency usage. The officer confirmed that the new development would include a new access within the entrance of the property and so this additional access point was primarily designed for usage during an emergency.

A question was asked by the committee seeking clarification on the current condition the buildings were in. The officer responded with confirmation that the property was in a poor state and was not currently occupied. In addition, the shop unit was currently vacant. The committee asked a series of questions relating to concerns on risks to the preservation of the site and how conditions would be enforced. The officer explained that a number of conditions had been implemented which controlled the materials that could be used on construction. Additionally, the officer added that as the property was a listed building, any non-permitted alterations was a criminal offence and could be subject to prosecution, which from their experience was an adequate deterrence.

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/V3043/FUL subject to the following conditions;

Standard

1. Commencement within three years
2. Approved plans list

Pre-commencement

3. Check for nesting birds on-site
4. Submission of Archaeological Watching Brief
5. Archaeologist to be present on-site and findings reported within two years
6. Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted
7. Access details including visibility splays to be submitted

Pre-damp course level

8. Submission of material details (samples by photographic record)

Pre-occupation

9. Swift brick/box to be provided on site
10. Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure to be provided
11. Car parking to be provided in accordance with plan
12. Bicycle parking and bin storage to be provided in accordance with plan and bin storage

Compliance

13. All unauthorised works to be agreed and rectified within six months of any permission being granted.

23 P20/V3044/LB - 25-27 Stert Street, Abingdon

The committee considered application P20/V3044/LB for the refurbishment, alterations and extensions to separate commercial unit from existing flat, and provide 2 x 1 bed flats. (As amended by additional information received on 28.4.21 and 29.7.21)

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.

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

RESOLVED: to grant listed building consent for application P20/V3044/LB subject to the following conditions;

Standard

1. Commencement within three years
2. Approved plans list

Pre-commencement

3. Submission of details for the rear and stair walls to be reinstated
4. Submission of details for the proposed lobby walls

Pre-damp course level

5. Submission of material details (samples by photographic record)
6. Rectification of unauthorised construction

Advisory

7. Photographic details of the site over the course of its development

24 P21/V0477/FUL - Wootton Business Park, Wootton, Abingdon

The committee considered application P21/V0477/FUL for the construction of an office building and associated refuse store, cycle store, plant enclosure and car parking and 58 residential units with car parking and associated landscaping across the site (As per amended plans received 20 August 2021 and 20 October 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 informed the committee that of the fifty-eight residential units to be built, twenty-one of these would be affordable housing. It was also added that while fifty-eight residential units was proposed in the application, the permissions from 2014 and 2016 were for sixty-four units and as such this application was a reduction of six housing units. The committee were told that amended designs for the site had been submitted by the applicant in order to remedy the objections raised by Landscaping, Urban Design, Housing and Oxfordshire County Council and that the objections relating to these issues were now withdrawn. Additionally, the officer added that since publication of the agenda, the council had received a revised comment regarding the financial contributions requested from the development, which sought to receive contributions for the nearby nature reserve, which would be included in a legal agreement.

Ian Bristow, representative of Wootton Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. In response to a question on whether he considered the new application more contentious than the existing permission held, Mr Bristow explained that the new application was subject to the newly implemented Neighbourhood Plan and the new application had not made any allowance of this and as a result the new proposal needed significant improvements to it to meet the standards of the Neighbourhood Plan now implemented.

Mark Krassowski, the agent, spoke in support of the application. Mr Krassowski responded to a number of questions from the committee surrounding the previous application of the site, and the provision of parking spaces for the proposed new application. Mr Krassowski explained that development of the site from the previous planning permission had commenced with the required fees paid and planning permission had lawfully commenced, however for various reasons had been unable to proceed further. Additionally, the agent explained that modelling had been completed for the provision of parking places and that the parish council's contention was due to the Deerhurst development. Mr Krassowski also added that the on-plot parking met the parking standards required for the proposed development.

Councillor Val Shaw, local ward member, spoke in objection to the application. Councillor Shaw in response to questions from the committee explained that the current public transport links were not adequate for the proposed development, and that there was only one bus per hour in the area. Additionally, the parish would like a roundabout added to the entrance of the proposed developments entrance in order to facilitate a new bus route into the estate.

The committee asked whether a wheel-wash could be added to the site due to concerns on the amount of mud that could be on the roads. Additionally, the committee asked why there was no mention of roundabouts for the site. The planning officer responded that a wheel-wash was already in the conditions but that a roundabout had been deemed unnecessary and there had been no requirement either from the previous application originally approved which needed to be considered.

The committee asked in relation to children attending the nearby school, how they would be able to cross safely without a designated pedestrian crossing area and whether any formal risk assessment had been carried out for a crossing point or roundabout. The officer responded that OCC had provided guidance on what was acceptable and had not requested any additional pedestrian crossing zones. Additionally, as the site was by an existing road and public transport links, OCC did not feel additional crossing or traffic control points necessary. In addition, the committee asked a question relating to the existing children's play area and the funding for the site's maintenance. The planning officer responded that the sums raised from the previous application were not required to go to this play area, however the committee were advised that if the other development who had built the site did not maintain it then a condition allowed the district council to take possession of it. Additionally, in response to a question on the amenity space in the adjacent land, the officer explained that the neighbouring site was a nature reserve and green-belt area, and so expected maintenance of this land would have an insignificant cost.

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

Councillor Cheryl Briggs, owing to losing connection during the item, took no part in the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P21/V0477/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

Standard

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

Pre-commencement

3. Landscape Management Plan
4. Landscaping (S38 and S278 works)
5. Details of amount of rooting volume provided for each tree
6. Detailed sustainable drainage scheme
7. Foul water drainage scheme
8. Phased contaminated land risk assessment
9. Slab levels
10. Tree Protection Plan
11. Construction Traffic Management Plan
12. Community Employment Plan

Pre-occupation

13. SUDS compliance report
14. Wootton Meadow Management Plan
15. Details of noise control measures
16. Remediation strategy and validation report

Compliance

17. Foundation depths

Informatives

18. Contaminated Land Informative
19. Highway Informatives
20. Thames Water

25 P21/V2040/RM - Care Home site, Centre West Phase, Kingsgrove

The committee considered application P21/V2040/RM for reserved Matters application for the construction of a 72 bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated access, parking, landscaping, plant, and site infrastructure, pursuant to outline planning permission P19/V1269/FUL. Details submitted in accordance with conditions 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 43, 48 and 54. As amended by plans and information received 29 September 2021 and 28 October 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 explained that the proposed development consisted of an allocated site in the local plan and had been brought to the committee as a result of an objection from Wantage Town Council. It was confirmed that there had been no technical issues raised and that subject to conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Erik Johnson, representative of Wantage Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Amy Paterson, the agent, spoke in support of the application. In response to questions from the committee surrounding the parking facilities for the proposed care home, Ms Paterson explained that the provision had been based on a multi-site study of existing Care UK facilities, with the evidence submitted to the Highways Authority. Ms Paterson also added that they had based the parking provision on the shift pattern of staff who would be on site at any one time, and that parking spaces had been allocated alongside cycle storage and the consideration that the site was near public transport linkage.

Andrew Crawford, local ward member, spoke in objection to the application.

In response to question raised by the committee on pedestrian movement, the planning officer explained that the road network had been analysed through the conduct of a road safety audit, and it was noted that the existing road had a low speed already in place. The officer clarified that there was a pedestrian link from the east of the site which led to the public square, together with footpaths along the north side of the access road outside of the development and officers felt that a continuous footpath on the south side of the road was not required.

In response to a question on the provision of disabled parking spaces as a proportion of the twenty-six spaces provided by the proposed care home, the planning officer explained that the number of disabled spaces were required based on a proportion of the total spaces

provided. Additionally, the officer explained to the committee in response to a further question on a possible continuous footpath, that it had been looked at during an earlier iteration of the application but the current proposal which did not feature one was deemed acceptable.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer the item was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer application P21/V2040/RM to review:

1. Concerns on the layout of car-parking spaces to serve the site
2. Concerns for public safety arising from the lack of a continuous pedestrian pavement on the external road outside the proposed development

The meeting closed at 8.22 pm