

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 6 July 2022 at 7.00 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, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley  
Officers: Steve Culliford (Democratic Services Team Leader) and Emily Hamerton (Development Manager)  
Other Councillors: Andy Cooke

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Sally Appleyard (Senior Major Applications Officer) and Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer)

## **12 Chair's announcements**

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

## **13 Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **14 Minutes**

The chair provided an update to the committee regarding a correction to the minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2022 as follows:

In minute number 25 relating to Land at Kiln Lane, Drayton, delete the following text:

“A motion moved and seconded, to refuse planning permission, failed on being put to the vote.

The committee remained concerned at several aspects of the proposals; the apparent absence of market research relating to this site and house types, housing density proposals not complying with the neighbourhood plan, a lack of information regarding contaminated land, and the need for more information on flood risks. The committee also considered that engagement between the applicant and the local community could be improved.”

Replace that text with the following:

“A motion moved and seconded to refuse planning permission was later withdrawn in favour of an alternative motion to defer consideration of the application. The reasons for the deferral were to seek (1) more local engagement between the applicant and the local community, (2) market research on house types, (3) greater consideration of Core Policy 4 and whether a different housing mix could be achieved as the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan’s had stated a preference for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes, and (4) further information on contaminated land and flooding risk.

A motion moved and seconded, to defer planning permission, was carried on being put to the vote, for the reasons set out above.”

The committee concurred and approved the minutes as a correct record, subject to the amendment set out above.

**RESOLVED:** to adopt the minutes of 20 April 2022 as a correct record, subject to the amendment set out above, and agree that the chair signs them as such.

## **15 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **16 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **17 Public participation**

The committee had received a list of public speakers prior to the meeting. Statements which had been made by the public in respect of the application had been circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

## **18 P21/V2176/FUL - Land at Kiln Lane, Drayton**

The committee considered application P21/V2176/FUL for the demolition of single dwelling and associated outbuildings and structures, and erection of 1x2bed, 2x3bed, 4x4bed and 1x5bed detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping (as amended by plans and additional information received 14 September 2021 and 14 February 2022, including change to red line area. Amended plans and documentation received 27 May 2022. Application description amendment agreed with agent 27 May 2022), on land at Kiln Lane, Drayton.

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 background to the application, explaining to the committee that the site was located in Drayton and comprised a site that was 0.4 hectares in size. The site currently had existing structures, consisting of a detached bungalow with ancillary structures. It was noted that the trees and vegetation had already been removed prior to the application. The site’s location was detailed, and the planning officer confirmed that the site was surrounded on all sides by existing residential dwellings. The planning officer also added that the application would lead to a net increase of seven dwellings on the application site should planning permission be granted, and that these houses would fall under six

different design layouts. However, these designs were all considered acceptable and reflective of the area.

The committee was informed that consideration of the application had been deferred on 20 April 2022 to enable a market assessment to take place, for information on contaminated land and flood risks to be gathered, and to encourage a greater community engagement for the design of the site. The planning officer explained that officers received advice from the planning policy team, attached in the report as Appendix 3. This outlined for Drayton and other larger villages, that no local needs test was required for unallocated housing sites within the built area, rather a presumption in favour of the grant of permission operated. In light of comments received from the policy team, officers were of the view that a Market Assessment was not reasonable or necessary. However, the scheme had been amended to introduce two and three bed units, as highlighted in the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan. The housing mix was considered acceptable by officers. In addition, the committee were told that for this stage of the application, the conditions already proposed would deal with contaminated land and flood risks. Finally, planning officers confirmed that they did not see community engagement as a valid reason for refusal, as consultations had been carried out with neighbouring properties under planning policy requirements, in accordance with the council's own Statement of Community Involvement. As the application was policy compliant, and there were no technical objections, the planning application was recommended for approval.

Mr Brian Jeffries, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. The committee asked the speaker about car accidents in the area and the cause. The response by the speaker was that the small movements on the application site were already causing accidents due to the smaller road and narrow road width. A second question from the committee related to the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan and the speakers view on it. The speaker responded that they felt the plan would enable smaller houses to support local families staying in the village, and they considered the application contrary to the aims of the neighbourhood plan. A final question was raised to the speaker, asking their view on apartments for the site. The speaker confirmed that this housing option would have been more beneficial than larger housing developments in their view.

Mr James Corris, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. The speaker was asked by the committee regarding the housing density on whether it was similar to village housing density. The speaker responded by confirming that the site and proposal were appropriate for the site, and whilst it was short of the preferred density, they believed the application was still suitable. A supplementary question was asked on traffic risks. The speaker responded that relevant traffic officers had been involved and the county council's highway officers had raised no significant concerns. A final question to the speaker was raised asking for clarification on the community engagement that had taken place after the previous decision to defer the application. The speaker stated that he could not comment on the consultation, and could only speak to the specific application presented before the committee.

Councillor Andy Cooke, the local ward member, spoke in objection to the application.

The committee asked the planning officer for clarification on the housing density on the site compared to the local village. The planning officer stated that the density for the site was partly determined by the constraints of the site, and the character of the area. The committee was told that policy CP23 requested a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless specific local circumstances indicate that this would have an adverse effect on the character of the area, highway safety or the amenity of neighbours. The planning

officer noted that the proposal was in keeping with the character of the area in terms of density, particularly given the site constraints.

The committee also asked for clarification on core policy three and what local needs were defined as. The planning officer stated in response that advice had been sought regarding local needs and the advice given was that core policy three set out their settlement hierarchy and core policy 4 set out the development management policy approach and that there was no local needs test for unallocated housing sites in a built up area.

The committee raised a concern regarding the committee on the risk of contamination from the site, which was noted as a concern raised by local residents. The planning officer explained that the contaminated land officer reviewed their position and they confirmed that whilst they advise phased contaminated and risk was required, a condition could be required but was not something that would be expected upfront prior to the determination of the application.

The planning officer, in response to questions on biodiversity, stated that the metric assessment had been scrutinised by the countryside officer, and the concerns had been addressed by amendments to the application. The latest application with biodiversity offsetting was based on the site before any vegetation were removed.

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/V2176/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. Landscaping scheme
5. Tree/Hedge Protection details
6. Phased contaminated land risk assessment
7. Access and visibility details to be submitted
8. Construction traffic management plan
9. Surface water drainage scheme
10. Foul water drainage scheme
11. Biodiversity off-setting certificate
12. Biodiversity enhancement details
13. Details of any external lighting

**Pre-occupation**

14. Management of open space
15. Parking, including visitor parking, to be provided
16. Details of boundary treatments
17. Bin storage details
18. Bin presentation point details
19. Contamination validation report
20. SUDs compliance report
21. Cycle parking in accordance with plan

## **Compliance**

- 22. Construction working hours
- 23. Compliance with ecological mitigation measures
- 24. Unsuspected contamination
- 25. First floor side windows to be obscure glazed
- 26. Rooflight sill height to be 1.7 metres from finish floor level
- 27. Garages to be retained for parking

## **Informatives**

CIL

INF17 – Works within the highway

PRoWs

Thames Water

### **19 P21/V1376/FUL - Foxcombe Hall, Boars Hill, Wootton, Oxford**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

### **20 P21/V1379/LB - Foxcombe Hall, Boars Hill, Wootton, Oxford**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.08 pm