

Minutes



OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00PM ON 12 JANUARY 2010

AT COUNCIL OFFICES, CROWMARSH GIFFORD

Present:

Mrs P Slatter (Chairman)

Mr G Andrews, Ms J Bland, Mr F Bloomfield, Mr P Cross, Capt J Flood, Mr J Griffin, Mr A Hodgson, Mr I Lokhon, Mrs A Midwinter, Mrs J Murphy (as substitute for Mrs E Gillespie), Mr R Peasgood, Mr R Peirce, Mr A Rooke, Mrs M Turner

Apologies:

Mrs E Gillespie tendered apologies.

Officers:

Mr P Bowers, Mrs S Crawford, Miss P Fox, Ms L Murfett, Mr I Price, Ms C Scotting, Ms S Spencer, Mrs J Thompson

Also in attendance:

Mr D Groves and Mr A Pope (Oxfordshire County Council)

82. Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December with the amendment:

Minute 79 P10/E1281: delete 'The committee expressed concern....neighbouring properties' and replace with 'Concern was expressed at the siting of the property within the plot and how this and its height would impact on neighbouring properties'

as a correct record and that the chairman sign them.

83. P10/W1589 Land at 2 Winterbrook, Reading Road, Wallingford and land west of Reading Road (in the parish of Cholsey)

The clerk reminded councillors that although they may have taken part in debates on the core strategy at meetings of full council, scrutiny or Cabinet in November 2010, this did not prevent them making planning decisions provided they are open to the

possibility that they would hear arguments during the debate that would cause them to change their minds about how they intended to vote. They were entitled to take part in any vote on the applications provided they kept an open mind and were mindful of the council's planning code of good practice.

Mr I Lokhon declared that he considered that he had a predetermined view on this application. He stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P10/W1589 to demolish 2 Winterbrook, Reading Road, Wallingford and develop the land to the west to accommodate 98 dwellings together with associated access and landscaping works.

The planning officer reported that:

- in the final sentence of paragraph 8.1, the reference to policy H5 should read as policy H6;
- she was proposing an amendment to the second refusal reason to include additional words (in bold and underlined):
“Development of this site is not the preferred option for growth identified in the emerging Core Strategy. There is no housing shortfall in the district outside the Didcot area and no need to bring forward additional sites for development. Development of this site would predetermine decisions about the location and scale of new development **and the necessary supporting infrastructure** and would therefore undermine the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and Local Development Framework which should determine the location and scale of new development **and the approach to infrastructure provision**. The proposal is therefore contrary to the strategic objectives of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, the Council's Proposed Submission Core Strategy, and South East Plan policies SP3 and BE1, C01, and C03 which focus growth at Didcot, and is contrary to the advice in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS12.”
- the crime prevention officer reported that the amended plans appear to have addressed the original concerns;
- the forestry officer reported that the revised submission provided a more realistic proposal for tree planting within the central area of the site and remaining issues could be addressed through an appropriate condition.
- developer contributions of £1,092, 328 to Oxfordshire County Council are required to fund infrastructure improvements in respect of education, library, waste management, museum resources, social and health care and youth centre/early years centre provision;
- a 177 signature petition against the development had been received.

Mr P Dawe, a representative of Cholsey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr A Jones and Mr S Josephs, representing Save Winterbrook, and Mr PWD Greene, County Councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Ms J Ashton and Mr J Bevis, the agent and the transport consultant for the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

A motion to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report, with the amendment to reason 2 as suggested by the planning officer, was moved, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P10/W1589, 2 Winterbrook, Reading Road, Wallingford and land to west of Reading Road for the following reasons:

1. That the proposed development is contrary to the policies of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan. This development for 98 dwellings and associated infrastructure is on land outside of the built up area of Winterbrook (Wallingford) and in the open countryside. The site is not allocated for development (H2) and it is not infill development (H5). The development would undesirably extend into and encroach upon and harm the open countryside (H6).

2. Development of this site is not the preferred option for growth identified in the emerging Core Strategy. There is no housing shortfall in the district outside the Didcot area and no need to bring forward additional sites for development. Development of this site would predetermine decisions about the location and scale of new development and the necessary supporting infrastructure and would therefore undermine the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and Local Development Framework which should determine the location and scale of new development and the approach to infrastructure provision. The proposal is therefore contrary to the strategic objectives of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, the Council's Proposed Submission Core Strategy, and South East Plan policies SP3 and BE1, C01, and C03 which focus growth at Didcot, and is contrary to the advice in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS12.

3. That, having regard to the location and width of the proposed access and to the linear nature and sense of enclosure along this stretch of Reading Road which contains a number of non designated heritage assets, the provision of the new access to serve large scale residential development to the rear of frontage properties would damage irreparably the character of the area contrary to Policies G2, C1, and D1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and advice contained in PPS5.

4. That the proposal fails to provide affordable housing in accordance with PPS3 and Policy H9 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

5. That the proposal fails to provide adequate facilities and services to meet the needs of the development contrary to PPS12, Policy G3

of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan and Policies C6, R2, R3, R6, D11, D12 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

84. P10/W1201/O, land north of the A4130, Wallingford and P10/W1530, land to the west of Reading Road, Winterbrook, Wallingford (in the parish of Cholsey)

Mr I Lokhon declared that he considered that he had a predetermined view on this application. He stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P10/W1201/O for a residential development of not more than 380 dwellings, a 60-bed extra care facility, a primary school, and access on land north of the A4130 in the parish of Cholsey, and application P10/W1530 for a pedestrian cycle link immediately south of Bradfords Brook linking Reading Road, Winterbrook and the site of application P10/W1201/O.

The planning officer reported:

- details of proposed works to Reading Road for a footway between the proposed footway link (P10/W1530) and the community hospital had been submitted. The highway authority maintain their objection to the scheme on the grounds of poor accessibility and would need to see further works to the north (paragraph 7.20 of the report refers)
- Save Winterbrook has submitted a design safety review of the Reading Road the highway authority considered the access from the Wates site to be acceptable in terms of highway safety and traffic generation.
- a 211-signature petition objecting to application P10/W1201/O and a 149-signature petition objecting to application P10/W1530 had been received.
- in paragraph 6.4 of the report, Policy H7 relating to Housing Mix and Policy H14 relating to Lifetime Homes should be added to the list of policies.
- she proposed an amendment to Reason 3 of P10/W1201/O to add a further sentence:
'..... the integration of new and existing communities. Furthermore the lack of vehicular and pedestrian links to existing areas will be likely to result in increased traffic to Winterbrook Lane for school drop offs and this will lead to a diminution in amenity and character to the lane. The proposal is
- she proposed an amendment to Reason 8 to refer to Policy H7 of the Local Plan: '..... identified in the South Oxfordshire Housing Needs Assessment and is contrary to Policy H7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.'

Mr A Dawe, a representative of Cholsey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr A Jones and Mr S Josephs, representing the Save Winterbrook Group, and Mr PWD Greene, County Councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

A motion to refuse planning permission for application P10/W1201/O for the reasons set out in the report, with amendments as proposed by the planning officer, was moved, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

A motion to refuse planning permission for application P10/W1530 for the reasons set out in the report was moved, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P10/W1201/O, land north of A4130 Wallingford by-pass, Wallingford for the following reasons:

1. That the proposed development is contrary to the policies of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan. This development for 380 dwellings, a 60 bed extra care home, a school and associated infrastructure is on land outside of the built up area of Wallingford and in the open countryside. The site is not allocated for development (H2) and it is not infill development (H5). The development would undesirably extend into and encroach upon open countryside and detrimentally affect the landscape setting of Winterbrook and Wallingford, contrary to policies G4, H6 and C4.
2. Development of this site is not the preferred option for growth identified in the Proposed Submission Core Strategy. There is no housing shortfall in the district outside the Didcot area and there is no need to bring forward additional sites for development. Development of this site would predetermine decisions about the location and scale of new development and would therefore undermine the Proposed Submission Core Strategy and Local Development Framework which should determine the location and scale of new development. The proposal is contrary to the strategic objectives of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, the Council's Proposed Submission Core Strategy, and South East Plan policies SP3 and BE1, C01, and C03 which focus growth at Didcot, and is contrary to the advice in PPS1, PPS3 and PPS12.
3. That the development is unsustainable in that it does not provide good vehicular, pedestrian and cycle connections to and from existing areas and local services in Wallingford. The footway/cycle path proposed under application P10/W1530 is isolated and not overlooked by habitable properties and will not provide a safe, secure and attractive route for residents and schoolchildren. There are inadequate vehicular and pedestrian links to existing areas and facilities in Wallingford which will encourage car based travel and undermine the sustainability and vibrancy of the development and the integration of new and existing communities. Furthermore the

lack of vehicular and pedestrian links to existing areas will be likely to result in increased traffic to Winterbrook Lane for school drop offs and this will lead to a diminution in amenity and character to the lane. The proposal is contrary to PPS1, PPS 3, PPG13 and South Oxfordshire Local Plan Policies D1, D6, and T1.

4. That the development is unsustainable as residents would not have a frequent bus service within reasonable distance of their homes. It does not provide walking access to public transport and will not promote sustainable travel. The development is therefore contrary to PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and Policy T1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.
5. That the form of the proposed development of this site includes the main site access with street lighting through an open area important for the setting of Wallingford. This major access will intrude into the open space and will not result in a satisfactory visual edge to the development. This will not provide an adequate landscape transition between the proposed development and the open countryside to the south. As a result an attractive landscape setting for Wallingford will not be maintained, which will harm the distinctive character and appearance of the area. The proposals will be contrary to policies G2, G4, C4, D1 and EP3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, and Government advice set out in PPS1, PPS3, and PPS7.
6. The illustrative layout and design proposed does not:
 - demonstrate a integrally planned and comprehensive layout that is sustainable in relation to the location and accessibility of facilities;
 - indicate that the amount of development proposed can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in a high quality design;
 - ensure that routes into and within the site promote sustainable and safe travel, legibility and permeability
 - ensure that there is adequate and sufficient space to achieve a high quality landscaping scheme and mature tree planting within the built environment;
 - ensure the protection of existing trees that contribute to the landscape character of the area;
 - The development is therefore contrary to guidance PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and Policies G6, D1, D6, C1 and C9 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.
7. That the proposal fails meet the needs for improved local services and infrastructure generated by the additional

housing. The development would therefore have a detrimental impact on existing services and infrastructure contrary to PPS12, Policy CC7 of the South East Plan and Policies C6, R2, R3, R6, D11, D12 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

8. That the proposal fails to demonstrate that an appropriate mix of housing will be provided. The development will therefore not address the housing needs of the District identified in the South Oxfordshire Housing Needs Assessment and is contrary to Policy H7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.
9. That the proposal fails to provide affordable housing in accordance with PPS3, Policy H3 of the SEP and Policy H9 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

To refuse planning permission for application P10/W1530, land to the west of reading Road, Winterbrook, Wallingford for the following reason:

- The proposed footway / cycle path is isolated and not overlooked by habitable properties. The route will not therefore provide a safe, secure and attractive route for residents and schoolchildren. It will therefore not provide adequate accessibility and connections to and from the site and existing areas and will encourage car based travel. The proposal is contrary to PPG13, PPS3 and South Oxfordshire Local Plan policies T1 and D6.

85. P10/W1479/DAD Various sites within the district of South Oxfordshire¹

The committee considered application P10/W1479/DAD seeking advertising consent for the display of advertisements of two sizes (910mm by 460mm and 765mm by 380mm) on 23 roundabouts across the district.

The planning officer and the council's solicitor reminded the committee that in considering the applications for advertising consent before them they must have regard only to the impact on visual amenity in the area where the adverts were displayed and to the impact on public safety, and specifically on the safety of road users.

Mr B Stone, a representative of Wallingford Town Council spoke objecting to the application.

Mr M Tyce, a representative of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, spoke objecting to the application.

¹ Mr G Andrews left the meeting at the start of this item.

At this stage, to allow the greatest number of committee members to debate and vote on the proposals, the Chairman varied the standard procedure to split the application into three related groups and take separate votes on the three groups.

Group A: roundabouts on A4074, at Playhatch, and at Watlington (numbers 1, 2, 14-16, and 22-23 in Appendix B of the report)

Mr F Bloomfield, Mr P Cross, and Mr R Peasgood, local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this part of the application.

Mr F Bloomfield, local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

Mr P Cross, local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

Mr R Peasgood, local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application as it related to the Playhatch roundabout.

Members of the committee were of the opinion that the proposed advertisements were modest in size, did not cause any serious harm to the amenities of the areas in which they are displayed and there was no evidence to suggest that they cause any significant distraction to users of the public highway.

A motion to grant advertising consent for the roundabouts numbered 1, 2, 14-16, and 22-23 in the schedule of advertisements was proposed, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

Group B: roundabouts on the Thame and Wallingford perimeter roads (numbers 17-21 in Appendix B of the report)

Mr F Bloomfield, Mr P Cross, and Mr R Peasgood rejoined the committee.

Mr I Lokhon and Mrs A Midwinter, local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this part of the application.

Mr I Lokhon, local ward councillor, reminded the committee about Wallingford Town Council's plans for signs in the town.

Mrs A Midwinter, local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application as it related to the Thame roundabouts.

Members of the committee were of the opinion that the proposed advertisements were modest in size, did not cause any serious harm to the amenities of the areas in which they are displayed and there was no evidence to suggest that they cause any significant distraction to users of the public highway.

A motion to grant advertising consent for the roundabouts numbered 17-21 in the schedule of advertisements was proposed, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

Group C: roundabouts in and around Didcot (numbers 3-13 in Appendix B of the report)

Mr I Lokhon and Mrs A Midwinter rejoined the committee

Capt J Flood, Mrs J Murphy, and Mrs M Turner, local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this part of the application. Mrs M Turner declared a personal interest as she had chaired the Didcot Town Council meeting which had made comments on this application.

Capt J Flood, local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application as it related to the Didcot roundabouts.

Members of the committee were of the opinion that the proposed advertisements were modest in size, did not cause any serious harm to the amenities of the areas in which they are displayed and there was no evidence to suggest that they cause any significant distraction to users of the public highway.

A motion to grant advertising consent for the roundabouts numbered 3-13 in the schedule of advertisements was proposed, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

The committee therefore:

RESOLVED:

To grant advertising consent for application P10/W1479/DAD for sponsorship advertisements at 23 roundabouts at various sites in the district, subject to standard advertisement conditions.

86. P10/W1478/DAD A4139 Wallingford Bypass, South Oxfordshire (in the parishes of Crowmarsh and Cholsey)²

Mr J Griffin, a local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this part of the application.

The committee considered application P10/W1478/DAD seeking advertising consent for the display of advertisements of two sizes (910mm by 460mm and 765mm by 380mm) on four roundabouts on the A4139 Wallingford Bypass.

The planning officer reported a correction to the report to insert a final paragraph in the Highway Authority's reported comments which unfortunately had been left out of the report. After the final paragraph on page 93 the following was inserted:-

² Mr A Hodgson left the meeting at the start of this item.

'Conclusions:

On balance however, given the proximity of the 5th anniversary and the existing policy agreement for the principle of the signs contained in the Deed no objection is returned. This is with the proviso with the strong recommendation that as sign contents are replaced that specific heed is paid to the principles of the comments above and that the advertisement copy is produced in accordance with those principles at the earliest date possible'.

Mr N Hannigan, a representative of Crowmarsh Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr M Tyce, a representative of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr J Griffin, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Members of the committee were of the opinion that the proposed advertisements were modest in size, did not harm the beauty, special landscape quality or distinctiveness of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and there was no evidence to suggest that they cause any significant distraction to users of the public highway.

A motion to grant advertising consent for the four roundabouts was proposed, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED:

To grant advertising consent for application P10/W1478/DAD for sponsorship advertisements at four roundabouts on the A4139 Wallingford Bypass, subject to standard advertisement conditions.

87. P10/W1460/DAD B4445, junction of Aylesbury Road, North Street and Bell Lane, Thame.

Mrs A Midwinter, a local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this part of the application.

The committee considered application P10/W1460/DAD seeking advertising consent for the display of advertisements of two sizes (910mm by 460mm and 765mm by 380mm) on the roundabout on the B4445 at the junction of Aylesbury Road, North Street and Bell Lane, Thame.

The planning officer reported a correction to the report. The comments contained in this report were the initial draft comments from their Liaison Officer, not the formal response of the Highway Authority. The formal Highway Authority comments were of no objection and their content was as in the previous two applications.

Mr M Tyce, a representative of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, spoke objecting to the application.

Mrs A Midwinter, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Members of the committee were of the opinion that the proposed advertisements were modest in size, did not cause any serious harm to the character of the Thame Conservation Area and there was no evidence to suggest that they cause any significant distraction to users of the public highway.

A motion to grant advertising consent for the roundabout was proposed, seconded, and carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED:

To grant advertising consent for application P10/W1460/DAD for sponsorship advertisements at the roundabout on the B4445 at the junction of Aylesbury Road, North Street and Bell Lane, Thame, subject to standard advertisement conditions.

The meeting closed at 8.50pm

Chairman

Date