

# Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

## Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 17 MAY 2017 AT 6.00 PM

DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN

### Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman), Anthony Dearlove, Toby Newman, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Ian White, Elaine Hornsby (as substitute for Joan Bland) and Sue Lawson (as substitute for David Nimmo-Smith)

### Apologies:

Joan Bland, Jeannette Matelot, David Nimmo-Smith and Margaret Turner tendered apologies.

### Officers:

Emma Bowerman, Paul Bowers, Steve Culliford, Paula Fox, Phil Moule, and Tom Wyatt

### Also present:

Paul Yoward (Oxfordshire County Council – Highways)

### 252 Minutes of the previous meeting

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 April 2017 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

### 253 Declarations of interest

None

### 254 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

None

### 255 Applications deferred or withdrawn

None

### 256 Proposals for site visits

None



Listening Learning Leading

## **257 Public participation**

A list showing twenty members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

## **258 East End Farm, South east of Wallingford Road, Cholsey**

Elaine Hornsby, acting on behalf of the local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S3607/FUL for planning permission to erect 68 residential dwellings, including affordable housing, access, parking, open space and landscaping following the demolition of existing buildings, on land at East End Farm, south-east of Wallingford Road, Cholsey.

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 this meeting.

Officer update: the officer reported that since publication of the agenda pack, a further six letters of objection had been received, and a sewer impact survey had been received concluding that the proposed development would have no adverse impact on the existing sewer system.

Mark Gray, a representative of Cholsey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- Traffic on Wallingford Road was too fast and this proposed development would bring additional traffic
- The developer should provide a more acceptable traffic solution at the proposed junction and a pedestrian crossing also
- The drainage system might not have sufficient capacity
- The spaces between the existing and proposed housing were too small
- Parking provision on the site was inadequate for the number of dwellings proposed
- There should be covenants to stop garages being converted into habitable rooms
- The neighbourhood plan would accept a significant number of homes already
- The parish council was not opposed to sustainable development but it did not believe that this was a sustainable development site

Paul Ramsay, a representative of the Cholsey neighbourhood planning group, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The pre-submission version of the neighbourhood plan would be published in approximately one month and it did not include this as a housing site
- The village had already grown recently
- Local people should decide on the location of new housing
- Approximately 135 homes had been included in the neighbourhood plan
- This was not a sustainable housing site

Alex Smith spoke objecting to the application on behalf of Stop Unwanted Development in Cholsey. His concerns included:

- The neighbourhood plan would be published in a few weeks and any new development should be plan-led with local support
- The proposed development did not meet the National Planning Policy Framework policies
- It would cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings
- Traffic sped along Wallingford Road and would cause a hazard to traffic entering and leaving this site
- There had been no road safety audit—this was a requirement
- Surface water flooding had been experienced at Wallingford Road
- The spaces between the proposed and existing homes did not meet the council's design guide minimum standards

Marcus Holford had registered to speak objecting to the application but answered a question to confirm that although there had been surface water flooding in the area, he did not have any evidence that the flood water had entered any residential property.

Nick Kirby, Max Thurgood and David Knight, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application:

- This was a sustainable development located close to village facilities and bus and rail transport
- It would bring less than 60 additional vehicle movements in peak hours
- The junction design with Wallingford Road had been agreed with the county highways authority
- Speed cushions would be introduced along Wallingford Road to reduce the speed of passing traffic
- Thames Water had confirmed that the drainage system had sufficient capacity
- The neighbourhood plan in its current form had no weight as a material planning consideration
- The number of homes on the site had been reduced following consultation with local residents
- A landscaping scheme would be introduced to protect neighbours' amenity
- The gap between the new housing and the listed building was 35 metres

Elaine Hornsby spoke on behalf of the local ward councillor, objecting to the application, raising the following concerns:

- About the mass of the proposed development, the distances to the existing dwellings, and the impact on local residents
- This was overdevelopment
- The amenity open space on the site was poorly located
- The proposed development was unsustainable and unneighbourly
- There was insufficient infrastructure and services in the village to cope with this additional housing

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The committee had concerns about the following:

- This application would harm the setting of the listed building
- It was overdevelopment of the site
- It was unsustainable development
- No weight could be given to the unpublished pre-submission version of the neighbourhood plan
- The impact of additional traffic on to Wallingford Road

- Insufficient school capacity
- It was unneighbourly to the residents of Rothwell Close
- There was insufficient parking on the site

The development manager advised the committee that the neighbourhood plan could not be afforded any weight as it was not yet made or published as a pre-submission plan. There were no technical objections in relation to highway safety or education capacity.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse outline planning permission for application P16/ S3607/FUL, due to the following reasons:

1. That, having regard to the proximity of the development to the Grade 2 listed property known as Duxford and its design, density and height the proposal would adversely affect the setting of the listed building, detaching a vernacular cottage from its rural setting thereby harming its significance and special historic interest contrary to Policy CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and CON5 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed access is located on a stretch of the Wallingford Road where vehicles frequently exceed the speed limit. Taking this into account and the position of the access relative to the junction of Goldfinch Lane and the bend in the carriageway to the south west of the site, the proposal would fail to provide safe and convenient access for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists and would therefore increase the likelihood of accidents contrary to Policy T1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and paragraph of the 32 of the NPPF.
3. There is insufficient capacity for early years education and primary and secondary schools in the local area to meet the demands arising from this proposal. Furthermore significant other development has already been permitted in Crowmarsh, Wallingford and Benson which means that the capacities of other schools in the locality are also expected to be exceeded. The development cannot therefore make adequate provision for education infrastructure and is an unsustainable form of development, contrary to Policy CSI1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the NPPF.
4. That, in the absence of a completed S106 agreement the proposal fails to i) secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the District and ii) secure other on and off site infrastructure necessary to support the development, and as such is contrary to policies CSH3 and CSI1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **259 Bloom Buildings, West End, Cholsey**

The committee considered application P16/S4177/FUL for planning permission to demolish existing B8 storage buildings and erect five dwellings with associated parking and amenity space, on land at Bloom Buildings, West End, Cholsey.

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 this meeting.

Officer update: the officer reported that since publication of the agenda pack, the county council had requested an archaeological survey before this development commenced. The officer recommended additional conditions to cover this request.

Paul Ramsay, on behalf of the Cholsey neighbourhood planning group, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The site had employment use, not residential use
- This was outside the built up area of the village
- It was in an unsustainable location, encouraging further car use
- There were no special circumstances to approve this application

Mark Gray, a representative of Cholsey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The site was outside of the village and was inappropriate for housing development and would set a precedent
- It had a poor access from the village through the small railway bridge and along a single-track road that was prone to flooding
- It was unsustainable development
- It was overdevelopment of the site
- There was only a private water supply to the site with low water pressure, insufficient for more housing

Sarah Wright spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- This was development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that would create a precedent
- The access to the site was poor
- The development would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents
- There was no mains drain for sewage
- There was no public water supply to the site, only a private supply that would be insufficient for further development
- If the development proceeded, there must be no adverse impact to the existing residents' water supplies and drainage system

Adrian Gould, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The council did not have a five-year housing land supply
- The site had permission to be used more intensively for B8 storage
- Residential development would be less intrusive than B8 storage use
- There would be no adverse impact on the neighbours
- The site was well screened and there would not be any adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- This was a sustainable development close to local services and good public transport links
- There were no unresolved issues from the technical consultees
- The lack of a mains water supply was not a formal requirement of a planning application but details of a water supply were required by the officer's recommended conditions

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The committee considered that:

- Although this was not the best location due to the access road and being away from the village, it provided a more neighbourly use than the currently permitted B8 storage use
- The development had been well-designed
- The water supply was covered by the officer's recommended planning condition
- Permitted development rights should be removed to require future, secondary applications on this site to come to the local planning authority

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning permission for application P16/S4177/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years.
2. The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Schedule of materials to be submitted for approval.
4. Existing vehicular access shall be improved to Oxfordshire County Council specifications.
5. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
6. Construction traffic management.
7. No garage conversion into accommodation.
8. Wildlife protection (mitigation as approved).
9. Contaminated land (preliminary risk assessment).
10. Contaminated land - remediation strategy.
11. Scheme for external lighting.
12. Water supply assessment to be submitted.
13. The applicant, or their agents or successors in title, shall be responsible for organising and implementing an archaeological watching brief, to be maintained during the period of construction/during any ground works taking place on the site. The watching brief shall be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation that has first been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
14. Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 13, no development shall commence on site without the appointed archaeologist being present. Once the watching brief has been completed its findings shall be reported to the Local Planning Authority, as agreed in the Written Scheme of Investigation, including all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication.
15. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order), the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of any dwellinghouse as described in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order shall not be undertaken without obtaining planning permission for the Local Planning Authority.
16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) the provision within the curtilage of the dwelling of any building, enclosure or swimming pool as described in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the

Order shall not be undertaken without obtaining planning permission for the Local Planning Authority.

## **260 Land at 67 Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor**

Ian White, the local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S3471/FUL for planning permission to erect two dwellings with access, parking and amenity space on land at 67 Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor.

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 this meeting.

Martin Wright, a representative of Chinnor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The new dwellings each had a smaller footprint than neighbouring dwellings, resulting in a cramped development that did not fit in with the surrounding area
- The access to the site was poor, with poor sight lines near the brow of a hill
- The access road into the site was narrow
- There was no space for the residents to leave their waste bins

Jake Collinge, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- There was an existing permission for one dwelling on the site
- The proposed development was not cramped but fitted in well with the surrounding area
- There would be no adverse impact on the neighbours' amenity
- The access arrangements had been approved by the local highways authority

Ian White, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- Those referred to by the parish council
- This would be an overdevelopment of the site and not in keeping with its surroundings
- How would waste vehicles access the site?
- The access was poor onto a busy road
- There was inadequate parking for visitors
- It was a poor design

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The committee had concerns about the development being cramped overdevelopment due to its layout and scale and would detract from the spacious character of its surroundings.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P16/S3471/FUL, for the following reason:

1. The proposed development, due to its layout and scale, would represent a cramped form of development resulting in an overdevelopment of the site that would detract from the spacious character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies G2, D1 and H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and guidance contained within the South Oxfordshire Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **261 Land to the south of A4130, Didcot**

Anthony Dearlove stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S3609/O for outline planning permission to erect up to 166 dwellings, associated open space and infrastructure on land south of the A4130 at Didcot.

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 this meeting.

At its meeting on 29 March 2017, the committee had deferred the application due to highway concerns, asking the applicant to negotiate with the adjoining land owner to explore an alternative site access. However, the officer reported that the applicant wished to have the application determined in its original form. The county highways authority had no objection to the proposal.

Anthony Dearlove, a representative of Didcot Town Council, spoke objecting to the application:

- The principle of the development on this site was acceptable but this proposal should be refused on the grounds of highway safety
- Access to this site must not be directly on to the A4130 but instead should be accessed from Sir Frank Williams Avenue

Matthew Dawber and Alex Bennett, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application:

- This was a high quality scheme with no technical objections
- It had a good layout in a sustainable setting
- The proposed access could be delivered safely
- The applicant wished to have the application determined in its original form

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. The committee was disappointed that the applicant had not made more effort to explore a safer, shared access to the site. However, the committee noted that there were no technical planning reasons to refuse the application.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve outline planning permission for application P16/S3609/O, subject to



- (i) The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing, other obligations and financial contributions listed in paragraphs 6.34 and 6.43 of planning officer's report; and
- (i) The following conditions:
  1. Development not to commence until details of reserved matters (landscaping, appearance, layout and scale) have been submitted and approved.
  2. Approved plans (relating to access).
  3. Market housing mix to be in general conformity with SHMA at 5.7% 1 bed, 26.7% 2 bed, 43.4% 3bed and 24.2% 4 bed units.
  4. Sample materials to be agreed.
  5. Landscaping scheme to be approved.
  6. Landscape management scheme to be agreed.
  7. Play space / equipment to be approved.
  8. New vehicular access to be laid out and constructed in accordance local highway authority's specification prior to occupation.
  9. Vision splay details to be approved.
  10. New estate roads: including all highways infrastructure to be provided prior to first occupation.
  11. Parking and manoeuvring areas and car parking plan to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.
  12. Public right of way shown on framework plan to be secured through the site.
  13. Travel Plan and travel information pack to be submitted and approved prior to first occupation.
  14. Construction Traffic Management Plan to be agreed.
  15. The distance between the front elevation of any dwellings and the kerbside of the A4130 shall measure 39 metres.
  16. Electric vehicle charging points to be provided.
  17. A scheme for noise protection to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development
  18. Construction method statement to be agreed
  19. Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.
  20. Staged programme of archaeological evaluation to be carried out.
  21. Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy to be submitted and approved concurrent to reserved matters application.
  22. Limit on hours of construction – 7:30am to 6pm Mondays to Fridays and 8am to 1 pm Saturdays.
  23. Appropriate provisions for control of construction noise and dust.
  24. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved Flood Risk Assessment and mitigation measures detailed within.
  25. Surface water drainage works, including site investigation information, to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.
  26. Foul drainage strategy detailing any on / off site drainage works to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development.

## **262 Lorien, Waterperry**

The committee considered application P16/S2467/FUL for planning permission to demolish a garage and erect a new dwelling on land at Lorien, Waterperry.

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 this meeting.

The committee considered the application was acceptable as the principle of a self-contained dwelling was established on this site and the proposal did not adversely impact on neighbouring dwellings.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning permission for application P16/S2467/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Work to commence within three years.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Details of materials to be submitted.
4. Parking spaces as indicated on plan to be useable prior to occupation of the approved dwelling, and SuDs compliant.
5. Boundary detailing in place prior to occupation.
6. Removal of permitted development rights of proposed dwelling – Class A (enlargement / alteration), Class B (Roof alterations / dormer windows), Class D (Porch), Class E (Outbuildings).
7. Minimum cill height of upper floor windows on south-eastern elevation: 1.65m.
8. Details of waste / recycling storage to be submitted.
9. Removal of all containers prior to occupation.
10. Restriction of eaves / ridge height of proposed shed.

## **263 Barn at Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake**

The committee considered application P16/S4292/FUL for planning permission for the change of use of a barn to four residential units, parking in an outbuilding, a courtyard, landscaping, demolition, the closure of an access from Thames Farm field and amendments to the access to Reading Road, all on land at Thames Farm, Reading Road, Lower Shiplake.

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 this meeting.

Kester George and Susan Wright, representatives of Harpsden Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included:

- The proposed development negated planning principles
- There had been no permission to erect the barn, which was now the subject of this application
- The Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan had found more appropriate housing sites; this proposal was inconsistent with the neighbourhood plan
- This was urban sprawl in a rural area
- It should be refused on highway safety grounds

Ken Arlett, a representative of Henley Town Council, spoke objecting to the application:

- He agreed with the objections made by Harpsden Parish Council and pointed to the Town Council's objections set out in the officer's report
- The proposed development was a change of use of an unauthorised barn and therefore should be refused

Gregg Davies, a representative of Shiplake Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The proposed development was out of character with the surrounding area
- It was contrary to the neighbourhood plan
- It should be refused on the grounds of highway safety (a video showing traffic levels was shown)
- It was unlikely that there would be fewer than two cars per household
- The pedestrian access from this site was dangerous; there was no footpath

Les Durrant, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- There was no material planning reason to refuse this application
- The history of adjacent sites was not relevant
- The development had been well-designed; cars would be screened from view
- The precedent of development on this site had already been established
- The neighbourhood plan was not offended by this application
- There was no road accident history at this point on Reading Road

The planning officer advised the committee that each application must be judged on its merits. The Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan had been adopted in 2015.

The committee considered that it would be appropriate to visit the site before determining the application. A motion, moved and seconded, to defer the application to allow for a site visit was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to defer consideration of application P16/S4292/FUL to allow for the committee to visit the site.

The meeting closed at 8.36 pm

Chairman

Date