

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 26 APRIL 2017 AT 6.00 PM

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

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

Joan Bland, Margaret Davies, Anthony Dearlove, Jeannette Matelot, David Nimmo-Smith, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Margaret Turner and Ian White

Apologies:

Toby Newman tendered apologies.

Officers:

Paul Bowers, Katherine Canavan, Joan Desmond, Adrian Duffield and Nicola Meurer

241 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2017 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

242 Declarations of interest

None.

243 Urgent business and chairman's announcements

None.

244 Applications deferred or withdrawn

None.

245 Proposals for site visits

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of application P16/S3607/FUL – East End Farm, south east of Wallingford Road, Cholsey for a site visit, was declared carried when put to the vote.



Listening Learning Leading

RESOLVED: To defer consideration of application P16/S3607/FUL for a site visit to establish the impact of the proposed development on the landscape setting of the village.

246 Public participation

The list showing 23 members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

247 P16/S4062/O - Land east of Chalgrove

David Turner, 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/S4062/O for outline planning permission to erect up to 120 residential dwellings and space for a community facility with associated highways, landscaping and open space with all matters reserved except for access on land east of Chalgrove.

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, Cuxham and Easington parish council have sent in their objections comprising the following:

1. Highway safety concerns.
2. All applications in Chalgrove and the surrounding areas should be considered at the same time.
3. Extension into open countryside narrowing space between the two settlements.
4. Increased traffic would be harmful to the village of Cuxham.
5. Construction traffic dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists and would potentially damage listed buildings.
6. Extra heavy vehicles could destabilise the road and extra traffic will increase pollution and run-off into Marlbrook stream.

Ann Pritchard, a representative of Chalgrove Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The emerging neighbourhood development plan has identified an alternative preferred site, which will shortly be coming up for consideration at planning committee;
- There is only one access road onto the busy B480;
- Safety concerns for proposed pedestrian crossings, which the parish council did not request (as stated in the report) but for the dangerous corner to be addressed;
- There is no pavement on the slip road;
- The traffic survey was conducted during the Easter holidays at a quiet time of day;
- Future flooding is a major concern as the site is upstream of the village; and
- No-one knows how effective SuDS or Swales will be.

Jacky Nab, a representative of the Chalgrove Neighbourhood Development Plan, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The NDP has been subject to many delays over the last few years, which been out of the working group's control;
- They are not opposed to development and welcome the proposal for 200 more homes in Chalgrove;
- The Marley Lane site is the preferred option for the NDP, would provide all 200 homes as opposed to 120 as proposed for this site and is downstream;
- Concern for risk of flooding;
- The proposed site would be isolated from the village, the only footpath linking it is liable to flood;
- Loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats; and
- There is a danger that if approved, Chalgrove could face 320 new homes if the Marley Lane site is also approved for which the pressure on infrastructure (especially schools) would be too great.

John Tarvit, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application:

- The applicants have developed a good relationship with the parish council and neighbourhood development plan working group and look forward to continuing this if the application is approved;
- There have been no objections from statutory consultees;
- The proposed roundabout on the B480 would alleviate traffic speed concerns;
- The pedestrian access to the village will be the quickest route for future residents and Oxfordshire County Council Highways have deemed the proposed pedestrian crossings safe – the applicants would be open to securing measures to increase safety by condition;
- The surface water flood risk will be alleviated by the measures proposed, this being a unique opportunity to reduce the flood risk for Chalgrove.

David Turner, the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Not averse to development, but not content with the prospect of 320 new dwellings;
- The flood map has been updated following flooding issues, which delayed the submission of the NDP;
- Of the two sites (of which this application is one), the site to the west of Chalgrove is preferred by 65% of residents;
- This site is not connected to the village by road and not coalescent being a greenfield site;
- The access on to the B480 is of great concern;
- There are poor vision splays at the proposed zebra crossings;
- There is no footpath on the Berwick Slip Road, which is dangerous;
- The site is at risk of flooding;
- There is just enough school provision with 200 extra dwellings, not 320; and
- The doctor's surgery is already under pressure.

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

- This application not being the preferred site for the village;
- Loss of agricultural land;
- Density being too high as per the Urban Design Officer's conclusion;
- Lack of pedestrian walkway on the slip road.

The head of planning advised the committee that the emerging neighbourhood plan can only be afforded limited weight as it is not yet made. He advised that there were no objections from statutory consultees. He also stated that the agricultural land is grade 3 and therefore not regarded as of particularly high quality.

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/S4062/O, due to the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its urban character and open location to the east of Chalgrove, would represent a significant encroachment into the open countryside. As a result, the proposal would detract from the undeveloped rural character and appearance of the site and its surroundings, and would fail to conserve the landscape setting of Chalgrove. Whilst all matters relating to design and layout are reserved for future consideration, the proposal, by virtue of its form and access arrangements would result in a development that would not be sufficiently integrated and connected to the wider built context and would fail to make a positive contribution to the quality of the character and functionality of the wider settlement and would fail to establish a strong sense of place. The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits, and as such the proposal would not comprise sustainable development as defined by local and national legislation. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 of the NPPF and sections 7 (Requiring good design) and 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) and policies CS1, CSR1, CSEN1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies G2, G4, D1 and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.
2. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the district. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CSH3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy
3. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure on and off site infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CSI1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies T1, R2 and R6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

248 P16/S3607/FUL - East End Farm, south east of Wallingford Road, Cholsey

Application P16/S3607/FUL to erect 68 residential dwellings including affordable housing provision, access, parking, open space and landscaping following demolition of the existing building at East End Farm, south east of Wallingford Road, Cholsey was deferred to allow for a site visit.

249 P17/S0164/O - Little Martins Field, land east of Waterman's Lane, Brightwell-cum-Sotwell

The committee considered application P17/S0164/O for a residential development of up to 31 dwelling including new access from Didcot Road, following demolition of the existing buildings on site at Little Martins Field, land east of Waterman's Lane, Brightwell-cum-Sotwell.

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.

Celia Collett, a representative of Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council, spoke in support of the application:

- This site is a preferred option in the emerging neighbourhood plan;
- The parish council is in support of the application, however would like to be reassured that the character of the village and wishes of the neighbourhood plan are not compromised at the reserved matters stage; and
- A condition restricting street lighting would be welcome.

Dr A J Walley, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. Although Dr Walley recognises that this is the preferred neighbourhood plan site, he raised the following concerns:

- Impact on the village as an edge of settlement site, which therefore extends the envelope into the open countryside;
- Concern about the scale and height of the proposed development as the properties adjacent to the site are predominantly one to one and a half storeys – he would like reassurance that at the reserved matters stage, this is taken into consideration; and
- Access onto Didcot Road is already difficult and paired with Site B in Wallingford already approved this issue could be exacerbated.

Henry Venners, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The application is in response to the neighbourhood plan's preferred option for this site;
- It is a modest scheme with generous open space;
- There are no technical objections to the site;
- It has good access to the village amenities; and
- The residents will be consulted at the reserved matters stage.

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

A motion, moved and seconded, to authorise the head of planning to grant planning permission, including an extra condition relating to a restriction on street lighting to fit in with the character of the village, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to authorise the head of planning to grant planning permission for application P17/S0164/O, subject to the following:

A. The completion of a s106 agreement securing:

1. Affordable housing.
2. Public transport contribution.
3. Bus stop infrastructure.
4. Open space.

5. Street naming, waste collection, and legal agreement monitoring fees.

B. Conditions:

1. Commencement - outline with reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout, scale).
2. Market split - in general conformity with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
3. Archaeological working brief.
4. Archaeological watching brief and findings report.
5. Details of access.
6. Details of visibility splays.
7. Biodiversity enhancement plan.
8. Safeguarding of public rights of way – details/alterations/links.
9. Boundary and access landscaping scheme.
10. No street lighting.

250 P17/S0299/FUL - 5 Crown Lane, South Moreton

The committee considered application P17/S0299/FUL to demolish a single storey element of the existing house and detached garage; construct a replacement two storey side extension; and construct a new detached dwelling within the curtilage with associated works at 5 Crown Lane, South Moreton

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.

Lesley Searle, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The impact on the surrounding area leading to a loss of amenity;
- Parking is already an issue on the lane, which this development will exacerbate;
- Impact on the conservation area;
- Removing the trees on site will create urban creep;
- The setting of the North Wessex AONB should be enhanced and respected; and
- This application is overdevelopment, which is contrary to policy.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Although the committee expressed their understanding of the residents' concerns they did not feel that the impact of the development would be too harmful.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P17/S0299/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Matching materials (walls and roof) for the extension.
4. Schedule of materials for the new dwelling to be submitted.

5. Obscure glazing in windows in first floor rear and east facing side of the new dwelling.
6. No additional windows, doors or other openings in the new dwelling.
7. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.

251 P16/S4254/FUL - 4A Farm Close Road, Wheatley

The committee considered application P16/S4254/FUL for a side extension to the existing flatted block to provide two two-bedroom flats; the provision of three off street parking spaces with new access; and secure cycle storage and bin enclosures at 4A Farm Close Road, Wheatley

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.

Roger Bell, a representative of Wheatley Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Dissatisfaction with the consultation procedure whereby residents most affected were not initially consulted and information not being readily available;
- Land ownership not clear on the plans provided; and
- Confusion about measurements.

Kathryn Whitby and Suzanne McGuinness, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- Impact on parking provision as the road is already at parking capacity;
- Distance from the flank wall of the proposed development to habitable room windows insufficient, leading to a loss of amenity; and
- Overdevelopment, overbearing and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Marc Chenery, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- Highways have no objection on parking;
- The distances comply with policy; and
- The plans include a scale bar, which should help with measuring distances.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Some of the committee agreed that the application met policy requirements, however others were concerned about the impact on neighbours, parking and overdevelopment of the site.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared lost with the chairman's casting vote on being put to the vote.

A motion, moved and seconded to defer the application, to allow for a site visit to better understand the neighbour impact, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer application P16/S4254/FUL to allow for a site visit.

The meeting closed at 7.50 pm

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank