

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7 NOVEMBER 2018 AT 6.00 PM

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

Present:

Toby Newman (Chairman)

Anthony Dearlove, Joan Bland, Lorraine Hillier, Elaine Hornsby, Mocky Khan, Jeannette Matelot, David Nimmo-Smith, Ian Snowdon and David Turner

Apologies:

Ian White tendered apologies.

Officers:

Sharon Crawford, Paula Fox, Lloyd Jones, Simon Kitson, Nicola Meurer, Abbie Mulcairn and Amanda Rendell

Also present:

Ian Marshall, Principal Transport Engineer, Oxfordshire County Council

124 Chairman's announcements

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

125 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2018 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

126 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

127 Urgent business

The development manager advised committee members that application P18/S1215/FUL – Thame Park Road, Thame had been withdrawn and would therefore not be considered.



Listening Learning Leading

128 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

129 Public participation

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

130 P18/S1964/FUL - Land off Fieldside Track, Long Wittenham

The committee considered application P18/S1964/FUL to vary Condition 4 (approved plans) of outline planning permission P16/S1124/O for a revised access design on land off Fieldside Track, Long Wittenham.

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 updates:

- Since the publication of the agenda Long Wittenham Parish Council have been consulted on all the revised plans and still object to the proposals. They reiterate their concerns:
- The application indicates that surface water will not be discharged to the public network and as such Thames Water has no objection, however approval should be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority. Should the applicant subsequently seek a connection to discharge surface water into the public network in the future then it would be considered a material change to the proposal, which would require an amendment to the application at which point the council would need to review their position.
- Environmental Health have no objections.
- Prior to the site visit, Long Wittenham Parish Council had mapped out their interpretation of where the access would be on site. The accuracy of these markings could not be verified and in some instances, they were found to be incorrect. Members were advised to disregard the markings.

Ian Marshall, Principal Transport Engineer at Oxfordshire County Council was present to answer any technical highways questions.

Steve Brown, a representative of Long Wittenham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Michael Robson and Nick Jones Hill, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application.

Sue Lawson, one of the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to questions raised by the committee, the officers reported that:

- In relation to the usability of the new access, Ian Marshall confirmed that it was similar to the previously approved access with good visibility.

- As a result of the road realignment, the distance from the front curtilage of some properties on Didcot Road would be reduced from 6m to 3.2m (still including the widened footpath and reduced grass verge).

Some committee members were not satisfied with the proposed access having regard to highway safety concerns, air pollution and the potential impact on trees. In this regard, officers reminded members that there were no technical objections from consultees to the proposal and it would therefore be difficult to defend these reasons should the application go to an appeal.

Members also highlighted concerns about the impact of the highways works on the informal and rural character and appearance of Fieldside Track which is a prominent entry point to the village. They expressed their concerns about the impact on the amenity of residents living in the properties opposite to the proposed access whose front gardens served as their main amenity space. Some members requested that an alternative option was investigated through discussion with another landowner.

Other members were not satisfied that there were sufficient material planning reasons nor support from technical experts to refuse the application and were content that it met policy requirements.

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 P18/S1964/FUL, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed road realignment and associated works would have a detrimental impact on the informal rural character of Fieldside Track and the amenity of the adjacent residential properties contrary to policy LW4 of the adopted Long Wittenham Development Plan and policies G2 and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.
2. In the absence of a completed Deed of Variation 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 Policy T1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

131 P18/S0181/O - Braze Lane, Benson

The committee considered outline application P18/S0181/O for a development of up to 19 dwellings with all matters reserved with the exception of access on land adjacent to The Orchard, Braze Lane, Benson.

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.

Bill Pattison, a representative of Benson Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Craig Tribe, a representative of Berrick Salome Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Jane Ellingworth and Jan Williams, two local residents, spoke objecting to the application.

Giles Brockbank, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Felix Bloomfield, one of the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to questions raised by the committee, the officers reported that regarding the Clincial Commissioning Group's objection, members were advised that CIL payments would help fund the expansion of the doctor's surgery.

Committee members expressed concern about the urbanising effect of the proposed development on the rural character of the area; the detrimental impact on the setting of the village and nearby AONB; the coalescence it would lead to between Benson and Rokemarsh and the loss of grade 3a agricultural land.

Officers advised committee that this application site was within the area referred to as site BEN4 in the Benson Neighbourhood Plan, despite affirmations to the contrary by the Parish Councils, they also advised that the loss of agricultural land was not a strong ground given the allocation and size of the area involved.

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 P18/S0181/O, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal forms part of a housing allocation by virtue of policy NP4 of the made Benson Neighbourhood Plan. Policy NP4 of the made Benson Neighbourhood Plan requires a comprehensive scheme of development.
The proposal would fail to fully integrate with the wider allocation and the application site is not required to secure the delivery of the Relief Road together with a dedicated pedestrian route to Roke.

Due to its form and access arrangements it would result in a development that appears piecemeal and would not comprise a comprehensive development of the housing allocation. It would not be sufficiently integrated and connected to the housing allocation site and wider built context. It would therefore fail to make a positive contribution to the quality of the character and functionality of the wider settlement as well as the wider housing allocation. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in the unnecessary urbanisation of the open countryside to the detriment of its character and appearance and would lead to the coalescence of Benson and Rokemarsh.

The proposal would not comprise sustainable development as defined by local and national legislation. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, polices CS1, CSR1, CSEN1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, saved policies G2, G4, D1 and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and policies NP4, NP7, NP27, NP28 and NP29 of the made Benson Neighbourhood Plan.

2. The proposal would involve the unnecessary loss of grade 3a agricultural land, best and most versatile land, contrary to paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. 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 and Policy NP4 of the adopted Benson Neighbourhood Plan.
4. 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 CS11 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies T1, R2 and R6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and Policy NP4 of the adopted Benson Neighbourhood Plan.

132 P18/S1868/FUL - Harpsden Wood House, Harpsden Woods, Harpsden

The committee considered application P18/S1868/FUL to erect a woodland maintenance barn at Harpsden Wood House, Harpsden Woods, Harpsden.

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.

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 P18/S1868/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within three years - full planning permission.
2. The development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Detailed tree protection measures to be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any works on site.
4. The construction materials shall be in accordance with the details supplied within the application submission.
5. The proposed building hereby approved shall only be used for the woodland management purposes specified within the application submission. It shall not be used for any incidental or ancillary residential purposes.

133 P18/S1215/FUL - Thame Park Road, Thame

Application P18/S1215/FUL had been withdrawn prior to committee.

134 P18/S2125/FUL - 6 Reading Road, Cholsey

The committee considered application P18/S2125/FUL to redevelop a redundant builders yard including the demolition of storage and workshop buildings and the change of use to a former office building in order to create one 4-bedroom, seven 3-bedroom, three 2-bedroom and four 1-bedroom residential units at 6 Reading 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 updates:

- An error had been identified in the report – CNP H6 from the neighbourhood plan – distance requirements between dwellings - should be referenced in the report at para 5.4.
- Further comments from the neighbourhood plan group had been received. They thought the weight given to the NP should be more than “limited” and pointed out the omission of CNP H6.

Chris Jones, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Richard Potter, the applicant’s agent, spoke in support of the application.

Jane Murphy, one of the local ward councillors, spoke to the application.

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 P18/S2125/FUL, subject to the prior completion of the Section 106 agreement and the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Sample materials required (all).
4. Dust mitigation.
5. Landscaping.
6. Surface water drainage works – details required.
7. Construction traffic management plan.
8. Contaminated land (preliminary risk assessment).
9. Contaminated land remediation strategy.
10. Wildlife protection.
11. Hours of operation for construction.
12. Noise – restriction on construction hours.
13. Provide solar panels and energy performance certificates for market housing.
14. New vehicular access.
15. Vision splay protection.
16. Roads and footpaths prior to occupation.
17. Provide parking and manoeuvring areas

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Chairman

Date