

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee



Listening Learning Leading

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 18 MAY 2016

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

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

Margaret Davies, Anthony Dearlove, Lorraine Hillier, Elaine Hornsby, Jeannette Matelot, Toby Newman, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Ian White and David Nimmo-Smith

Apologies:

Joan Bland and Margaret Turner tendered apologies.

Officers:

Emma Bowerman, Sharon Crawford, Paula Fox, Nicola Meurer, Carolyn Organ and Cathie Scotting.

Also present:

Lynn Lloyd, Imran Lokhon and Jane Murphy

1 **Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest**

Councillors Margaret Davies and Anthony Dearlove declared that in relation to P15/S4257/FUL - Lea Meadow, Sonning Common, they would be stepping down from the committee and not voting on this item due to their having voted against the application as members of Didcot Town Council planning committee.

2 **Urgent items**

None.

3 **Applications deferred or withdrawn**

None.

4 Proposals for site visit reports

None.

5 P15/S4257/FUL - Lea Meadow, Sonning Common

The committee considered application P15/S4257/FUL for a residential development of 65 dwellings with associated public open space, landscape planning and new access onto Peppard Road, Lea Meadow, Sonning Common.

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.

Leigh Rawlins, a representative of Sonning Common parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Barrie Greenwood, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Stephen Trenwith and Tim Burden, the applicant and applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion included the following points:

- Concern regarding prematurity, as the site has been allocated in the emerging neighbourhood plan which won't go to referendum for a few more months;
- How the site is viable and can contribute to the housing shortfall in the five year land supply;
- Complies with policy and has no statutory consultee objections

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

RESOLVED: to delegate authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning for application P15/S4257/FUL, subject to the 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. Fire hydrants and water supply.
5. Secured by design part two.
6. Off site highways works including new vehicular access.
7. Estate accesses, driveways and turning areas.
8. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
9. Construction traffic management.
10. Construction hours restriction.
11. Appropriate provision for the control of noise and dust.
12. Residential travel plan.
13. No surface water drainage to highway.
14. Surface water drainage works (details required).
15. Foul drainage works (details required).
16. Drainage strategy waste water infrastructure.

17. Landscape management plan.
18. Landscaping scheme (trees and shrubs only).
19. Boundary walls and fences.
20. Footpath details.
21. Lighting.
22. Tree protection (detailed).
23. Reptile mitigation strategy.
24. Biodiversity method statement.
25. Childrens' play space.

6 P15/S3228/O - Land east of New Road, East Hagbourne

The committee considered outline application P15/S3228/O for the construction of circa 170 residential dwellings with associated vehicular access from New Road, internal access roads, public open space, landscaping and parking on land east of New Road, East Hagbourne.

Officer updates: an explanation as to the responses received in paragraph 3.5 of the report. There are 667 folders on the website, which is not representative of the number of objections. There were 431 objections, conditional support from 4 people and 36 technical consultee responses.

The officer referred to the last sentence of paragraph 6.12 of the report and clarified that the site is not covered by any landscape designations, however the North Wessex Downs AONB is 400m to the east of the site and extends south where the AONB is visible from the site.

The officer also advised that because the proposal is being recommended favourably in view of the five year housing supply situation the applicants have agreed to commit to an earlier than normal commencement of two years to submit reserved matters instead of three years and one year to commence from approval of last reserved matters instead of two years.

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.

Crispin Topping, a representative of East Hagbourne parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Anthony Dearlove, a representative of Didcot town council, spoke objecting to the application.

Nick Wright, a representative of Mind the Green Gap, spoke objecting to the application.

Chris Rees, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

The committee did not agree that the site was sustainable and that the application would significantly harm:

- The 'green necklace' around Didcot;

- East Hagbourne's identity as a small rural village;
- The setting of the North Wessex Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

There were serious concerns about contributions to infrastructure.

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 P15/S3228/O due to the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would occupy farmland that helps to maintain distinct separation between the settlements of East Hagbourne and Didcot, which contributes to the character and appearance of the area and to the enjoyment of nearby public rights of way. The openness of the site affords views to the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) from New Road and from the public footpath immediately to the north of the site, and forms part of the setting of the AONB. Development of this site and the consequential loss of openness would result in a coalescence of settlements that would harm the role this site performs in protecting and enhancing the distinctive and valued landscape setting and identity of East Hagbourne and Didcot. Moreover, development of this site would result in the loss of the distinctive landscape boundaries of the settlements, which would harm the valued landscape setting of the AONB. As such the development would result in significant and demonstrable harm and is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular but not confined to paragraphs 7.14, 109 and 115, and is contrary to policy CSEN1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies G2, G4, D1 (ii and iv) and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011'.
2. In the absence of a completed S106 agreement the proposal fails to secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the District contrary to policies CSH3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. In the absence of a completed S106 agreement the proposal fails to secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the District contrary to policies CSH3 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

7 P15/S0779/FUL - Mill Lane, Chinnor

The committee considered application P15/S0779/FUL to erect 61 dwellings and create a new public open space; realign Mill Lane to create a new junction with Thame Road; create a vehicular access from the realigned Mill Lane; deliver a new car parking facility; public open space; surface water drainage; landscaping and other ancillary works on Mill Lane, Chinnor.

Officer update: Chinnor parish council have commented on the amended plans of the scheme, objecting on the grounds of the loss of communal parking. The officer suggested a reduced time limit from three to two years to commence the development.

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.

Steve Bird, a representative of parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Keith Webley, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Stewart Butcher, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillors Lynn Lloyd and Ian White, the local ward members, spoke to the application.

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

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application with an extra condition regarding parking and the reduced time limit was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to delegate authority to grant planning permission to the head of planning for application P15/S0779/FUL, subject to:

- I. The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing, financial contributions and obligations stated above; and
- II. The following conditions:
 1. Commencement two years - full planning permission.
 2. Approved plans.
 3. Sample materials to be agreed.
 4. Slab and ridge levels to be agreed.
 5. Compliance with mitigation measures in biodiversity enhancement plan.
 6. Construction hours restriction.
 7. Appropriate provision for the control of noise and dust to be agreed.
 8. Details of external lighting to be agreed.
 9. Air quality mitigation to be agreed.
 10. Surface water drainage to be agreed.
 11. Foul drainage to be agreed.
 12. Drainage strategy for any on and off site works to be agreed (in consultation with Thames Water).
 13. Impact studies of the existing water supply to be agreed (in consultation with Thames Water).
 14. Remediation scheme to be agreed if contamination is found.
 15. Landscaping scheme to be agreed.
 16. Landscape management scheme to be agreed.
 17. Tree protection to be agreed.
 18. Green travel plans to be agreed.
 19. Visibility splays to be agreed and retained.
 20. Off site highway works to be agreed and a timetable for their implementation to include, but not limited to:
 - details of measures to permanently prevent vehicular access onto Thame Road at existing access point;
 - details of measures for treatment of area to front of 5 and 7 Mill Lane;
 - traffic management measures; and
 - new vehicular access onto Thame Road and Mill Lane.

21. Estate accesses, driveways, parking and turning areas to be provided.
22. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
23. Cycle parking to be agreed.
24. No surface water drainage onto highway.
25. First floor bathroom windows in side elevations to be obscure glazed.
26. Provision of fire hydrants to be agreed.
27. Refuse and recycling storage to be agreed.
28. Details of boundary walls and fences to be agreed.
29. Development to achieve Secure by Design Part 2.
30. Notwithstanding details shown on approved plans, a plan showing 15 parking spaces in the communal parking area shall be submitted for approval.

8 P16/S0198/FUL - St Albans Court, Wallingford

The committee considered application P16/S0198/FUL to demolish the existing buildings comprising 28 flats and to redevelop the site to provide 17 two-bedroom flats and 6 one-bedroom sheltered flats with communal lounge, office, car parking and landscaping; and to alter the vehicular and pedestrian access at St Albans Court, Wallingford.

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.

Adrian Lloyd, a representative of Wallingford town council, spoke objecting to the application.

Jacqueline Bradney, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Steve Lynch, Nik Lyzba and Neil Perry, the applicant and agents, spoke in support of the application.

Councillors Imran Lokhon and Elaine Hornsby, the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was not pursued following advice that parking was not sufficient reason to refuse the application as there had been no technical objections received. The committee on balance felt that the application was a great improvement on the current building, which is no longer fit for purpose.

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 P16/S0198/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Materials specification required.
4. Landscaping (access/hard standings/fencing/walls).
5. Sustainable drainage system details.

6. Archaeology.
7. Foul drainage works (details required).
8. Access details.
9. Parking and manoeuvring areas.
10. Construction traffic management.
11. Occupation restricted to 55 years of age or over.
12. Obscure glaze bathroom windows in side elevations of Block A.
13. 10% of the units to meet Lifetime Home standards.

9 P15/S4360/FUL - 99 High Street, Wallingford

The committee considered application P15/S4360/FUL to demolish the existing barn and erect a two-storey dwelling house at 99 High Street, Wallingford.

Officer update: the following corrections have been made in the report:

Para. 4.1 – The consent granted under P88/W0983 being the removal of a dilapidated greenhouse and the erection of a garage relates to Castle Lane House and NOT the application site

Para.6.6.3 – In the final sentence of comment relating to St Nicholas, there is NO boundary wall, merely a low chain link fence between the proposed dwelling and the garden to St Nicholas

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.

Adrian Lloyd, a representative of Wallingford town council, spoke objecting to the application.

Richard Knight and Andrew Harper, two local residents, spoke objecting to the application.

Mark Thackeray, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillors Elaine Hornsby and Imran Lokhon, the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Although the committee agreed with the principle of building on the site, there were concerns regarding the building line being so close to a listed wall which would cause significant harm to a heritage asset. The committee considered the application to be overbearing and unneighbourly.

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 P15/S4360/FUL, due to the following reasons:

1. That, having regard to the size and scale of the proposed new dwelling, its position on the boundary and the resulting relationship with 100 High Street,

the proposal represents an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development that would detract from the residential amenity of the occupants of 100 High Street, Wallingford. As such the proposal is contrary to saved policies G2 and H4 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

2. There is insufficient information to assess the full impact of development on the listed wall at 100 High Street given the amount of ground works proposed immediately adjacent to the listed wall. Without such information to show that the designated asset can be conserved in an acceptable manner, the limited public benefit of the proposal would not outweigh the potential harm to a designated heritage asset. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies G2, CON3 and Paragraphs 131, 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

The meeting closed at 9.45 pm

Chairman

Date