WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Date: 15th January 2018

Report of Additional Representations



Agenda Index

Please note that if you are viewing this document electronically, the agenda items below have been set up as links to the relevant application for your convenience.

17/02930/S73	Hollytree House, Main Street, Clanfield	3
17/03250/HHD	50 Richens Drive, Carterton	
17/03259/OUT	Land South of Middlefield Farm, New Yatt Road	5
17/03338/RES	Land North of Burford Road, Witney	6

Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	17/02930/S73
Site Address	Hollytree House
	Main Street
	Clanfield
	Bampton
	Oxfordshire
	OX18 2SP
Date	3rd January 2018
Officer	Miranda Clark
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Clanfield Parish Council
Grid Reference	428505 E 201791 N
Committee Date	15th January 2018

Application Details:

Non compliance with condition 8 of Planning Permission 14/0859/P/FP to retain the existing access.

Applicant Details:

Mr & Mrs Shaun and Caroline King Hollytree House, Main Street CLANFIELD OX18 2SP

Additional Representations

Suggested Conditions:

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

Application Number	17/03250/HHD
Site Address	50 Richens Drive
	Carterton
	Oxfordshire
	OX18 3XU
Date	3rd January 2018
Officer	Kelly Murray
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Carterton Parish Council
Grid Reference	427515 E 206827 N
Committee Date	15th January 2018

Application Details:

Erection of a front porch. (Retrospective).

Applicant Details:

Mr Phil Caswell 50 Richens Drive Carterton Oxon OX18 3XU

Additional Representations

The applicant wrote to Paul Cracknell on 4 January. New points (not already within the Committee report and documents) can be summarised as follows:-

He was advised by his builders that the size of the porch was below the threshold at which planning permission was required and would have sought permission in advance had he known this was a requirement, or at least would have amended the plans to fall within the permitted development threshold. Had the walls of the porch not been double-skinned and insulated (for energy efficiency purposes), it would not have exceeded the threshold. The porch exceeds the threshold only by a small amount.

The applicant spends prolonged periods of time at home. The long-term prognosis for his health is not good and he has suffered a significant reduction in mobility over the past 12 months. He is reliant upon a walking stick and grab rails. The design of the porch considers the potential future need to install mobility aids. The existence of the downstairs toilet and the additional space created by the porch has assisted the applicant's independence and helped reduce anxiety and stress.

The design of the porch, including doors and windows is intended to be in keeping with the existing and neighbouring properties.

The outer wall supporting the flat roof on the side of the property adjacent to number 49 was unsafe and had to be replaced with a double-skinned wall with foundations. This part of the building was already in place and does not form part of the porch.

The porch is designed to be energy-efficient. The roof is seamless and hardwearing and complies with all building Regulations. Removed materials were recycled where possible and appropriate.

No financial assistance was requested for the build. As a veteran the applicant does not expect special treatment.

The applicant is willing to host a site visit to address any concerns.

Application Number	17/03259/OUT
Site Address	Land South Of Middlefield Farm
	New Yatt Road
	Witney
	Oxfordshire
Date	3rd January 2018
Officer	Sarah De La Coze
Officer Recommendations	Refuse
Parish	Hailey Parish Council
Grid Reference	436427 E 211145 N
Committee Date	15th January 2018

Application Details:

Outline Planning Application (all matters reserved except for access) for the erection of up to 5 dwellings.

Applicant Details:

Mr David Carrington C/O Agent

Additional Representations

Biodiversity

I object to the application due to insufficient information on the ecological value of the site (grassland habitat).

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report dated May 2017 prepared by Ecology By Design has been submitted with the application. This report is insufficient, as the semi-improved neutral grassland habitat in the northern part of the site has not been adequately assessed at the appropriate time of year (June-July) to ascertain whether it qualifies as priority habitat (i.e. a habitat pf principal important for biodiversity conservation under Section 41 of the natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006). Further grassland botanical surveys are therefore required, which will inform the mitigation/compensation strategy for the proposed development.

The main focus of the PEA report appears to be species such as reptiles and nesting birds. But no specific species surveys have been carried out. I would recommend that a reptile survey is required to inform the mitigation required for the proposed development, as there is suitable habitat on site in the form of dry stone walls, long grass/ruderal vegetation, scrub and log piles.

There is therefore a lack of ecological information submitted with the planning application that could constitute a reason for refusal of the application, as secondary reasons to those already being put forward to committee.

Reason for refusal:

Insufficient information has been submitted, in particular, ecological survey information, assessment and mitigation/compensation details to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully assess the extent to which species and habitats, including neutral grassland, which is listed as a Habitat of Principal Importance (Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) and reptiles, which are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), may be affected by the proposed development.

The Local Planning Authority is therefore unable to fully assess the development with regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular section 11, paragraphs 109 and 118), Planning Practice Guidance, the West Oxfordshire Local Plan policies NE13 and NE15, the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan Policy EH2 and ODPM Circular 06/2005. Without sufficient information the Local Planning Authority may also be unable to meets its statutory duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to "have regard, ..., to the purpose of conserving biodiversity".

Given the lack of an Ecological Impact Assessment and thereby, details of the required mitigation and compensation for any potential impacts, there is insufficient information to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully assess whether a development of 5 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without a detrimental ecological impact.

Application Number	17/03338/RES
Site Address	Land North Of
	Burford Road
	Witney
	Oxfordshire
Date	3rd January 2018
Officer	Kim Smith
Officer Recommendations	Provisional Approval
Parish	Witney Parish Council
Grid Reference	434666 E 210448 N
Committee Date	15th January 2018

Application Details:

Construction of 260 dwellings (appearance, scale, landscaping and layout).

Applicant Details:

Mr Luke Webb David Wilson Homes Remus 2, 2 Cranbrook Way Solihull Business Park Solihull B90 4GT

Additional Representations

Windrush Valley Protection Group (WVPG) objects to the proposal based on the following matters;

The Schedule of recommended conditions (Secretary of State) states very specifically that the reserved matters shall follow the general parameters and broad design / layout concepts set out in the Design and Access Statement dated February 2015 (DAS).

The scheme embraced the CABE / House Builders Federation "Building for Life" criteria, the design submitted by David Wilson Homes disregards and in certain areas completely ignores these criteria.

Integrating in to the Neighbourhood:

The recreation areas are at the northern extremities of the site and require navigation for most across many of the streets (safety) and also provides no clarification of how they will make the blast zone area inaccessible, which is adjacent to the wildlife recreational area and attenuation pond pathway (safety).

The design and materials stated is both clumsy, generic and a pastiche of similar sites across the UK and uses no contemporary design rooted in "local character" or materials.

The "affordable" housing element has been (95%) grouped and pushed to the East / South boundary in direct violation of the DAS and reserved design matters (Annex A Point 12.1, "... affordable housing provision to be made which shall be pepper potted throughout the development...")

The provision of Green space is placed directly in the known flood zones delivering areas for minimal / no recreation viability in autumn & winter, more remedial detail is required for annual availability.

No detail has been provided about the developers obligations to the current private homeowners and business owner neighbours of the site or guarantees provided with respect to safety, environment and security / privacy, these matters need to be published and agreed.

The biggest issue is the proven and known lack of viable nursery, primary & secondary school places or doctors surgeries, critical for integration for the new residents. This will directly impact the transport plan and hence directly affect Bridge Street NOx levels. We require confirmation of the design & build start / completion date for Shores Green Junction, used as the basis for approval (Monetary provision S106) on known transport / pollution issues from OCC.

Access and Layout:

The entrance to the site is problematic (safety and large vehicular access) and does not meet WODC's own design guide requirements as stipulated as a key document utilised in the DAS Introduction Page 5, Design Context section.

The layout has shoe-horned in 260 dwellings, whilst failing to ensure both garage sizes and visitor car parking spaces meet WODC's design guide specifications as stated above it is confirmed on page 53 Para 4 of the DAS.

Clarification is needed, as to what consideration has been given to the storage of refuse bins across the estate (Green bin, Recycle bin, General waste bin, Recycle glass box and food waste box per household), otherwise these will be left out by the roads causing obstruction and hazards to road users.

We believe a complete redesign is required to meet the DAS obligations.

Public roads should be tarmacadam and private areas block paving giving clear boundary demarcation.

Bus access is problematic, as is refuse collection services and emergency vehicles due to width of roads and tight access / turning circles to the side streets off main estate streets. Emergency vehicles need to be included, particularly Fire Engines and Ambulances, especially in light of the neighbouring gas storage and distribution centre (safety).

Landscape:

We refer you to page 63 of the DAS on Development Proposals:

To date no detail has been provided on an approved / best practice SuDS, attenuation system including viable pumping methods to main sewers. This is both unacceptable and highly concerning based on the proximity to the flood plain. We would expect a significant focus and best available solution due to the inherent known flooding issues.

WVPG believes adamantly that the plans submitted from David Wilson Homes for the "Reserved Matters" cannot in all faith be approved in their current state due to gaping and most likely economically driven holes in their submission. The people of Witney deserve better, even if it is NOT wanted or for the majority NEEDED. Please reject this plan and ensure David Wilson Homes adhere to the letter of the approved Design & Access Statement February 2015, as well as Annex A.