



Drayton Parish Council

www.DraytonPC.org

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee of Drayton Parish Council held on Monday 16th November 2015, at 7:00pm at the Caudwell Day Centre, Gravel Lane, Drayton, OX14 4HY



Present: Richard Williams (Chairman); Patricia Athawes; Matthew Lowy; Richard Wade
In Attendance: David Perrow (Parish Clerk)

The meeting had the following documentation available:

Planning Application P15/V2447/FUL Land to the South of High Street Drayton. Erection of 140 new dwellings, extension of the existing access with High Street, creation of new pedestrian and cycle routes, formation of public open space, construction of internal access roads, surface water attenuation, landscaping features and ancillary development.

The Planning Application papers had been circulated beforehand to members of the Planning Committee for them to study the proposals, together with:

- The VWHDC notification to Drayton Parish Council (attached)
- The Drayton Neighbourhood Development Plan (Referendum Copy)

1. Apologies for Absence: Colin Arnold (family illness)

2. Public Participation. 15 members of the public were present, including two representatives from the applicants (Rob Linnell – Savills & David Joseph - Bloor Homes); Daniel Scharf; Steve Wright; Paul Coster; Derek Pooley; Jenny Pooley; Paul Mayhew-Archer; Julie Mayhew-Archer; Rev Rebecca Peters; Chris Bone, Antony King; Mark Guthrie; Hannah Johnson; Norman Kidd

The following points were made by members of the public:

- (a) Drainage.** Concern was expressed about any runoff/drainage from the new development onto lower-lying farmland. This land already floods in winter since it receives water from the Church Lane/High Street area to the north as well as from the proposed development land to the west. The existing watercourse/piping does not have the capacity to take the existing through/overflow and so the water ponds on to what is now effectively a flood plain. The water moves east through Little Smith's Farm and Gilbourne's Farm. Concern was expressed that each housing development was being treated individually by the VWHDC planners and that there may be a cumulative effect of any runoff from each of the developments over previous years and planned. The liability of the landowner/farmer was raised as an issue if flooding on the lower land worsened, since it is the landowner who has responsibility for drainage which affects those upslope. David Joseph (Bloor Homes) responded to reassure residents that there was a requirement for the proposed development to absorb its own water through the SUDS scheme. Though the land will be raised by 0.5m-1m for the development, this should not affect the runoff adversely. In summary: volume of water would be captured on site and discharged rate of flow would not be an issue from any increased gradients. The Chairman commented that the new D2020 Implementation Director to be appointed by the Parish Council was a drainage engineer and could be asked to check out his situation on behalf of Drayton residents.
- (b) Traffic.** There was great concern about the increased volume of traffic from the proposed development onto High Street, which was already congested at peak time. There was an extended discussion about housing being built without adequate infrastructure – particularly increased road

capacity. OCC did not have funds to deliver this, and despite promises from local MPs about government funding/improvements to the A34 (the responsibility of the Highways Agency) the only funding was for piecemeal improvement at Steventon Hill & the Milton interchange using 'pinch point' monies. These junction improvements got traffic on and off the A34 more quickly, but did not increase its capacity, or deal with accidents (since there is no hard shoulder) which shunted traffic onto the already overloaded local road system through Drayton (the old A34). The Chairman suggested that OCC should consider a 'Park and Ride' at Milton Heights with a bus/coach shuttle service from Newbury to Oxford and further north, and linking into the local rail network.

On Drayton High Street were traffic lights to be installed? Rob Linnell (Savills) confirmed that the discussions with OCC had led to the proposed junction design (which did not include traffic lights) and that this was acceptable in highways terms; and that locally there would be a contribution to the Drayton2020 NDP traffic calming scheme.

A further point was raised about the traffic study undertaken by the developers. Why did not this extend as far as the Ock Street junction on Marcham Road? Rob Linnell (Savills) responded that the traffic study design was agreed with OCC according to their criteria, and that OCC had indicated that the study should terminate at the South Abingdon/Preston Road junction.

- (c) **Southern Exit on to East Way.** There was support for a suggestion that it would be preferable for the traffic to exit the new housing development to the south, onto East Way and Steventon Road, rather than north onto High Street and the congested Wheatsheaf roundabout junction with the Abingdon Road. The Clerk notified the meeting that this option had been explored with the developers and with OCC/VWHDC some 18 months ago, and it had been rejected as an option by the planning/transport authorities. David Joseph (Bloor Homes) confirmed that the developers had looked at this option but that it was not feasible since the developer could not find anyone who owned the East Way bridleway with whom to negotiate purchase. There was general agreement that a southern road exit to East Way was desirable, but that the legal issues were complex and may be insoluble. The Chairman suggested that the Parish Council should consider obtaining independent legal advice on this issue from its own solicitor.
- (d) **Road Safety.** Concern was expressed about increased traffic volumes and the effect this might have on safety for cyclists, both for those who commute by bike, and for schoolchildren who bicycle to school..
- (e) **Bus reliability.** It was pointed out that bus users/commuters cannot rely upon the bus service since buses got stuck in traffic and did not arrive on time, either to pick up or reach their destination. On bus subsidies, s106 monies could/would be asked for by OCC and these should specify how the subsidies would be used in Drayton to mitigate car traffic impact.
- (f) **Sustainability.** It was asserted that the government would not be able to meet its carbon budget targets to 2050 and that unless any housing developments such as this were designed to be carbon-neutral they will only add to the national target shortfall. To be sustainable developments should design in energy saving measures (such as solar panels) and deal with travel and transport in a more sustainable way, including e.g. car clubs, public transport (noting that the X2 OCC subsidy is now to be withdrawn) etc. to reduce car ownership and dependency. It is a Drayton NDP transport policy to reduce the impact of traffic impact, but the planning application produces measures which seek to deliver only 10% of the additional impact.
- (g) **Housing Mix.** Drayton needed opportunities for people to downsize. Disappointment was expressed that the number of 2 bedroom houses was not greater. It was pointed out that the proposals agreed with the VWHDC's SHMA figures on housing mix, so complied with the overall VWHDC housing needs.
- (h) **Phasing.** Concern was expressed that all three of the major housing developments in Drayton (250+ houses) might be built within the first 5 years of the NDP (i.e. by 2020), which lasted until 2031. It was suggested that large developments such as this should be phased to allow villagers to make more use of the available housing and to ensure that after 2020 yet more housing was not required of the village to meet increased housing targets from VWHDC (which might be required from the Oxford City overspill). The Clerk informed the meeting that phasing had been discussed with VWHDC when the NDP was drafted, but that as a planning policy this would not be allowed by VWHDC, who would only impose this condition on larger developments. As such, a NDP policy on phasing

would not have been compliant (as is required) with the VWHDC Local Plan, so the NDP inserted phasing as *desirable* in the text. Bloor Homes commented that there were downsides to phasing which could have unintended consequences (e.g. disruption to the community/uncertainty/effect on s106 funding flows) and that the neighbouring residents to the site had actually requested that a plan be brought forward to build-out the site, rather than phase it in two tranches. Bloor Homes would build to sell, so the rate of build would depend on market conditions.

- (i) **Trees and Hedges.** A question was asked about which trees on the site would be kept and which removed. The enquirer was directed to the ecological and tree documents in the planning application. There was also a concern about the eastern boundary parallel to the public footpath, lest the public should feel encouraged to trespass onto grazing farmland there. David Joseph (Bloor Homes) responded with information about the ecology study and trees scheme and undertook to discuss the form of the eastern boundary hedge with the neighbouring farmer who has expressed concern.

3. (a) **Declarations of Interest:** None

(b) **Dispensations:** None received

4. **Details of Application:**

This site is one of the three allocated housing sites under the Drayton NDP 2015-2031:

“PLANNING POLICY P-H1: SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT AND SITE ALLOCATION

The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land for residential development on the following sites:

- Manor Farm (3.98ha) for approximately 50 dwellings
- North of Barrow Road (8.17ha) for approximately 65 dwellings
- **South of the High Street (9.64ha) for approximately 140 dwellings**

All dwelling numbers are approximate and will be reviewed at the planning application stage based on the need to provide smaller homes.

Specific Planning Issues

(a) **Number, type and layout of houses proposed**

- (i) **Number of houses.** The 140 houses applied for is in line with the number proposed during the Drayton NDP discussions and exhibitions, and in the Referendum NDP document.
- (ii) **Type of housing.** The proposals are in line with the VWHDC’s SHMA, and therefore compliant with the Drayton NDP. 35% of the houses are affordable. Nevertheless, it was **noted** that the Drayton NDP text expresses a preference for smaller houses so that there is both market and affordable housing for Drayton residents to either downsize or to move into as starter homes: there is a need for both in the village, as both the 2011 Census and the Drayton NDP Questionnaire and housing survey indicate.
- **32 Drayton households are living in overcrowded conditions (2011 Census)**
- (iii) **Layout of the development.** It was **agreed** that the affordable housing should be more evenly distributed through the development
- (iv) **The Drayton Design Guide** should be used for any new housing in Drayton to ensure that materials and styles reflect and respect the locality. This is acknowledged in the planning application.
- (v) **Energy Efficiency.** The installation of solar panels and other energy-saving measures would be welcomed. The Drayton NDP states at para 82:

82. To help achieve both the sustainability goals of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the wider objectives of national and international emissions obligations such as the Climate Act 2008 and 2016

Zero Carbon Target, all developments in Drayton should help reduce the Parish's carbon footprint through the promotion of:

- high levels of energy conservation in the construction and use of new buildings;
- the use of local building materials;
- the reuse of rainwater and minimization of the amount of impermeable ground cover;
- the use of sustainable energy sources – solar, wind, ground-source heat pumps, biomass;
- the use of local forms of power to minimize power loss through the national grid;
- the promotion of low CO₂ transport options.

(b) Traffic Issues, including junction with High Street. Parking – Transport Statement

- (i) **Junction. Single Point of Access to High Street.** It was **agreed** that if a vehicular access south to East Way could be engineered then this should be supported as traffic could then exit onto the Steventon Road to travel south, avoiding the High Street/Wheatsheaf roundabout junction. It was **agreed** that the Clerk should approach the Parish Council's solicitor for a view on the feasibility of upgrading the East Way bridleway to an adopted OCC highway, and the Parish Council's powers, means and likely costs to enable this, if feasible. If a second exit is provided to the south via East Way then care would need to be taken in any revised layout design to ensure that a 'rat-run' was not created through the development for through traffic going south and avoiding congestion on High Street

[Clerk's note: The legal opinion (dated 17th Nov 2015) obtained states, in summary:

"If the Parish Council are smart, they will leave well alone; this will be expensive; and it's implausible;"]

- (ii) **Traffic Volume.** It was noted that the VWHDC Local Plan Pt. 1 pointed to the limitations of housing developments between the south of Abingdon and the A34 due to the poor and overloaded road network and lack of an Abingdon southern by-pass. OCC had also recognised this problem in the past with restrictions on the size of housing developments in this area. The additive traffic volumes from approved and proposed developments in Drayton, South Abingdon, Steventon and Sutton Courtenay remain of great concern to residents, and require investment in transport infrastructure by OCC, the Highways Agency and government.
- (iii) **Traffic Mitigation measures.** Locally the developers have agreed to contribute to traffic calming measures. It was **agreed** that should the development receive planning approval OCC should be required to specify in detail how they will allocate the s106 contributions for public transport and for improvements to cycle ways. The OCC bus contribution to the Barrow Road development contains no such specification, despite this being requested from OCC via VWHDC by the Clerk. East Way towards Sutton Courtenay should be upgraded to national cycleway surface quality. Steventon Road southwards should have designated cycle lanes in both directions. All bus stops in Drayton should have real time traffic information (RTI) systems. A bus stop should be provided near the new junction to the proposed development.

(c) Site, Ground and Topography

- (i) No specific comments

(d) Flood Risk and Drainage, and Utilities

- (i) **Thames Water** has stated that the sewage from such a development cannot be supported by the current sewage works and have asked for a Grampian Condition to be applied to any planning consents.
- (ii) **Neighbouring farmers** are concerned about the drainage from the site and inadequacy of existing field drains to take any additional runoff. The applicant's SUDS scheme needs careful examination to ensure that there is no outflow from any development of the site which would cause flooding on adjacent farmland in winter.

- (iii) **The Parish Council’s Drayton2020 NDP Implementation Director** should be asked to examine the drainage proposals and any related drainage issues in the area and to give his opinion.

(e) Ecology and Trees planting

- (i) **Ecology.** The site is described as not being of great ecological value, but given that it is currently open grazing land it is nevertheless important within the local Drayton context. The following Planning Policy in the Drayton NDP should be applied:

“PLANNING POLICY P-S1: BIODIVERSITY

Development proposals are required to protect and enhance biodiversity. Any loss or degradation of habitats arising from new development will need to be offset by for example, funding environmental improvements elsewhere in the Parish.”

The applicants should be required to provide bat, swallow and other bird boxes on site and encourage such wildlife into eaves and gable ends where feasible.

- (ii) **Trees.** The retention of key trees and commitment to compensation by planting replacement trees and hedges is welcomed. The developers should be asked to work with the neighbouring farmer to secure the eastern boundary to the site with attractive native hedging.

(f) Historic environment

- (i) **Drayton village** is at the centre of important historic sites which feature locally the Sutton Courtenay Saxon Palace complex and the Drayton Cursus. The archaeological survey is noted, and the probability of more sensitive and extensive remains to the north part of the site. The OCC archaeologist is being relied upon to provide supervision in these matters for the local community.
- (ii) **Conservation Area.** The applicants have noted the abutment of the site to the Conservation Area and the need to ensure building materials and styles reflect the neighbouring vernacular.

(g) S106 requirements

- (i) relevant s106/CIL contributions will be required as outlined in the Drayton NDP P-H3 and Annex E:

“PLANNING POLICY P-H3: CONTRIBUTIONS All eligible development will be required to make contributions to secure improvements to existing Parish infrastructure (both on and off site) through a Section 106 agreement or when introduced, the Community Infrastructure Levy, or by other relevant means, subject to the development remaining viable”.

(h) Drayton NDP Planning Policies relevant to the application

The following Drayton NDP Planning Policies are deemed to be relevant to this planning application:

P-LF3 to P-LF6 inclusive

P-WP3

P-T1

P-S1

P-H1 to P-H4 inclusive

RESOLUTIONS:

- A. By virtue of the Drayton NDP the principle of development on this site ‘South of High Street’ is supported by Drayton Parish Council.

Proposed: Richard Wade

Seconded: Mathew Lowy

Agreed Unanimously

B. Based on the actual planning application [P15/V2447/FUL] the Parish Council has a number of reservations which unless addressed should lead to the rejection of this planning application.

Therefore the Parish Council **objects** to the current application

Proposed: Richard Wade

Seconded: Mathew Lowy

Agreed with one abstention

DECISION: Drayton Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application for the following reasons:

- a) **Drainage.** The Parish Council's drainage advisor needs to verify the SUDS scheme and the VWHDC's attention is drawn to the concerns expressed by its own drainage advisers and by Thames Water. These concerns need to be allayed.
- b) **Traffic and Transport.** The mitigation scheme for additional traffic volumes needs to be detailed so that adequate alternative and additional public transport and cycle way schemes are agreed with OCC and delivered as part of the development, funded by s106 contributions. The Parish Council notes with regret that neither OCC nor the Highways Agency/Government are investing sufficient resources or planning into improving the local road infrastructure serving Drayton and the surrounding villages south of Abingdon.

5. P15/V2077/O Proposed Rear of 10 Halls Close Development –Revised Layout

- a) The new layout (whose papers had been circulated previously to the Committee) was discussed and it was **agreed** that:
 - The proposed footpath west into the proposed Bloors development South of High Street does not lead anywhere, and needs much better specification and agreement with the neighbouring landowners before it can be proven to link into the footpath network south to East Way.
 - The sketchy road spur opportunity to the south is not drawn adequately to indicate how this will actually be built. This should be re-drawn accurately using a professional designer and re-submitted.
- b) It was **agreed** that the legal opinion provided by Cedar Homes to the VWHDC should be made available to the Parish Council to consider and respond to, and the Clerk was asked to request that VWHDC make this available to the Chairman and Clerk in confidence.

6. P14/V2504/FUL Land west of Abingdon Road Drayton (Barrow Road)

The Decision Notice issued by VWHDC was **noted**. Several conditions relating to the sports land, pavilion, footpath and open land required input at an appropriate point from the Parish Council which will ultimately own and control these resources. It was also **noted** that though the Decision Notice made passing reference to the Drayton NDP, no NDP policies were listed in the Notice. However, the Committee was advised that since April 2015 it was no longer a legal requirement for relevant planning policies to be listed in a Decision Notice.

The meeting concluded at 10.15pm

Signed:

Date: 7th December 2015

Name: Richard Williams

Role: Chairman,
Drayton Parish Council Planning Committee

Planning

HEAD OF SERVICE : Adrian Duffield



CONSULTATION WITH DRAYTON PARISH COUNCIL

OFFICER: Stuart Walker

**PLEASE RETURN TO VOWH NOT LATER
THAN 12 NOON ON 20 NOVEMBER 2015**

Planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk
Tel : 01235 540546
Textphone: 18001 01235 540546

135 Eastern Avenue Milton Park
ABINGDON OX14 4SB

Application Reference: P15/V/2447/FUL (Full Application)

Application Type (see definition over): Major

Proposal: Erection of 140 new dwellings, extension of the existing access with High Street, creation of new pedestrian and cycle routes, formation of public open space, construction of internal access roads, surface water attenuation, landscaping features and ancillary development.

Address: Land to the south of High Street Drayton

DRAYTON PARISH COUNCIL:

FULLY SUPPORTS this application for the following reasons

has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application

has **NO OBJECTIONS** to this application but wish the following comments to be taken into account :

OBJECTS to this application for the following reasons :

If you have a current Parish Plan does it support your view on this application?

If so, please give details of the relevant section below:

YES/NO
(Please circle)

.....

.....

Signed on behalf of Drayton Parish Council

.....

Date

PLEASE NOTE: We will display your comments on our website under 'consultations' in the specific application. If you have strong views on the application we encourage you to contact your local Ward

www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

