



# Drayton Parish Council

www.DraytonPC.org

## Planning Meeting Minutes

held on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2018 at 7:00pm

in the Caudwell Day Centre, Gravel Lane, Drayton, OX14 4HF



**Present:** Richard Williams (Vice Chairman), Colin Arnold, Patricia Athawes, Matthew Lowy.

**Not Present:** Richard Wade (Chairman).

**In Attendance:** Christopher Price (Deputy Clerk and meeting administrator).

**Public:** Tim Atkins, Paul Mayhew-Archer, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Paul Coster.

**Richard Williams assumed the chair as Richard Wade was not present.**

**13/2018 Apologies for Absence.** Richard Wade.

**14/2018 Declarations of Interest, Dispensations and Use of Delegated Powers.** None.

**15/2018 Public Participation.**

**(a) P17/V1225/RM Halls Close Development.** A parishioner raised concerns that information is not being supplied by the developer. It was **noted** that the roads need to be built to an adoptable standard. It was **agreed** that Richard Williams should draft the Parish Council's response.

**(b) BW1 East Way Bridleway.** A parishioner raised concerns with quad bikes using East Way Bridleway.

**ACTION:** Clerk to request 'No Motor Vehicle' signs.

**16/2018 Minutes of the Previous Parish Council Planning Meetings** were confirmed with no amendments. Richard Williams signed the minutes as a correct record.

**Proposed:** Colin Arnold

**Seconded:** Patricia Athawes

**Resolved:** Unanimous

**17/2018 Planning Applications.** It was **resolved** to authorise the Clerk/Deputy Clerk to respond to the VWHDC with **Support/Respond/Object** to the following planning applications, with reasons or comments agreed at the meeting, in accordance with material planning considerations and the Drayton NDP planning policies.

**P17/V1225/RM Amendment : No. 2 - dated 8th February 2018.** Erection of 22 dwellings together with replacement garage for 10 Halls Close.(As amended by plans and information received 19 July 2017). As amended by plans received 8 February 2018. Land to Rear of 10 Halls Close Drayton ABINGDON OX14 4LU. It was **resolved** that Richard Williams should draft the Parish Council's response.

**Proposed:** Colin Arnold

**Seconded:** Matthew Lowy

**Resolved:** Unanimous

Clerk's note: The following response was written and submitted after the meeting:

Support, with the following reservations.

The Parish Council accepts that this development will go ahead, if not exactly in accordance with the latest amended plans, then with a very similar site design. Nevertheless, it has concerns about a number of issues which appear yet to be resolved. Some existing residents of Halls Close have commented that the latest site layout responds to some of their previous criticisms and is therefore an improvement on previous iterations. This may be the case, but looking at the Design and Access Statement, it is unclear to the Parish Council exactly which of the variants presented is now on offer. The original total of 28 properties was reduced, first to 21 dwellings, now revised to 22 dwellings. There is no objection to this latest figure, but again, the final configuration of these properties is far from clear. The Conservation Officer has stressed the importance of maintaining views out of the development towards St Peter's Church and other significant buildings in the High St, but until a settled layout is confirmed, these sight lines remain in doubt.

Drainage is potentially a serious issue on this site as several nearby properties have been affected by flooding and sewage backing up in the past. The County Council has stated that it does not believe the proposed drainage scheme to be adequate, and we note that the developers have been advised to

contact Thames Water to ascertain that any proposals meet with their full approval. It is crucially important that this matter be satisfactorily resolved before any work on site commences.

In addition, the Hydrock technical note refers to a Maintenance Schedule for property owners which involves, among other items, visual inspection of catch pits, removal of litter and debris from silt traps, and sediment removal from silt traps. The Parish Council questions how realistic (or reasonable) it is to require residents to carry out these tasks on a regular basis when the development is specifically aimed at retired people, or at least, at the over 60s.

The plans seem to indicate that only the road on the western side of the site will be built to adopted standards. The Parish Council has previously experienced problems with other sites in the village where roads have been constructed in the past to non-adoptable standards. It has the same issues with another site currently under construction. Non-adopted roads inevitably raise the question of who will be responsible for maintenance in the long-term, and we would much prefer this uncertainty be eliminated by building all access roads to a standard acceptable to OCC in the first place. In other words, the road on the east side of the development should also be adoptable by OCC. However, if Blue Cedar are intent on keeping the latter road private and maintained by a private management company, the Parish Council will want assurances that safeguards are in place should the management company not be able to maintain the road at any time in the future.

Halls Close has lacked a pavement leading to High Street since the original houses Nos 1-11 were built. However, the new development will likely triple the number of vehicle movements in and out of the Close, and this is an opportunity to create a footpath on the east side of the roadway, where the pyracantha hedge has been cleared, leaving space to do so. This will increasingly become a safety issue, especially as the residents of the Blue Cedar site are going to be predominantly of an older age group. A connecting path through to the adjoining Bloor site has also been mentioned by residents as a desirable addition to the footpath network in the village.

**P17/V3208/HH Amendment : No. 2 - dated 22nd February 2018.** Amendment to approved P15/V2068/HH: Proposed dropped kerb to allow off road parking and close board fencing in a 'U' / 'V' shape to maintain vision splay either side of car exit. (As amended by revised plan received 15 January 2018) (As amended by revised plan received 22 February 2018). 2 Steventon Road Drayton ABINGDON OX14 4LE. It was **resolved** that Richard Williams should draft the Parish Council's response.

**Proposed:** Colin Arnold                      **Seconded:** Matthew Lowy                      **Resolved:** Unanimous

Clerk's note: The following response was written and submitted after the meeting:

Objection, in present form.

The Parish Council is concerned that vehicles should be able to drive forwards into the off-road parking spaces, and have sufficient room to manoeuvre within the parking area so that they can drive out forwards again onto the Steventon Road. It is considered it would be hazardous in the extreme for vehicles to attempt to back out onto the main road, or for that matter to try to back into the parking area. The Steventon Road is very busy during peak periods, and this house is located on a bend just to the south of a mini-roundabout, compounding the likely traffic hazard. There are question marks over whether the space within the parking area is adequate. There are also questions concerning vision for drivers emerging onto the main road. The splay appears not wide enough and the fence either side too high to allow good vision, unless the car is already out on the footpath. Obviously, for the duration of the time the car is on the footpath (which could be a while in busy periods) it would be blocking the path for pedestrians. This could be a particular problem for parents with small children.

It is requested the Highways Officer look closely at the proposed plan with reference the indicated dimensions of spaces, gate and splay, and the height of the fence.

**Appeals** under section 78.

**P17/V1891/FUL.** Close End House 19 East Way Drayton ABINGDON OX14 4JZ. Demolition of 19 East Way and development of three new dwellings. (as amended by drawings received 29 September 2017). Clerk's note: the following response had been submitted prior to the meeting.

Objection: Drayton Parish Council continues to object to this development. The main reasons for this were set out in DPC's statement of 6th September 2017, and these have not changed. However, we re-iterate that access to this site remains problematic. Issues of ownership of the access route have not been resolved. The safety of pedestrians using the bridleway, including the many schoolchildren that use the nearby bus stops, has been largely ignored, as has the fact that the 140 house development being built by Bloor Homes will generate many more pedestrian users of Eastway. As a bridleway of course, the route is also used by horse riders.

From the Committee Report dated 25th October 2017, it is noted that when 2 previous applications were made to construct a single house in this location, one in the mid 80s, one in the mid 90s, both applications were rejected. The reasons stated were - 'unacceptable noise and disturbance' to neighbouring properties, and 'further permissions would increase vehicular use of Eastway resulting in unacceptable deterioration of this access onto Steventon Road'. The present applicant has promised to improve the relevant surfaces, but only for 10 years, after which the cost will presumably fall on residents. It has never been clear why the objections made 20 years and more ago have now been completely set aside, although the condition of Eastway is as bad now as it has ever been.

The Committee Report states, para 5.6, that 'the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan Inspector's Report has been reviewed, but officers can find no evidence that policy P-LF2 has been misinterpreted'. It has been pointed out to officers on many occasions that the wording of Policy P-LF2 was dictated by the need to state all policies in positive terms. However, the addition of the words 'subject to compliance with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan' was intended to mean just that, and if Drayton PC had meant that any site within the built-up area could be developed, why would we have specifically allocated 3 sites in a Policy called P-H1 Scale of Development and Site Allocation?

The above point may perhaps be moot, given that 8 houses are already being built on this site. However it is fairly clear that this application (for 3 houses) and the previous one (for 8) were purposely subdivided so as to avoid them being dealt with as a single application. This was also the view of the councillors on the Planning Committee, and it is probably the main reason for their refusal of planning permission for 3 more properties.

The Vale argues that a higher density would not have been appropriate on this site, thus a net gain of 11 houses would not have been achievable. Hence they agree that an affordable component need not be built. This seems a very arbitrary decision and one which just happens to be extremely convenient for the applicant. Despite the poor access to this site, evidently recognised in the 2 much earlier applications, a net gain of 10 properties is apparently OK. Building 12 or 13 smaller properties (or apartments) might have generated more vehicle movements, it's true, but the fact the total falls just short of the affordable threshold is, in our view, an entirely cynical calculation on the part of the developer.

If the 2 recent applications are aggregated, as they should be, then even at a net gain of 10 properties, and not 11, this still constitutes a 'major' site, albeit a 'smallscale major site' - as defined in the government's data. gov.uk website - see link below:

<https://data.gov.uk/dataset/planning-applications-decisions-major-and-minor-developments-england-district-by-outcome>

There presumably is a reason for drawing a distinction between minor and major sites, or else why differentiate at all? In our view, at the very least, as a major site, this should have been subjected to the 8 criteria in Drayton's Sustainability Appraisal, in which case, it would certainly have merited a 'Red' for access. It is unfortunate that, although no fewer than 14 separate sites were assessed in the DNP, this one was not known about at the time, and was consequently overlooked. Partly this is because it was never included in the SHLAA for Drayton.

In our view, the developer should have been required, for a major site, to consult directly with the Neighbourhood Planners, as to design, layout, housing mix, and all other relevant features aside from

overall numbers. This is exactly what happened with the 3 allocated sites, and the collaboration which took place over many months resulted in significantly better outcomes for the village in terms of amenities provided and overall design. We regard the splitting of the Eastway application as a deliberate attempt to circumvent the consultation process, which is an integral part of Neighbourhood planning. We do not believe this attempt should be rewarded by now granting planning permission.

**18/2018 Date of the next Meeting.** 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018. 9:30pm. Caudwell Day Centre.

[Clerk's note: it was later decided not to hold a Planning Committee meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018 and if necessary hold it on a different evening to allow more time for the Annual Parish Assembly meeting. See March 2018 minutes item 41/2018 (d).]

**The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7:30pm**

**Signed:**

**Date:** 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018

**Name: Richard Wade** (Chairman, Drayton Parish Council Planning Committee).