



Drayton Parish Council

www.DraytonPC.org

Planning Meeting Minutes

held on Monday 6th August 2018 at 7:00pm
in the Caudwell Day Centre, Gravel Lane, Drayton, OX144HF



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

Not Present: All Councillors were present.

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

Public: None.

37/2018 Apologies for Absence. None.

38/2018 Declarations of Interest, Dispensations and Use of Delegated Powers. None.

39/2018 Public Participation. None.

34/2018 Minutes of the Previous Parish Council Planning Meetings were confirmed with no amendments. Richard Wade signed the minutes as a correct record.

Proposed: Patricia Athawes

Seconded: Matthew Lowy

Resolved: Unanimous

35/2018 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.

P18/V1616/FUL. Demolition of existing dwelling and development of two new dwellings. Close End House 19 East Way Drayton Abingdon OX14 4JZ.

PC: Objection: Reiterate previous comment [Clerk's note: Previous comment from 5th March 2018 below].

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.

Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous
P18/V1791/HH and P18/V1792/LB. New conservation roof light, two opening casements added to existing glazed screen and installation of wood-burning stove with flue. Manor Farm Barn The Green Drayton Abingdon OX14 4JA. PC: Support		
Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous
P18/V1835/HH. Summer house and garden shed. Retrospective application. 45 Steventon Road Drayton Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4LA. PC: Support.		
Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous
P18/V0795/LB Amendment : No. 1 - dated 31st July 2018 and P18/V0794/FUL Amendment : No. 2 - dated 31st July 2018. Conversion of existing barn to 1 residential unit and revision to associated parking forecourt. Removal of barn and erection of 1 residential dwelling with attached double garage and erection of 1 residential dwelling with detached double garage (variation to consents 10/02088/FUL and 10/02089/LBC). (amended plans received 31/07/18 to amend design of plot 2 and the boundary treatment around plot 1). 24 land to the rear of 24 High Street Drayton ABINGDON OX14 4JL. PC: Pending.		
Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous
ACTION: Deputy Clerk to request an extension and circulate previous comments.		
P18/V1644/FUL. Single storey extension to existing unit. Address: 1-2 Bradfield Court Milton Road Drayton Abingdon OX14 4EF. PC: Objection: Drayton Parish Council feel that this is over development outside of the built up area of the village. We also disagree that this is a single story extension as the plans appear to show a mezzanine floor and second floor windows.		

Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous
P18/V1778/FUL. Change use of existing cabin to office and showroom. Milton Garden Machinery Milton Road Drayton Abingdon OX14 4EZ.		
PC: Objection: Drayton Parish Council believes that the planning decision notice that granted planning application P14/V2531/FUL has been violated as the existing unauthorised residential building has not been demolished and the bridleway that adjoins the site has been damaged. Planning decision notice states: 5. Within 12 months of the date of this planning permission, or within one month of the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner (unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the local planning authority), the existing unauthorised residential building shall be demolished and the materials removed from the site. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity (Policy DC1 of the adopted Local Plan). NB: INFORMATIVE A bridleway adjoins the site. This planning permission does not authorise the stopping up, diversion or temporary obstruction of the footpath/bridleway, or any damage to it. Any damage to the bridleway shall be repaired at the applicants expense.		
Proposed: Richard Williams	Seconded: Colin Arnold	Resolved: Unanimous

36/2018 Date of the next Meeting. 3rd September 2018. 7:00pm. Caudwell Day Centre.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7:23pm

Signed:

Date: 3rd September 2018

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