

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 2nd March 2016 in Chilton Village Hall.

Present : Mr C Broad Chairman
 Mr F Dumbleton
 Mr R Beech
 Mr R Girling
 Mr B Morris
 Dr S Druce

Mrs M E Morris Parish Clerk

1. **Apologies for Absence** were received from Mr J Lewis and Mr M Urso-Cale.
2. **Minutes** of the last meeting were approved.
3. **Open Forum** None
4. **Application** for proposed two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory. 40 Crafts End P16/V0368/HH
Comments
 Chilton Parish Council does not object to this application but observe that the location of the back flue pipe should be assessed by Building Control and Environmental Health.
5. **Amendment** to Application P15/V2199/O - 40 dwellings on Hagbourne Hill.

| | |
|--|---|
| Table 1 <u>Application ref. no.</u> | P15/V2199/O. Comments on additional material supplied with Amended Details #1 4 th February 2016 |
| Title | Land off Hagbourne Hill Chilton |

| Table 2 Response | Objects | Does not object | Does not object but wants conditions (see list below) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|--|
| Chilton Parish Council | X | | |

| X | Table 3 <u>Material considerations</u> |
|----------|---|
| X | <p>National/regional planning policies & guidance, including impact on North Wessex Downs AONB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In our view the additional material in the agent’s 3/2/16 letter citing a decision to approve a development near Tetbury in the Cotswold AONB District Council is misleading and not relevant. In the Cotswold examples cited, the Inspector noted that there was a pressing need for the houses proposed and there was very limited scope to provide residential development on sites not within the AONB. The inspector concluded at paragraph 14.69: <p><i>“While I consider that the proposed development would not harm the setting of the historic town of Tetbury, I find that it would detract from the significance of Highfield Farmhouse, a designated heritage asset. It would also harm the AONB through</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>replacing open fields with built development, thereby resulting in the loss of some of the natural beauty of the landscape. But importantly, in terms of the harm that would be caused to the AONB, I have not been provided with any evidence to suggest that there is anything other than very limited scope indeed to provide housing within the District on sites that are not part of the AONB. Moreover, there is a clear and pressing need for more housing; locally, in terms of the severe shortfall that currently exists in the Cotswold District, and nationally, in terms of the need to get the economy growing. In my view, these amount to exceptional circumstances, where permitting the proposed development can reasonably be considered to meet the wider “public interest”, in the terms of the framework.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting of Chilton and this site is quite different because the VWHDC has significant sites nearby but not within the AONB that would be able to provide housing within the District. These include an outline application for more than 4,000 houses in Valley Park which is outside the AONB but only about two miles from Chilton, There are also >3,000 houses being built on Great Western Park partly in SODC and partly in VWHDC. • Furthermore, evidence was presented at the recent Examination in Public into the VWHDC Local Plan that developer led housing (such as is proposed in this application) will not meet the needs of the Campus and therefore cannot constitute exceptional circumstances. • This means that there are no exceptional circumstance, including unmet local employment housing demand that this development could supply, that cannot be met by development either outside the AONB or on already-developed brownfield Campus land. • The comparison with the Tetbury setting is doubly spurious.because it is a a small market town of >5000 population with many facilities and local public transport, while Chilton is a small village with almost no local facilities and very limited public transport • We reiterate that there are therefore no exceptional circumstances that would override NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116 and permit such a development in open countryside in the AONB.. |
| X | <p>Local planning policies and guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This council’s objections to housing development on this site are comprehensively described in its response last October to this Application as well as its very similar predecessor P15/V0325/O. As the additional documentation supplied by the agent does not materially alter or answer these objections, they are included in this response as appendices. |
| X | <p>The planning history of a site, including previous planning and appeal decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A previous proposal P15/V0325/O for this proposed development was refused because the “the proposed development would constitute major development in the North Wessex Downs AONB” and because “the site is not allocated for development” and” would represent development in open countryside” None of these circumstances have changed. The site’s size meets the definition in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2010 of being a major development. The assertion in the Strutt & Parker p1 that it is not a major |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>development in the accepted sense is therefore incorrect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would point out that a similar speculative application P14/V2462/O Upper Farm Road for open country housing development in the AONB was also refused in January 2016 for similar reasons. The proposed site on the flanks of Hagbourne Hill is even more intrusive than the Upper Farm Road site because it is entirely farmland and well beyond the present settlement boundary of Chilton. |
| X | <p>Highway safety, traffic generation, car parking/pedestrian movement provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are dealt with in our previous objections (see appendices), especially the points about access to the adjoining CYO Seeds agroindustrial business and its likely effect on new properties |
| X | <p>Proposed landscaping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are dealt with in our previous objections (see appendices) |
| X | <p>Local drainage/flooding problems or other environmental impact inc. sewage & flooding risk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are dealt with in our previous objections (see appendices), especially the need for a Grampian condition. This means the site could not be delivered within a timescale compliant with NPPF Footnote 11, the sanitary engineering expansion required to service a development of this size not being either within Thames Water's current or next 5-year Asset Management Plan for infrastructure improvement.. Also the likely adverse impact on new properties so close to the adjoining CYO Seeds agroindustrial business which is the village's most important employment site, whose access road across the proposed site is still not shown on any of the plans submitted. |

6. Planning application by Raymond Brown Minerals & Recycling Ltd A1 Omega Park, Electron Way, Southampton, Hampshire, SO53 4SE for planning permission for the Section 73 retrospective application for the continuation of development for variation to conditions 5&6 of Planning Permission UPT 3451/2 (Planning Permission for development comprising the filling of a disused railway cutting in the parish of Upton with controlled waste and quarry waste with the intention of restoring the land to agricultural use at Prospect Farm, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0ST OCC ref: MW.0029/16 and MW.0033/16
Comments
Chilton Parish Council have no objections to this application.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.45pm.