

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

Minutes of the Parish Council Sub Committees Meeting held on Monday 9th December 2019 at Shippon Church Hall

Present: Cllrs. M. Page (in the Chair), C. Parkin, P. Painting, D. Churchouse, V. Talbot, L. Church

In attendance: Cllr Catherine Webber, Mr David O'Hara, Mr Dave Cookson (Vale Infrastructure Implementation Officer), Anna Clarke (Clerk).

1. Apologies for Absence

Cllr. R. Bahu

2. Declarations of Personal or Personal and Prejudicial Interests

Cllr Talbot – Planning application for 76 Church Lane

3. Matters raised by members of the public

None present

4. CIL Planning Presentation by the Vale

A new team of 4, split across the district, has been set up to deal with Section 106 & CIL spending. Self build and affordable housing are exempt from paying CIL. It is at the discretion of the local authority as to which method of charging, Section 106 or CIL is implemented.

When the decision is made, an officer will be assigned and get involved in helping sort out what is needed, e.g. a community centre or sports ground. CIL is to be paid by the developer to the district council on commencement and will automatically be paid to the the Parish; payments are made in April & October. A letter will be sent to the Parish with the amount of CIL owed to them and then they can accept the money or ask the Vale to hold onto it if they do not have the powers to spend it. The Vale can only hold onto it and cannot spend the money.

There is a time limit of 5 years from receipt, for the parish council to spend CIL. There is a CIL register on the Vale's website where Parishes can check what is available to them. Because SHW has a NP, the amount received will be 25%. The Vale takes 5% for admin.

The remainder is split as follows:

- County Council for transport and education 50%
- Clinical Commissioning for Healthcare 20%
- Vale Sports & Leisure Facilities including improved disabled access 20%
- Vale green infrastructure and biodiversity 5%
- Public art and public realm 5%

The difference between Section 106 & CIL; S106 – it can be named in the agreement, exactly what the Parish wants the money to be used for. If a development affects a parish, it can ask the parish where the development is taking place for some of the s106 monies. However, with CIL, money is awarded to the Parish and they control the money. Even if a parish is on the edge of a development, then it cannot ask for anything. CIL is specifically for infrastructure, not just money to be handed over. CIL can be pooled with another Parish Council. Parishes may need the general power of competence to spend CIL. If something is in the Local Plan, it will be Section 106, if not, CIL.

If the 200 houses are built on the land north of Dunmore Road, then, even though the land will go to Abingdon, SHW PC will be able to request some section 106 monies.

Section 106 are generally large developments. CIL is charged on all non exempt developments.

CIL is charged per square metre; in this parish at £120 per square metre of new habitable space.

SHW could tell Highways that they would like to use their 25% share, (If Paddock goes ahead), for Barrow Road traffic calming measures but it needs to be remembered that Highways will receive 50% of the CIL themselves.

If a house is taken down and replaced with e.g. 2 houses, as happened in the Parish, then CIL will only be paid on the increased volume.

5. Finance Sub Committee

Budget & Precept 2020/21 (Risk Assessment)

The Parish Council is required to submit its Precept bid to the VWHDC by 10th January 2020.

The Clerk circulated the proposed budget for 2020/21 prior to the meeting, for agreement of the 2020/21 precept figure. Also circulated were the risk assessment and insurance documents for review.

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

The Clerk to check the expenditure figure.

AC

The Community Orchard will to be taken out of the Risk Assessment.

Shippon Hall to be taken out of the Reserves (as may not be necessary with the development of the Barracks) and the funds for Highways and Speed reduction measures to be increased.

Spend for 2019/20 is estimated to be £19,882.16.

Risk Assessment & Insurance Schedule – reviewed and unanimously agreed.

Budget for Precept - reviewed and unanimously agreed.

Precept Figure – The tax base has increased from 829.60 (2019/20) to 840.40 (2020/21). If the Precept remained at the 2019/20 level of **£18,756**, the Council tax per Band D property would decrease from **£22.61** in 2019/20 to **£22.32** per household in 2020/21. The Precept figure for 2020/21 was unanimously agreed at £18,756.

6. Minutes of the meeting held on 4th November 2019

The minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.

7. Highways & Amenities Sub Committee (Richard Bahu & Lee Church)

Cllr Parkin is coming off the H&A group to concentrate on NP work.

- a) Money for (Barrow Road) Traffic Calming Measures – in progress for Barrow Road. The Clerk to request Archer tubes to be placed in locations on Lashford Lane, either side of the Primary School, in the New Year when the school is open. AC
- b) Overgrown Vegetation – Cllr Parkin checked Rookery Close and there is no vegetation currently obstructing the pathways. There is however, some around the letterbox on Barrow Road.
- c) Village Gates – the village gates are starting to peel. Mr O'Hara to follow up if the Army can help with the repair/repainting. D'OH

8. Development & Planning Sub Committee

The huge Cothill development surprisingly went through. It was lots of small extensions, which added up to a huge increase in total volume.

There is still no further information from Oxford Homes or any revised plans for the 200 houses.

The Conservation Officer is putting a lot of conditions on the conversion of the barns, although not objecting over all.

Cllr Page contacted Emily Hamerton re clarifications from her presentation. She is still to respond. The Clerk to circulate Cllr Page's email to Ms Hamerton. AC

a) Decision Notices

Ref:	P19/V2409/PDH
Date	8 th October 2019
Description	Erection of 4 larger home extensions under the terms of the GPDO. Extension 1: 8m from the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, with a maximum height of 4m and a maximum eaves height of 2.88m Extension 2: 8m from the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, with a maximum height of 2.7m and a maximum eaves height of 2.7m Extension 3: 8m from the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, with a maximum height of 2.7m and a maximum eaves height of 2.7m Extension 4: 3.2m from the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse formed by the nearest element (for reference 7.75m from the rear wall elsewhere on the property), with a maximum height of 4m and a maximum eaves height of 2.88m
Address	68 Cothill Road Cothill Abingdon OX13 6QQ
St Helen Without PC's comments	Erection of 4 individual large home extensions under the terms of GPDO. The Vale's letter to the parish states that 'the Government has recently increased the permitted development rights for householders who are seeking to add single storey rear extensions.' From the plans submitted it would appear that extensions 1 and 4 are only attached to the side elevations of the property and in fact are not even connected to extension 3 and 4, which are proposed to the rear of the property. There is a 200mm gap between the no 1 side extension 1 on the eastern and extension 2 to the rear, and a 100mm gap between extension 4 on the western side and extension 3 to the rear. All four extensions seem to be independent of each other and the only connecting openings are into the existing property. Response : No Objections We believe that the combined increase in volume of all four proposed extensions is in the region of 120%. Is this within current permitted volumetric restraints?

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

	The plans as submitted do not show the proposed dormer, porch or the location of the additional outbuilding (P19/V2410/LDP) - all of which adds even more additional volume over and above that of the existing property.
Decision	PDH Agreed on 14th November 2019

Ref:	P19/V2444/HH
Date	7 th October 2019
Description	Two storey and first floor extension with bay roofs and outbuilding.
Address	43 Lashford Lane Dry Sandford Abingdon OX13 6DY
St Helen Without PC's comments	No objections
Decision	Planning Permission on 2nd December 2019

Ref:	P19/V2410/LDP
Date	8 th October 2019
Description	Proposed outbuilding, porch and rear dormer.
Address	68 Cothill Road Cothill Abingdon OX13 6QQ
St Helen Without PC's comments	For info only
Decision	Certificate of Lawful Use or Development on 29th November 2019

c) Ongoing applications

Ref:	P19/V0169/RM
Date	29 th January 2019
Description	Reserved Matters application following Outline Approval P17/V1336/O for residential development for 200 dwellings, together with associated access, landscaping and public open space, infrastructure (utilities) and biodiversities enhancements.
Address	Land North West of Dunmore Road Abingdon Oxfordshire
St Helen Without PC's comments	<p>The Parish of St Helen Without wish to Object to Planning Application P19/V0169/RM</p> <p>St Helens Without Parish Council have reviewed the plans and supporting documents for this Reserved Matters planning application and must express our concerns about the revised proposals now before the Vale. Specific areas of concern are listed below but we are also disappointed in the way the applicants have presented this development to you. The overview paper is written as though there has been considerable work undertaken to the design and development of the site in a sympathetic and colloquial way but when you read the paper it soon becomes clear that this is not the case. What we see is a pre-prepared set of planning statements that have been cut and pasted, then collated to fit this particular development and a local heading put at the top. This then allows the developer to use a range of standard designed houses which can be incorporated onto any site wherever they build regardless of local factors.</p> <p>Page 13 of the paper refers to typical building materials used around Abingdon and some pictures to underscore the examples yet none of the houses now proposed have anything like the same type of features i.e. stone or rendered walls save the red/brown brick. We visited the Developer's site at Grove near Wantage which is currently nearing completion, only to find the houses there are of a similar construction to the ones proposed for the 200 here. It is clear that local character has not been taken into consideration at all when drawing up these plans despite the wording at Page 13. This is but one example of many generic statements the developers make throughout this document and thereby the developers can build what they want rather than what is best for the families they hope to attract or the development of Abingdon.</p> <p>1. Insufficient footpaths around the development for pedestrian safety. This has improved since the previous plan but is still incomplete and you can not walk safely</p>

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

across the site on a footpath. It would also seem that in places the footpath and the cycleway combine which is not ideal.

2. Cycle lanes have improved but in places still appear incomplete and stop randomly.

3. There are only 33 designated parking spaces for visitors (up from 22 on previous plan but still less than the 38 first proposed) to the 200 houses. Once again, they are all still located on the perimeter of the built-up area of the development. There needs to be more spaces and some dedicated to each block of houses. Unless the number of spaces improves there will be parking on the roads, which could well block roads, be dangerous and potentially lead to chaos and friction between residents.

4. Clarification is required that the roads as planned are wide enough (the widest being 5.5m and the narrowest 4.8m) to allow safe passage of two cars passing and also overtaking any cars parked on the road (see 3 above). Access and maneuverability of goods vehicles and emergency vehicles must also be considered.

5. In view of the possible 73 unit housing development on the opposite side of Wootton Road, we would ask that the question of installing traffic lights at the exit of the development be revisited despite the proposed layout having been agreed when outline planning permission was granted.

6. The MUGA which helps promote a community spirit to be sited more centrally i.e. adjacent to the North West corner of the recreation ground and closer the central village green to provide equal access for all residents, rather than in a furthest corner. The current location next to the ring road and its impact on air quality together with its close proximity to the swale we suggest would present a danger to young children. It's present position is somewhat isolated from the majority of the new homes and also vulnerable to use by people not living on the development.

7. Assurance is sought that all tree and shrub planting plans as submitted are fulfilled.

8. LPP1 states that the site layout must be mindful of future expansion of the A34 and should not preclude this. Developers must provide appropriate setbacks from all physical barriers along the boundaries of the site for this purpose. It would not seem the plans now submitted have taken this directive into account.

9. Environmental Health is a highly important and sensitive part of the planning process. We have reservations over the air quality because of the volume of traffic on the A34, B4017, Copenhagen Drive, and Dunmore Road. We believe that no air quality survey has been conducted in the locality or presented to support this application.

10. Since the last application the Developers have had a noise assessment report updated and provided to support building on this site. Having read this report we are concerned with its findings and some of the assumptions that are made.

- a) Although the report is dated 25 April 2019 it relies on readings taken in June 2014 and June/July 2015. Readings were taken from 3 points on the site but for only 3 hours in the afternoon between 14.55 and 17.52 and one hour in the morning between 08.36 and 09.36. Readings at night were an hour from each point ranging in time from 23.03 to 00.43.
- b) Therefore, all of this report and its conclusions are based on 10 hours of recordings in mid-summer. These readings are justified at para 4.2 because, since the readings, "there have been no significant developments in the immediate vicinity" and "neither have there been found any factors which would alter traffic on the surrounding network by more than a few percent". Try telling that to people who live locally! Interestingly the report is written by a company based in Brighton which, 4 and 5 years ago, spent a few hours here taking sound readings but conclude that the survey remains fit for purpose. We strongly disagree.

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

	<p>c) The decibel (dB) levels recorded see table 4.3: summary of noise monitoring results is far higher than is acceptable. The Vale were concerned with noise levels between 60-70dB (para 2,18) yet readings were recorded at above 80dB both at day and night peaking during the morning rush hour at 87dB.</p> <p>d) The site is immediately adjacent to and East of the A34; also, at this point the site is below the level of the A34 so it will be greatly affected by constant traffic noise from that road. Sound waves travelling through the air are longitudinal waves with compressions and rarefactions. Sound travels up or down evenly from the source, in this case the A34, however it is a proven scientific fact that typically the noise will be worse for areas below the source.</p> <p>e) Nowhere in the report is there any mention of the prevailing wind or temperature both of which will impact on noise levels. The prevailing wind is West to South West so that will magnify the traffic noise to a severe and arguably unacceptable level as it washes over the site.</p> <p>f) Nowhere in the report is there mention of the effects of temperature on sound waves. Sound waves move faster in warm air and slower in cold air. So, if the air at the surface is cooler than higher up (which is normal) then the top of the sound wave will be moving faster than the bottom; the wave will tilt and refract back towards the ground. In this case sound would leave the A34, go up into the air then be bent back down to the surface towards the cooler air. This means the noise would be louder and you could here the traffic noise from further away. If the dB recordings in this report had been done in cooler temperatures, they would have been higher than those presented in this report.</p> <p>g) We would urge the Vale planning department to be 100% satisfied that all necessary steps have been taken to protect the health and wellbeing of residents before they allow building to commence.</p> <p>11. The Parish Council would have hoped and expected in a development of up to 200 houses that a small number of single storey properties should have been included to provide homes for those who have difficulty now and in the future in using stairs etc.</p> <p>12. The proposed housing layout is condensed within the centre of the site with only one area of green space included amongst the planned 200 properties. All other open green space is on the perimeter. Therefore, the PC would like to see the number of proposed houses reduced to enable the inclusion of continuous footpaths throughout the whole site thereby allowing safe pedestrian passage by residents without the need of having to walk in the road. Wider roads throughout the site together with more visitor parking allocation and additional open green spaces incorporated within the built-up area of the development. In addition, by reducing the number of proposed houses, some of the planned homes currently with very small gardens would be able to benefit from an increase in their outdoor space. We are also mindful that there is a proposal for 73 properties on an adjacent site and in LPP1 the VWHDC stated that about 200 dwellings should be built across both sites; this reinforces our view that the number of homes on this site should be reduced.</p>
Decision	Due 20 th September 2019 (No decision issued)

Ref:	P19/V2274/FUL
Date	25 th September 2019
Description	Demolition of existing dwelling & annex. Erection of 2no dwellings.
Address	80 Barrow Road Shippon Abingdon OX13 6JQ
St Helen Without PC's comments	<p>No Objection but wish the following comments to be taken into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We would encourage the developer to consider a more traditional grey roofing material i.e. grey slate similar to that used on the roofs of the Old Vicarage and Coach House which are located on the opposite side of Barrow Road. 2. We understand that in the past there was a small pond, which was fed by a natural stream, in the area where the proposed hard standing for car parking is to be located. Reassurance is required that sufficient drainage arrangements will be made to prevent the likelihood of any flooding of this area in the future.
Decision	15 th November 2019 (No decision Issued)

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

Ref:	P19/V2489/FUL
Date	10 th October 2019
Description	Proposed conversion and alterations of agricultural barns to B1 (Office) use and associated parking and bin and cycle storage (resubmission of P18/V2554/FUL)
Address	Church Farm Barns Barrow Road Shippon OX13 6JF
St Helen Without PC's comments	<p>Response to Planning Application P19/V2489/FUL – Church Farm Barns, Barrow Road</p> <p>St Helen Without has No Objection to this planning application but wish the following comments to be taken into account before any decision is made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new plan shows a reduction of 35% in area of office space with the wing closest to the entrance (the east wing) having been removed and larger green areas in the middle between the buildings, which we view as a positive improvement. 2. The application still says they are applying for 30 car park spaces but the new plan shows a reduced figure of 25. We think the plan is probably correct and the agent submitting the application has failed to amend/ update the written application. 3. The access/exit is exactly the same as in P18/V2554/FUL. We were unhappy with it then and remain unhappy with it now. Our original comments 1 and 2 hold good on this part of the application. We would also request that should planning permission be granted a condition be attached requiring the developer to make a contribution to the cost of traffic calming measures required for Barrow Road to help reduce the speed of traffic at this narrow part of the road. 4. The biodiversity and flooding issues we raised previously need to be fully covered to mitigate any harm to the satisfaction of the Vale planning standards. 5. The “grass verge” as shown on drawing S1-02 is not in fact a grass verge at all. There is a large stone step that protrudes in to the road about half way along the barn wall where over time dirt and soil has built up along the base of the barn wall and weeds and small self seeded vegetation has grown up. 6. In the travel plan statement at 2.3, Pedestrian Access, they comment that there is no existing pavement along Barrow Road at this point. However, they say there is some scope to extend a pavement from the site and form an extended link to Farringdon Road. We believe that a pavement is required so workers can move safely to and from public transport in Farringdon Road and their place of work. We would suggest that the provision of a pavement becomes a condition of planning approval. 7. The design statement says that “The site is not close to or impacts upon any adjacent listed building” and we would advise that the Grade II Listed Church Farm House is directly opposite the site and only about 6m away and the Grade II Listed Old Manor is in very close proximity heading west. Further it states “Shippon developed as a village in connection with the aerodrome” (from the 1930’s onwards) something we would dispute as there are 14 Grade II listed properties in the village of which the majority are several hundred years old. We would therefore request that the Conservation Officer is approached for comments on this application. <p>Response to Planning Application P18/V2554/FUL – Conversion of redundant agricultural buildings into offices, Barrow Road, Shippon</p> <p>St Helen Without has No Objections to this planning application but wish the following comments to be taken into account before any decision is made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very serious concerns about traffic implications to this already very narrow and frequently congested part of Barrow Road. Therefore would seek that access to the developed site is limited exclusively to cars, small vans and emergency and waste disposal vehicles. 2. The drawing supporting the application showing the vision splay at over 40 metres would appear to be misleading, as the driver of any vehicle exiting the site would have to proceed approx 2 metres beyond the dotted line to achieve the full 40 metre view. 2. The proposed building materials are strictly adhered to. 3. Request a full habitat and species report prior to any decision being reached as it is believed that there are bats occupying areas within the site. 4. No overnight parking to be allowed on the site and limited hours of business to be considered as this proposed development is surrounded by residential homes.

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

	<p>5. The redevelopment to be limited to offices only, with no storage units, workshops or industrial units permitted as we notice that units 6,7 and 9* have only very little natural light in relation to that shown for all the other units so have concern about their possible future use.</p> <p>6. Seek reassurance that sufficient and appropriate drainage is put in place as this part of Barrow Road is prone to flooding in heavy rain.</p> <p>7. Note that no notices were sent to two of the Grade II listed properties closest to the farmyard, Church Farm House (directly opposite) and the Old Manor (next to the farm yard on the western side). Both buildings being some of the oldest and most historic in Shippon and we trust that the Conservation Officer will be asked for input on the development and its possible impact on this part of Shippon.</p> <p>*Unit 9 has been removed from the latest planning application P19/V2489/FUL</p>
Decision	20th December 2019

Ref:	P19/V3157/PDH
Date	29 th November 2019
Description	Single storey rear extension. Depth 8m Height 4m Height to eaves 3m
Address	Fenlands Cothill Road Dry Sandford Abingdon OX13 6JW
St Helen Without PC's comments	
Decision	Due 10 th January 2020

Ref:	P19/V3025/HH
Date	25 th November 2019
Description	Alterations and extension to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite and a new bathroom. Replacement garage and a new roof over the kitchen and conservatory.
Address	9 Rookery Close Shippon Abingdon Oxfordshire OX13 6LY
St Helen Without PC's comments	Due 4 th January 2020
Decision	Due 20 th January 2020

Ref:	P19/V3144/LB
Date	2 nd December 2019
Description	Garage and tool shed outbuilding is leaking. Rotting roof battens have allowed roof tiles to slip, and the tiles have blown and become brittle. The tiles on the front are red handmade clay tiles, with machine made grey concrete plain tiles to the rear. The front roof will be re-roofed with reclaimed tiles matching the current tiles. Propose to replace machine made grey plain concrete roof tiles (rear aspect only) with machine made red plain clay tiles to match the front, and an adjacent building.
Address	Lenthalls 76 Church Lane Dry Sandford Abingdon OX13 6JP
St Helen Without PC's comments	No objections
Decision	Due 23 rd January 2020

Ref:	P18/V2180/FUL
Date	18 th September 2018
Description	Development of up to 73 residential dwellings and associated works including design, access, landscaping and open space.
Address	Land to the West of Wootton Road Abingdon
St Helen Without PC's comments	<p>St Helen Without have no objection to this planning application but would like the following comments to be taken into account by the Vale of White Horse when making their decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern that there are insufficient car parking spaces allocated to accommodate any visitors therefore cars might well end up blocking access for emergency vehicles, waste disposal lorries etc. 2. Further increased level of traffic exiting on to the already very busy public roads with particular emphasis on ensuring the safety of bicycle users and pedestrians.

The Parish Council of St. Helen Without

	<p>3. The very close proximity of the flats to the A34 with resultant noise and air pollution concerns. Efforts to be made to soundproof these buildings where possible.</p> <p>4. Has any allowance been made for the possible widening of the A34.</p> <p>5. Relocation of a substantial part of the communal landscaping into the centre of the development as its current very close proximity to the A34 where the air pollution and noise levels might well render it unsafe to children and damaging to the residents health. Also measures to be taken to prevent any pedestrian access on to the very busy major road.</p> <p>6. Reassurance that sufficient drainage will be incorporated in to the development as the area is known to have flooded.</p> <p>7. Would prefer the number of homes to be reduced by say 10% with the resultant improvement in the amount of open space in and around the development and thereby enabling increased landscaping.</p>
Decision	30th January 2020

Ref:	P19/V1998/RM
Date	2 nd September 2019
Description	Reserved Matters Application (Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale) - Residential development for erection of 425 dwellings within 3 phases of the North Abingdon Development: Western Parcel Area A & B and Central Parcel Area A. Associated landscaping and infrastructure works together with additional details as required by conditions attached to outline planning permission (Ref: P17/V0050/O)
Address	Land North of Dunmore Road Abingdon OX14 1PU
St Helen Without PC's comments	
Decision	20th May 2020

9).Cllrs reports and items for future agendas

None

10).Date of next meeting

It was confirmed that the next meeting of the Sub Committees will be held at 7.00 p.m. on Monday 20th January 2020 at Dry Sandford Primary School.

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 8.15.p.m.

Signed.....Date.....

Minutes & Agendas can be found on our website at: <http://www.woottondrysandfordshippon.co.uk/>