



## Oakley and Deane Parish Council

### Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 18th April 2019

**Present:** Mr. Hewitt (Chairman), Mr. Bealing, Mr. Harding and Ms. Tofts . Two members of the public attended the meeting

#### 1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Mr. Bullions and Mr. Law and from Mrs. Taylor (Borough Councillor).

2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> April** , having been circulated to all members prior to the meeting were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a true record of the meeting.

#### 3. Planning Applications

**19/00673/HSE 24 Foxmoor Close.** Erection of log cabin and alterations/repairs to existing fence to increase height to 2.13metres. Members had no comments and no objections.

**18/02521/OUT. Cottage and Land at Andover Road Village Hall.** Outline application for demolition of existing cottage and the erection of up to 15 dwellings, with car parking for the village hall, with associated access (all matters reserved except for access).

Members reviewed the latest amendments to the application. The members do not feel that the amended proposals will be sufficient to make the junction safe for either vehicles or for pedestrians and so their previous comments, which we attach for reference, are still applicable. Further, if Station Road is deemed to be safe for pedestrians, members asked why was the clerk told not to allow the litter wardens to collect litter from the verges along Station Road, because of the speed limit?

As stated previously, the members appreciate that the the development is part of allocation agreed in the Neighbourhood Plan and have no objection in principle to the application, but are very concerned with the safety of both drivers and pedestrians along this busy road.

**Previous objections:** This part of Station Road has a 60mph limit at present and the entrance/exit to the development will be moved further to the bridge (which is on a bend). It is already a difficult turn out of the Andover Road site and putting the exit even nearer the bridge will make it more dangerous as it will reduce sight lines still further. It is also hazardous for pedestrians trying to cross the road at that point.

Further, with the increased use of electric cars, it is not so easy to listen for oncoming traffic. With the increased vehicle flows to the Park Farm development (just on the other side of the bridge) the area will see a significant rise in car movements.

The members have suggested that a lower speed limit, along with change of priority on both sides of the bridge (ie stop or give way signs) could help to alleviate some of the issues.

Members appreciate that this application is purely concerned with access, but would point out that there are still discrepancies between the Mason Report and the overall Design Statement.

#### 4. The Committee noted the following decisions:

18/03500/FUL	Erection of rear extensions to provide ancillary retail floorspace and 4 no. residential units (net increase of 2 units) following the demolition of existing single storey extension and outbuildings. Reconfiguration of rear	Granted
--------------	---	---------

	dormer window with pitched roof. 6 Rectory Road	
19/00421/FUL	Erection of two, four bedroom houses and a single garage following demolition of existing bungalow and garage. 2 Pardown	Withdrawn
18/03019/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling, erection of 2 no. 4 bed and 2 no. 3 bed dwellings with associated amenity space and parking, and creation of 2 no. vehicle access points. 4 Pardown	Granted
18/03528/GPDADW	Notification of proposed change of use of Agricultural Building to a dwellinghouse (Class C3) and for associated operational development. Bulls Bushes Farm	Granted

**5. To consider any other planning issues:**

- a) Mr. Hewitt confirmed he will attend the meeting at BDBC re the Golf Course development, which is scheduled for 24<sup>th</sup> April.
- b) **4 Springfield:** the clerk informed members that a Permitted Development application was raised. The clerk asked the Planning Officer if this was a replacement for the previous HSE application, but was informed that should the application be rejected at DC in May, the applicants could proceed under the Permitted Development process.
- c) **DC meetings:** Mr. Hewitt informed members that he felt that the meetings are in essence a foregone conclusion and that there is little chance of getting an application refused if the Planning Officer recommends it for approval. As the members of the DC are not 'experts' he felt that they could be swayed by emotion rather than by an analysis of the facts. The clerk let members know she had sent the letter asking about 'windfalls' to both the Planning Officer and the MP and awaited a response.

**6. Date of the next meeting was agreed to be Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019.**