

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the
Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee
held via video conferencing at 2.00pm on **Monday 14 December 2020**

PRESENT

Councillors: Ted Fenton (Chairman), Carl Rylett (Vice Chairman), Owen Collins, Maxine Crossland, Harry Eaglestone, Duncan Enright, Hilary Fenton, Steve Good, Jeff Haine, Richard Langridge, Nick Leverton, Kieran Mullins and Harry St John.

Officers: Phil Shaw (Business Manager Development Management), Abby Fettes (Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management), Miranda Clark, (Senior Planner Development Management), Kim Smith (Principal Planner, Enforcement); Stuart Mclver (Career Grade Planner); James Nelson (Trainee Planner); Keith Butler (Head of Democratic Services); Amy Bridgewater-Carnall (Senior Strategic Support Officer); and Ben Amor (Strategic Support Officer).

38. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 9 November 2020, copies of which had been circulated, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

39. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

There were no apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ted Fenton disclosed an interest in applications numbers 20/01893/FUL and 20/01894/LBC by virtue of his previous long-term employment by Cokethorpe School and left the meeting during the consideration of these applications. Councillor Rylett took the Chair for these items.

Councillor Crossland declared an interest in application 20/02650/HHD 105 Burford Road, Carterton because she lived close to the application site and had requested the item be considered at Committee in her capacity as Ward Councillor.

41. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated.

RESOLVED: That the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

(i) 20/01444/HHD – Razzi House, 31 Moorland Close, Witney

The Planning Officer, James Nelson introduced the part retrospective application for the installation of a raised patio, fencing and associated landscaping. He presented his report which contained a recommendation of approval and drew Members attention to the condition requiring details of planting and adequate screening.

Councillor Enright proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations and this was seconded by Councillor Langridge who felt that the concerns raised had been satisfactorily addressed by officers.

In response to a question from Councillor Leverton, Mr Nelson advised that the patio had been reduced by one metre on the east and western boundaries with planting provided. He stated that it was not usual practice for officers to request drainage conditions on an application of this type.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried subject to the conditions detailed in the report.

Approved

(ii) 20/01500/FUL – 26 Park Road, North Leigh

The Planning Officer, Mr Stuart McIver introduced the application for the installation of vehicular access. He presented his report which contained a recommendation of approval and drew Members attention to the comments from the Highways Authority.

Information contained in the follow on report advised that an informative would be added to any permission granted requiring the applicant to submit formal notice to the landowner regarding the right of access across land which was not under the applicant's ownership.

Councillor St John referred to the objection from the Parish Council and raised a concern about the number of cars on site at school pick up time and queried if the area could be conditioned to restrict it to access for garden use only.

In response, Mr McIver explained that the Council owned the land to the rear of 26 Park Road and advised that an individual could submit a planning application for land they did not own, as long as they notified the owner. He referred Members to the informative being suggested in the Additional Representations report.

Members queried which area of land the County Highway's comments referred to and were advised by officers that the team had been in receipt of all of the plans and had assessed it appropriately.

Councillor Langridge sympathised with the comments made but reminded Members that they could not make any assumptions about the potential motives for the application and therefore proposed that the application be granted as per officers recommendations.

This was seconded by Councillor Good who recognised that it was not an easy application to assess.

Councillor St John requested that a condition be added limiting access to the use of the single dwelling and garden and asked if planning permission would be needed for any

hardstanding installed. Officers agreed to double check with the Highway's Department regarding their comments.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried subject to the amendment of condition 4 as detailed below:

Approved

- 4) The vehicular access hereby permitted shall be used solely for the purposes as stated in the applicant's supporting planning statement dated the 16th June 2020 (to allow the collection and disposal of garden waste and cuttings and also to allow additional parking for the plot) and for no other purpose without the prior express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The access is of insufficient standard to serve a more intense use, and for the avoidance of doubt as to what has been submitted.

(iii) 20/01893/FUL – Cokethorpe School, Cokethorpe Park, Ducklington

In accordance with his earlier disclosure of interest, Councillor Ted Fenton left the meeting during the consideration of this and the following application, and the Vice Chairman of the Sub-Committee, Councillor Carl Rylett, took the chair.

The Planning Officer, Ms Miranda Clark introduced the application for the demolition of the existing changing room building and construction of a new science building; erection of a single storey changing room building together with associated hard landscaping and soft landscaping works. She presented her report which contained a recommendation of approval and an amended presentation was circulated prior to the meeting for reference.

This item was taken in conjunction with application 20/01894/LBC which dealt with the Listed Building Consent for the site.

Information contained in the follow on report advised that Historic England now raised no objection and summarised the revised proposal which addressed the points raised by Historic England and the District Council. A supporting statement from the applicant was summarised and conditions had been included relating to sample materials and the impact on the listed building was considered acceptable.

Councillor Good addressed Members and highlighted the school's excellent reputation. He felt the application preserved the history of the area whilst enabling the school to evolve. Having received a satisfactory response from Historic England, Councillor Good proposed that the application be granted as per officers recommendations.

This was seconded by Councillor Leverton who applauded all parties involved for making ground quickly with the application.

Following a query from Councillor Langridge, officers confirmed that the Conservation Design Officer was content with the proposal and was satisfied that the views would not be spoiled.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Approved

(iv) 20/01894/LBC – Cokethorpe School, Cokethorpe Park, Ducklington

The Planning Officer, Ms Miranda Clark introduced the application for the demolition of the existing changing room building and construction of a new science building; erection of a single storey changing room building together with associated hard landscaping and soft landscaping works. She presented her report which contained a recommendation of approval and an amended presentation was circulated prior to the meeting for reference.

This item was taken in conjunction with application 20/01893/FUL which dealt with the planning permission for the site.

Information contained in the follow on report advised that Historic England now raised no objection and summarised the revised proposal which addressed the points raised by Historic England and the District Council. A supporting statement from the applicant was summarised and conditions had been included relating to sample materials and the impact on the listed building was considered acceptable.

Councillor Good addressed Members and highlighted the school's excellent reputation. He felt the application preserved the history of the area whilst enabling the school to evolve. Having received a satisfactory response from Historic England, Councillor Good proposed that the application be granted as per officers recommendations.

This was seconded by Councillor Leverton who applauded all parties involved for making ground quickly with the application.

Following a query from Councillor Langridge, officers confirmed that the Conservation Design Officer was content with the proposal and was satisfied that the views would not be spoiled.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Approved

(The Chairman, Councillor Ted Fenton, was readmitted to the meeting.)

(v) 20/02416/FUL – 79 Milestone Road, Carterton

The Planning Officer, Miranda Clark introduced the application and advised that the report contained a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Harry Watts addressed the Committee in objection to the application . A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Ian Coleman addressed the Committee, representing the applicant, in support of the application. A copy of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Information contained in the follow on report advised that a further representation had been received and was summarised for information.

The Planning Officer outlined the proposal and advised that revised plans had been received and the general design principle was acceptable. However, officers still had concerns about the siting, design and form of the development and requests of the applicant to reduce the number of dwellings from eight to six had not been forthcoming.

Officers therefore felt that the proposal should be refused as the proposed building would appear overly dominant and would affect the appearance of the streetscene.

Councillor Leverton supported the officers summary and felt that the proposal would upset the street scene. He therefore proposed that the application be refused as per officers recommendations.

This was seconded by Councillor Haine who agreed with the comments made.

Following a query from Councillor St John, Mr Shaw clarified the access points on the site plan.

Members noted that there was a need for one bedroom properties in the area and in response to comments made by Mr Coleman, did not agree that there had been any poor conduct of or impropriety by staff.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was carried for the refusal reason outlined in the report.

Refused

Note to Applicant:

For the avoidance of doubt, some form of additional development is considered acceptable in principle. However, the proposal as submitted would constitute an over development of the site and a smaller scale form is considered would be more appropriate within this location and as such more likely to secure consent.

(vi) 20/02650/HHD – 105 Burford Road, Carterton

The Planning Officer, Miranda Clark introduced the application and advised that the report contained a recommendation of approval. The proposal was for the relocation of the fence which required permission due to its height which officers did not feel would affect the street scene.

Councillor Crossland addressed Members and advised that she was representing the views of residents. She referred to the original design scheme of the estate which had been of an 'open garden aspect'. She highlighted a number of concerns with the proposal which she felt was too dominant, would affect the view along the road, should respect the landscaping character and would affect the street scene.

Councillor Crossland therefore proposed that the application be deferred for one month to enable officers to discuss the height and siting of the fence with the applicant.

This was seconded by Councillor Leverton who felt that the fence would be an eyesore.

Councillor Langridge commended Councillor Crossland on her defence of the area and agreed with some of her comments. However, he noted that change happened and this application involved the height of the fence and its proximity to the highway, with no technical objections being put forwards.

Following a query from Councillor Haine, officers confirmed that the land the fence would be placed on was in the ownership of the applicant and there were no open plan conditions

attached to the historical application. It was noted that there were open plan restrictions on nearby Cotswold Way but not on Burford Road.

The recommendation of deferral then put to the vote and was carried.

Deferred

42. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers or withdrawn, was received and noted.

43. ENFORCEMENT UPDATE: THE PADDOCKS, BAMPTON

The Principal Planner, Enforcement, Kim Smith delivered an update on The Paddocks, Bampton which had been the subject of breaches of planning control.

The report noted that the site had originally gained consent for a limited number of Gypsy caravans but, in recent years, a significantly higher number of units had been placed on the land and a number of them were occupied by non Gypsy residents.

Section C of the report summarised the breaches and actions taken over the last few years to address the issues, which involved other services areas and external agencies.

Mrs Smith answered a number of questions from Members and outlined how officers hoped to address the issues moving forwards.

The report was noted.

44. FUTURE FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

The Sub-Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Head of Democratic Services, which asked it to consider whether, from 2021/22, it would be prepared generally to meet on a four-weekly cycle rather than once a calendar month.

Most Members were supportive of the proposal, however, it was noted that some were very used to the meetings being on set days of the month and would find it more difficult if that were to change.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

Prior to the close of meeting, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank all Members and officers for their work over the past year.

The meeting closed at 3:55 pm.

CHAIRMAN