

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2:00 pm on Monday 10 April 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: Mrs M J Crossland (Chairman); R A Langridge (Vice-Chairman); M A Barrett;
H B Eaglestone; P Emery; D S T Enright; Mrs E H N Fenton; E J Fenton; J Haine; P J Handley;
H J Howard and J F Mills

Officers in attendance: Catherine Tetlow, Miranda Clark, Cheryl Morley, Phil Shaw and
Paul Cracknell

68. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 13 March 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

69. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr P D Kelland and Mrs J C Baker and the Head of Paid Service reported receipt of the following resignations and temporary appointments:-

Mr E J Fenton for S J Good

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mrs Crossland declared a corporate interest in Application No. 17/00562/S73 (Witney Artificial Turf Pitch and Pavilion, Gordon Way, Witney), the Council being the landowner.

There were no other declarations of interest from Members or Officers relating to matters to be considered at the meeting.

71. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated. A schedule outlining additional observations received following the production of the agenda was circulated at the meeting, a copy of which is included within the Minute Book.

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 Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

3 17/00417/OUT Land North West of 1 Foxwood Lane, Bradwell Village, Burford

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Clive Henry addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Andrew Miles, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Handley, Mr Miles advised that a traffic impact assessment had not been undertaken as it was not required for an application of this scale. However, he suggested that, whilst ordinary residential development was likely to give rise to some 40 vehicular movements a day, given that staff were encouraged to walk or cycle to work in the park, the current application was only likely to generate a quarter of this.

Mrs Crossland enquired whether the applicants had sought to identify a suitable alternative site for staff accommodation within the park grounds. In response, Mr Miles confirmed that efforts had been made to identify a suitable alternative location but that, given the need to retain car parking provision, address the need of the park animals and avoid detriment to the existing Listed Buildings on the site, these had proved unsuccessful.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Handley expressed his support for the Officer recommendation and expressed the opinion that the Council ought not to permit any further development on the site unless the applicants improved the access to the site by the provision of a roundabout. Mr Handley advised that there had been two fatal accidents in this location and traffic often tailed back from the park access in all directions. Mr Handley advised that he was to meet with Officers of the County Council to discuss the position further. Given the success of this attraction, he considered that the owners were in a position to easily meet the cost of such work.

In response, Mrs Crossland suggested that this was a matter more appropriately pursued with the County Council.

Whilst he acknowledged the concerns expressed by Mr Handley, Mr Howard suggested that there were other factors beyond the popularity of the wildlife park that contributed significantly to traffic congestion in the vicinity. He noted that the applicant's agent had confirmed that his clients were prepared to discuss the layout of the proposed development and reminded Members that, as an authority, the Council encouraged businesses within the District to expand and improve. The Wildlife Park had gone from strength to strength over the years and Mr Howard expressed the hope that it would continue to expand.

Mr Howard contended that the Council should support tourism and not be seen to be standing in the way of local businesses. With regard to suggestions that staff accommodation should be provided within the park itself, Mr Howard suggested that, should the venture continue to expand, land within the site would be required for operational purposes.

Mr Howard indicated that, given the history of the site, the current application could be considered to be located on previously developed land and noted that there was unlikely to be any further residential development in the immediate vicinity. He went on to suggest that concerns over access, particularly during the construction phase, could be addressed by way of condition and considered that the nature of the proposed development was such that construction traffic would be less than that required for traditionally constructed dwellings.

Whilst he acknowledged that there were matters that still needed to be addressed, Mr Howard noted that the current application was in outline only and was of the view that these could be resolved at reserved matters stage.

Accordingly, he proposed that the application be permitted. The proposition was seconded by Mr Eaglestone.

Mr Emery indicated that he was unable to visualise the application site and the consequent impact upon the surrounding area and proposed an amendment that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

Mr Howard and Mr Eaglestone agreed to withdraw their recommendation of approval and, having been duly seconded, the recommendation of deferral became the substantive motion.

The Development Manager indicated that there were certain issues that could usefully be addressed prior to the next meeting. In particular, he made reference to the need to identify the essential operational need for additional staff accommodation, to clarify the suggestion that other staff accommodation had been disposed of in the past and explore the possibility of ensuring that any existing staff accommodation was retained as such in future, and the need to identify the full extent of land under the control of the applicants to ensure that adequate access arrangements could be created.

Mr Mills indicated that, whilst the Council would wish to support the development of this valued local business, it was necessary to determine the current application on relevant planning considerations and asked that these be expounded in detail in the next committee report.

Mr Fenton enquired whether access to the site could be secured through the park itself and the Development Manager undertook to enquire as to the possibility further.

Given Officers' concerns with regard to the proposed layout and Mr Miles' assertion that the applicants would be prepared to discuss a revision, Mr Langridge questioned whether improved arrangements could be considered at the next meeting. In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst the applicants could choose to withdraw the current proposal, layout remained an integral part of the application as submitted.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

11 17/00523/FUL 7 Charterville Close, Minster Lovell

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was proposed by Mr Mills and seconded by Mr Langridge.

Mr Emery enquired whether, having due regard to the particular needs of the applicant, a more attractive form of hard surfacing than tarmac could be employed. Mr Howard concurred and, having drawn attention to the proposed condition requiring approval of the materials to be used, the Planning Officer undertook to take this into account. In response to a further question from Mr Emery, it was confirmed that the land was in the ownership of the County Council and that, if permitted, the applicant would have to enter into a S184 Agreement with that Authority and obtain a license to carry out work on the highway.

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

Permitted

15 17/00562/S73 Witney Artificial Turf Pitch and Pavilion, Gordon Way, Witney

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and drew attention to the observations set out in the report of additional representations. She also advised that, if permitted, it would be necessary to amend the legal agreement relating to the original consent.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Emery and seconded by Mr Barrett.

Mr Fenton questioned whether the requirement that all floodlights be extinguished by automatic means at the curfew times could give rise to health and safety issues.

The Development Manager advised that this requirement had been applied to the original consent and was predicated on the intention that play would generally cease half an hour prior to the curfew. Having used the facilities personally, Mr Enright confirmed that there was sufficient ambient lighting to ensure that no such difficulties would arise.

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

Permitted, subject to the requisite amendments being made to the legal agreement appertaining to the original consent.

72. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing under delegated powers together with appeal decisions was received and noted.

73. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 52 DWELLINGS (ACCESS AND LAYOUT) EAST OF MONKSWOOD, PINKHILL LANE, EYNSHAM (APPLICATION NO. 17/00281/OUT

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing seeking consideration as to whether it would be expedient to undertake a formal site visit prior to the likely consideration of the above application on Monday 15 May 2017.

The Development Manager indicated that Mr Emery had questioned whether, given its status as a bridleway, it would be possible for the applicants to carry out the improvement work necessary to secure an adequate access to the site. The Principal Planner confirmed that the County Council had maintained a technical objection to the application on that basis and, in response to a question from Mr Howard, advised that this was the only potential means of access to the site.

In light of the above, it was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Emery that no site visit be undertaken at this stage. On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

RESOLVED: That no site visit be undertaken at this stage.

74. ERECTION OF 41 DWELLINGS (MEANS OF ACCESS ONLY) SUNSET VIEW, UPAVON WAY, CARTERTON. (APPLICATION NO. 16/04253/OUT

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing seeking consideration as to whether it would be expedient to undertake a formal site visit prior to the likely consideration of the above application on Monday 15 May 2017.

RESOLVED: That a site visit be held on Thursday 11 May 2017.

The meeting closed at 1:45pm.

CHAIRMAN