

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 13 August 2018**

PRESENT

Councillors: Ted Fenton (Chairman), Duncan Enright, Maxine Crossland, Harry Eaglestone, Hilary Fenton, Steve Good, Jeff Haine, Peter Handley, Peter Kelland, Richard Langridge, Nick Leverton, Carl Rylett and Ben Woodruff

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Miranda Clark, Kim Smith, Kelly Murray and Paul Cracknell

23. MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 9 July 2018, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

There were no apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Subsequently, Mr Leverton declared an interest in Application No. 18/01670/OUT (Land south of Middlefield Farm, New Yatt Road, Witney), the applicant being known to him and indicated that he would leave the meeting during its consideration.

26. 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.

(In order to assist members of the public, the Sub-Committee considered the applications in which those present had indicated a particular interest in the following order:-

18/01600/FUL, 18/01009/RES, 18/01491/HHD, 18/01509/FUL, 18/01510/LBC,  
18/01684/S73, 18/01647/FUL and 18/01670/OUT.

The results of the Sub-Committee's deliberations follow in the order in which they appeared on the printed agenda).

**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 18/01009/RES Land West of Thornbury Road, Eynsham

The Development Manager introduced the application. He made reference to a letter and brochure sent to Members of the Sub-Committee by the

applicants and to the additional condition they had proposed. The Development Manager also advised that the Parish Council had sought deferral of the application in order to enable them to comment upon the revised plans.

Mr Charles Mathew 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. In response to Mr Mathew's comments regarding traffic movements, Mrs Crossland pointed out that the County Council had raised no objection on highways grounds and questioned whether this addressed his concerns. In response, Mr Mathew indicated that he believed that further investigation was necessary and that traffic ought not to be routed along the B4409 as this would have a detrimental impact upon villages in the lower Windrush valley.

Mr Gordon Beach then addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Steven Neal of Taylor Wimpey then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Leverton questioned whether the proposed flats were in keeping with existing buildings and Mr Neal advised that the applicants had worked with Officers to devise a scheme that offered a contemporary view.

Mr Handley questioned whether any heads of terms were in place to secure access to adjoining sites. In response, Mr Neal explained that these links were required under the terms of the legal agreement related to the outline consent which required the applicants to facilitate un-ransomed access to the adjoining land.

In response to a question from Mr Good, Mr Neal advised that the three storey building provided six two bed and three one bed affordable units and was required to secure the 50% affordable housing contribution. Mr Good asked whether sufficient accommodation could be provided by a two storey building with a larger footprint taking in part of the proposed open space. In response, Mr Neal advised that the applicants were striving to strike a balance between the built environment and retention of open space.

Mr Rylett asked whether it was necessary for the affordable housing to be located in a cluster. Mr Neal advised that this was necessary in order to meet the phasing requirements within the legal agreement which required the completion of the affordable element prior to occupation of 50% of the market housing. To disperse the affordable housing throughout the site would result in occupation of units within an active construction site.

The Development Manager then presented his report. In response to comments made by Mr Mathew he reminded Members that this was a reserved matters application and that the County Council had raised no objection on highways grounds. Developer contributions towards improvements on the A40 had been secured on the back of the outline

consent and County Council Officers had been involved in protecting the crossing serving the school and to secure the option for alternative future access and limit access via Thornbury Road. He explained that the Council could not impose Mr Mathew's suggested requirements regarding Chill Bridge at reserved matters stage but could request that the boundary enclosures were provided at an early stage of construction.

The Development Manager noted that the underlying rationale for the three storey dwellings was outlined in the report and reminded Members that this element had been included in the outline application, conditions attached to which required adherence to the illustrative plans. He reiterated the need to achieve a balance between built form and open space and reminded Members that the Council had used its powers to secure the early provision of affordable housing. This would not be possible if it were to be distributed throughout the site.

In response to concerns expressed with regard to design, he noted that the design of the three storey building reflected that used successfully at the Buttercross Works site in Witney.

In conclusion, the Development Manager recommended that the application be approved subject to such conditions as the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing considers appropriate in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

Mr Rylett expressed surprise that the current application differed little from that considered at the previous meeting and, echoing the Parish Council's request, proposed that consideration of the application be deferred. The proposition was seconded by Mr Kelland.

Mr Woodruff indicated that there was a limit on how attractive an apartment building could be made to look and considered the current proposals to be acceptable.

Mrs Crossland thanked the applicants for addressing the points raised by Members at the last meeting and indicated that she found the current application good in parts. Whilst she was happy with the development at the countryside edge and the main street, she questioned whether it was appropriate to replicate those dwellings found in Crown Crescent in the mews at the centre of the site. Mrs Crossland considered the uniform use of red brick could be improved upon and felt that a greater variety of materials would be preferable. She also suggested that planting should be strengthened by planting more semi-mature trees.

The Development Manager advised that an appropriate condition could be applied requiring approval of materials to be employed and that landscaping requirements could also be addressed through conditions.

Mr Langridge stated that he found the proposals acceptable and liked the way in which it made reference to existing local buildings. He suggested that design was a matter of opinion and considered that there was nothing in the scheme to warrant refusal. It was important to secure the provision of affordable housing and Mr Langridge expressed concern that a further delay could prompt the applicants to appeal against non-determination

which would result in the Council losing control of the application.

Mr Handley cautioned that local residents felt that their concerns were being ignored and considered that it would be helpful if the plans were to show where the link road was to come in. Whilst the proposals were acceptable as part of a comprehensive development scheme, Mr Handley had concerns over it as a stand-alone proposal.

The Development Manager advised that, whilst the plans did show the future access point, the applicants could not design the highway layout on land outside their ownership. Protecting the potential access points was as much as could be achieved at present and the applicants had done what was required in this regard. He reminded Members that the County Council had no objection to the scheme and that, in the absence of technical support for the local view, the Council could not hope to defend an appeal and would be vulnerable to an award of costs.

Mr Good indicated that Officers had worked well with the applicants to secure the improvements requested by Members. In terms of design, beauty was in the eye of the beholder. Mr Good suggested that glass fronted balconies could be used for plants which would break up the bulk of the three storey element. The Development Manager cautioned that the provision of balconies often gave rise to mixed response.

Mr Good considered that the current scheme was much improved and indicated his support. Mr Haine concurred, indicating that the Sub-Committee had achieved all that it reasonably could.

Mr Kelland stated that he had always harboured concerns over the use of Thornbury Road as access to the site and was pleased that Officers had worked hard to secure potential future alternative access arrangements but believed that the scheme could still be improved. Mr Kelland expressed concern over the future maintenance of the open space and made reference to that at Hazeldene.

The Development Manager advised that arrangements for future maintenance had been agreed through the outline consent and reminded Members that the open space at Hazeldene had been retained for ecological purposes rather than as landscaping. The open space on the current site would be maintained with a parkland appearance. Mr Kelland asked that the Parish Council be kept informed of developments and the Development Manager noted that other local councils such as Charlbury Town Council had assumed responsibility for the maintenance of open space.

Mr Enright indicated that he would prefer to see local councils taking on such responsibility.

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

The Officer recommendation was then proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Woodruff and on being put to the vote was carried. In response to a request from the Development Manager, Members confirmed that they were content with the proposed use of red brick.

Permitted subject to such conditions as the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing considers appropriate in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

Post Committee Note:

The following conditions were agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee:-

- 1 The development shall be commenced within either five years from the date of the outline permission granted under reference 15/03148/OUT, or two years from the date of this approval, or where there are details yet to be approved, within two years from the final approval of those matters.  
REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- 2 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans accompanying the application as modified by the revised letter(s) dated 3rd August 2018 and accompanying plan(s).  
REASON: The application has been amended by the submission of revised details.
- 3 Notwithstanding any details contained within the application the proposed fencing and trellis to be sited along the boundary with existing properties to the east of the site shall be erected before the commencement of works on any of the dwellings hereby approved and shall be maintained in place thereafter.  
REASON: To limit the impact of construction activity and thereafter in the interests of the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.
- 4 Before above ground building work commences, a schedule of materials (including samples) to be used in the elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in the approved materials.  
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
- 5 Prior to beneficial occupation of any of the residential units proposed, a public art statement shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority. The statement will provide details with regard to the public art to be provided and will demonstrate how unique features will be introduced into the site to aid orientation and connections with the neighbourhood.  
REASON: In the interest of amenity and providing a development unique to and reflective of Eynsham.  
NB Members commended the idea of using architectural salvage of reclaimed materials within the proposed boundary walls as a means to fulfil the second element of this condition.
- 6 Notwithstanding the submitted plans the public open space in front of the main apartment blocks shall be more heavily landscaped than detailed, in accordance with details first agreed in writing by the LPA

and implemented in the first available planting season following commencement of development.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity of the site.

- 7 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional windows/roof lights shall be constructed in the elevations(s) of the buildings.

REASON: To safeguard privacy in the adjacent properties.

- 8 The garage accommodation hereby approved shall be used for the parking of vehicles ancillary to the residential occupation of the dwelling(s) and for no other purposes.

REASON: In the interest of road safety and convenience and safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

- 9 No dwelling shall be occupied until all the roads, driveways and footpaths serving the development have been drained, constructed and surfaced in accordance with plans and specifications that have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of road safety.

- 10 No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site for cars to be parked and such spaces shall be retained solely for parking purposes thereafter.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for off-street parking.

- 11 Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development.

REASON: To promote cycle use.

- 12 No works or structures shall be placed in that part of the site reserved for connection to the adjoining land to the west which shall be retained free of development such as to allow future unransomed connections as required by the legal agreement attached to the enabling outline planning application.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt.

(Mr Rylett requested that his vote against the foregoing recommendation be so recorded and Mrs Crossland requested her abstention from voting be noted)

12 18/01491/HHD 18 Larkspur Grove, Witney

The Planning Officer introduced the application and made reference to the applicant's request that consideration of the application be deferred as set out in the report of additional representations.

The Applicant, Mrs Sally Anne Smith, addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland, Mrs Smith confirmed that, whilst her lodger occupied the garage conversion and extension, he had shared use of the facilities in the main house.

The Planning Officer then presented her report.

Mr Handley questioned why this application had been brought before Members as it related in internal alterations only. The Development Manager explained that Officers had been subjected to criticism by neighbours and the Town Council had also expressed some concern.

In response to a question from Mr Good, the Planning Officer confirmed that the conversion was not used as an 'air B & B' but occupied by a single lodger.

Mr Langridge questioned why it was thought that a shower in the unit was acceptable but that provision of a sink was not.

The Planning Officer explained that, whilst the provision of a shower was analogous to an en-suite bathroom, the provision of a sink could be considered to suggest that the unit was capable of being occupied independently, not as ancillary accommodation. The Development Manager explained that Officers had sought to ensure that the conversion remained ancillary to the main property and, in so doing, had drawn a comparison with the facilities expected to be found in a hotel room.

Mr Haine questioned whether it was necessary to require the removal of the sink and the Development Manager advised that this made it easy to demonstrate that the accommodation was ancillary.

Mr Enright recognised that Officers had been placed in a difficult position. He stressed that the Council would not wish to see garages converted to independent living accommodation as occupants would be subject to a lack of amenity.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Enright and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

18 18/01509/FUL Kelmscott Manor, Kelmscott

The Senior Planner introduced the application and reported receipt of further observations from Mrs Anne Stephens and Councillor McFarlane.

Mrs Anne Stephens and Mrs Laura Roberts addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of their submissions is attached

as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes. In concluding her submission, Mrs Roberts indicated that the village of Kelmscott was promoted as part of the 'visitor experience' in itself and considered that it ought not to be.

Mr Woodruff agreed that the Manor was a popular attraction and asked, if a site visit was to be held, when it was at its busiest. Mrs Stephens and Mrs Roberts suggested that this was on Wednesdays and Saturdays with peak attendance in the early morning or after lunch.

Mr Leverton asked if there was a footpath between the car park and the Manor and it was explained that the footpath only ran part of the way with visitors having to walk the latter part of the route on the highway.

In response to a question from Mr Handley it was agreed that the public house also contributed to parking problems in the village.

Mr Good asked whether the Thames circular walk exacerbated these problems. Mrs Stephens and Mrs Roberts agreed that this gave rise to a small increase in visitor numbers but acknowledged that there were few places where access could be achieved. They had no objection to this level of use but the number of visitors to the Manor led to the village becoming saturated.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland, they indicated that the distance from the car park to the manor was some 410 metres and that there was insufficient width adjacent to the highway to enable the construction of a footpath.

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

Mr Handley suggested that the lottery bid required growth to make the visitor attraction pay and questioned whether public money had already been spent to support the Manor. In response, Mr Sensecall explained that the proposed expansion was not about making the Manor pay but to secure funds to maintain and restore the fabric of grade I and 2\* listed buildings. He stressed that the project was not for private gain.

Mr Woodruff questioned whether the owners were not capable of funding the necessary works and Mr Sensecall advised that the property was owned by the Society of Antiquaries of London which required lottery funding to undertake the work.

Mr Langridge asked if any steps had been taken to stop visitors from parking indiscriminately in the village. Mr Sensecall advised that, whilst visitors could not be prevented from parking in the village, the provision and promotion of alternative facilities would help to reduce this. The owners would be happy to discuss management arrangements with the Council.

Mr Good asked if coaches dropped their passengers at the Manor. Mr Sensecall advised that, whilst they did do so at present, they would not if the car park was extended.



In response to a question from Mr Leverton, Mr Sensecall advised that he could not confirm the ownership of an area of adjoining land.

The Senior Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. She explained that Mr McFarlane's request that a management committee be established could not be required by condition but could be suggested by way of a note.

Mr Woodruff proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held. The proposition was seconded by Mr Kelland.

Mr Handley expressed his support and raised concerns regarding access for fire appliances.

Mrs Crossland questioned the need for a site visit as she considered that the car park was in the wrong place, presenting a risk to pedestrians. A safe route between the car park and the Manor had to be established.

Mr Langridge questioned the merit of a site visit as there was no objection from the County Council on highway grounds.

Mr Kelland expressed concern that the Manor was imposing itself upon the village.

The Development Manager advised that the Council had no control over the opening times of the Manor as only the hours of use of the car park were regulated. The application sought to create a car park that was open on more days than at present but to capture vehicles before they passed through the village. In doing so, pedestrians would have further to walk to reach the Manor but the alternative was to increase traffic flow on country roads.

Officers recognised that there were disadvantages with the proposal but the intention was not to create a 'Disneyesque' theme park. The owners of the Manor needed to raise funds for its upkeep and the Council had to balance the needs of neighbouring residents against the requirements of the Heritage Lottery Fund. If Members had concerns over the proposed arrangements they could consider other management regimes.

Mr Good expressed his support for a site visit and suggested that it could be possible to secure alternative access arrangements via the Thames Path and the river.

Mr Leverton noted that school parties visited the Manor and expressed some concern over the levels of staff supervision required.

Mr Haine questioned the need for a site visit. He suggested that suitable management arrangements to address concerns over car parking could be imposed through conditions and staff could be instructed to direct visitors to the car park.

Mrs Fenton advised that she had visited the application site earlier in the day. The car park was some distance from the Manor and those less able to walk would require some assistance. Mrs Fenton also recognised that parking on verges in the village was problematic. The learning room would

be a welcome and necessary addition and Mrs Fenton anticipated that it would be well used. She also suggested that it would be useful to have somewhere for school parties to shelter from inclement weather in the grounds.

The application was to be welcomed but Members had to remain mindful of the needs of local residents.

Mr Woodruff amended his proposition to include a request that a representative of the County Council be present at the site visit. The recommendation of deferral was then put to the vote and was lost.

Mr Enright indicated that he was sympathetic to the views expressed by the objectors as similar problems were encountered in relation to the Cogges Manor Farm Museum in Witney. A lottery grant application had also been submitted by the museum at Cogges to secure funding to increase the heritage and educational opportunities and improve the car park.

Mr Enright suggested that it was right that Kelmscott Manor should be open to more people and that the educational offer should be enhanced. In the absence of a more suitable location for the car park the current scheme appeared to offer the best option. Mr Enright also noted that parking problems were generated by other sources in the village.

Mr Enright then proposed that the application be approved subject to such conditions as the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing considers appropriate (including a condition requiring the operation of a parking management plan) in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

Mr Fenton suggested that providing tickets exclusively from the car park would encourage visitors to park at that location.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Langridge acknowledged the problems faced by local residents but emphasised the importance of supporting heritage assets. He considered that the arrangements proposed had the potential to improve the current position.

Mr Handley considered that the needs of the local residents and concerns over the safety of pedestrians outweighed the need to support heritage assets.

Mrs Crossland suggested that access to parts of the village could be restricted through the use of lockable bollards. The Development Manager advised that this would be impractical on the public highway but that traffic could be managed by a variety of means including signage and satellite navigation.

Mr Good questioned whether permission to extend the opening hours of the car park could be given for a limited trial period. The Development Manager cautioned against such an approach as, once additional visitor numbers had been generated through improved facilities; it would be impractical to remove the opportunity for those additional visitors to park.

In response to a question from Mr Kelland, the Development Manager advised that the creation of a footpath would be reliant upon securing landowners consent.

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

Permitted subject to such conditions as the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing considers appropriate, following consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee, and to include detailed specifications of materials, methodology of storing materials, construction methodology, restriction on car park use and the operation of a parking management plan, passing bay reconstruction/resurfacing/repairing and signage in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved, ecology mitigation and tree protection measures.

(Mr Woodruff requested that his vote against the foregoing recommendation be so recorded and Mr Handley requested his abstention from voting be noted)

26 18/01510/LBC

Kelmscott Manor, Kelmscott

Listed Building Consent be granted subject to such conditions as the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing considers appropriate, following consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

33 18/01600/FUL

Store to rear 8-10 Market Square, Witney

The Development Manager introduced the application and made reference to the observations set out in the report of additional representations. In addition, he drew attention to the additional Officer advice regarding the amendment to the National Planning Policy Framework issued on 24 July 2018.

Members noted that, as a result, the references to the NPPF in the reports and refusal reasons as set out in the schedule of applications to be determined might need to be updated to take account of these amendments before any decisions were issued.

The Development Manager advised that the application was before Members as the owner of the site was a serving Member of the Council. He drew attention to the planning history of the site as set out at paragraph 5.2 of the report and indicated that the principle of residential development on the site had been established by the previous grant of permission on appeal.

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

The Development Manager then presented his report. In response to comments made by Mr Hobson he advised that, whilst Officers believed that the Council had a five year housing land supply, recent appeal decisions had emphasised that it was unable to demonstrate this until such time as

the emerging Local Plan was approved. In consequence, the tilted balance remained in place.

Whilst the current community use was clearly of value, the loss of this facility was addressed at paragraph 5.21 of the report. In terms of the impact on heritage assets, the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with more modern residential units had already been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal. However, this did not mean that the Sub-Committee was obliged to accept the current proposal.

Whilst objectors had sought the site's retention as both an employment use and as a community facility, in planning terms it had to be considered as one or the other.

Officers fully accepted that the current use provided a community benefit but recognised that the facility could be closed at any point. In addition, other venues were available and, whilst the loss would be regrettable, it was not sufficient to warrant refusal.

Equally, the extent of overlooking did not warrant refusal and the proposed development could not be considered as unneighbourly given the current degree of disturbance and physical massing.

Mr Enright indicated that this was a difficult decision as the current building was a well-loved facility with a good reputation for doing things that could not be done elsewhere. He thanked Officers for their comprehensive and well-balanced report and noted that the principle of residential development on the site had already been established on appeal.

However, this was a complex site which sloped in two directions and it was difficult to assess the impact of the proposal on existing properties. Mr Enright expressed a degree of concern with regard to potential overlooking and suggested that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held in order to assess the relationship between the proposed development and existing properties.

Whilst it might be beneficial, Mr Good questioned the implications of a deferral. The Development Manager advised that, should the application be deferred, the applicants could appeal against non-determination or the landowner could be prompted to terminate the lease.

Mr Langridge acknowledged that the Sub-Committee was faced with a difficult decision. He noted that the principle of residential development on the site had already been established on appeal and, whilst there may be some issues with the current application, he considered the proposals to be acceptable. He acknowledged that the current community use was highly valued as evidenced by the number of members of the public in attendance. However, that use could be carried on elsewhere and could be stopped by the landowner at any time. The application submitted to have the building listed as an asset of community value was a discrete process from the determination of the planning application and, even if planning permission was granted, the current occupiers could still seek to acquire the freehold of the property.

Mr Langridge stressed that the application had to be determined on planning grounds alone if the Council was to be able to defend a refusal at appeal. He indicated that he could see no planning grounds to warrant refusal and proposed that the application be approved.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Handley acknowledged that this would be disappointing for the objectors but stressed that the principle of residential development had already been established on appeal. He considered that a refusal could not be defended on appeal and suggested that the Town Council owned other facilities in the town centre that would be suitable for the current use. He suggested that financial contributions secured by the Town Council from impending development in the town could be used to improve existing facilities, indicating that a town the size of Witney required a theatre similar to that previously supported by the District Council in Chipping Norton.

Mr Handley expressed the hope that the current occupiers would be given sufficient time to identify and re-locate to suitable alternative premises such as the public halls operated by the Town Council as these were not fully utilised.

Mrs Crossland stressed that Members appreciated the valuable service provided by the venue and expressed the hope that the organisation would continue to thrive in an alternative location. However, she considered that the provision of residential accommodation on the site would be preferable, offering a more effective use of the site than the current part-time occupation.

Mrs Crossland considered that the site was well suited to residential use given its sustainable town centre location. The proposals were well designed and did not impact adversely on the Conservation Area. The Planning Inspector's earlier decision established the principle of residential use.

Mrs Crossland noted that the temporary licence did not provide the current occupiers with any security of tenure and suggested that they needed a new secure base suitable for their needs. Mrs Crossland believed that the Town Council would be able to offer such facilities and encouraged the occupiers to contact the Town Clerk.

Mr Haine suggested that the current application for six units differed significantly from that for four that had been granted on appeal. He indicated that he did not like the design and would have preferred to see an application for only four units. Mr Haine was also concerned over potential overlooking and expressed support for a site visit. Mr Rylett and Mr Fenton concurred.

An amendment that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held in order to assess the relationship between the proposed development and existing properties was proposed by Mr Enright and duly seconded. The amendment was supported and on becoming the substantive motion was carried.

**RESOLVED:** that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held in order to assess the relationship between the proposed development and existing properties

46 18/01647/FUL The Bungalow, Blackditch, Stanton Harcourt

The Senior Planner introduced the application.

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

The Senior Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Leverton noted that no garages were to be provided and questioned whether there was sufficient parking provision for these four bedroomed properties. The Senior Planner confirmed that the County Council was content with the proposed arrangements.

Mr Kelland suggested that parking to the rear of the properties as envisaged by the extant consent would be difficult and noted that the proposed arrangements reflected those of existing properties in the vicinity. As he considered the current proposals to be acceptable, Mr Kelland proposed that the application be approved. The proposition was seconded by Mr Langridge.

Mr Good indicated that, whilst he preferred the earlier scheme, the current proposals were acceptable.

The Development Manager advised that Officers had sought to preserve the existing hedge to the frontage to the site to avoid creating a panoramic view of the parking area. In response to a question from Mr Woodruff, the Development Manager advised that the hedge was not an evergreen species.

Mr Handley indicated that the current proposal would be more attractive to future residents.

Mr Kelland noted that approval had been given for some 80 units in close proximity to the site. The Development Manager explained that more extensive development gave rise to greater public benefit such as the provision of affordable housing and developer contributions.

Mr Leverton asked whether the retention of the hedge could be required by condition. The Development Manager advised that, whilst the hedge could be retained, it would have to be reduced so as to create a safe access.

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

Permitted subject to the following conditions:-

- I The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

- 2 That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

- 3 The external walls shall be constructed of natural local stone in accordance with a sample panel which shall be erected on site and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority before any external walls are commenced and thereafter be retained until the development is completed.

REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

- 4 The roof(s) shall be covered with artificial Cotswold stone slates of random sizes, samples of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any roofing commences and the slates shall be laid in courses diminishing in width from eaves level to the ridge of the roof in accordance with normal practice in the locality.

REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

- 5 Notwithstanding details contained in the application, detailed specifications and drawings of all external windows and doors to include elevations of each complete assembly at a minimum 1:20 scale and sections of each component at a minimum 1:5 scale and including details of all materials, finishes and colours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that architectural feature is commissioned/erected on site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the architectural detailing of the buildings reflects the established character of the area.

- 6 That, prior to the commencement of development, a full surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. Three tests should be carried out for each soakage pit as per BRE 365 with the lowest infiltration rate (expressed in m/s) used for design. The details shall include a management plan setting out the maintenance of the drainage asset. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained in accordance with the management plan thereafter.

REASON: To ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and/ or to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality (The West Oxfordshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance).

- 7 An archaeological watching brief shall be maintained during the period of construction/during any ground works taking place on the site. The watching brief shall be carried out by a professional archaeological organisation in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that has first been approved in writing by the LPA.  
REASON: To safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological importance on site.
- 8 Following the approval of the Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 7, no development shall commence on site without the appointed archaeologist being present. Once the watching brief has been completed its findings shall be reported to the LPA, as agreed in the written scheme of investigation, including all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication.  
REASON: To safeguard the recording of archaeological matters within the site in accordance with the NPPF.
- 9 In respect of both the means of enclosure and proposed landscape works to the shrubs/ trees along all of the boundaries of the site shall be in accordance with plan I6-0096 V6 unless otherwise agreed by the LPA and shall be completed prior to first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved and retained as such thereafter.  
REASON: In the interests of both visual amenity and residential amenity.
- 10 No development (including site works and demolition) shall commence until all existing trees which are shown to be retained have been protected in accordance with a scheme which complies with BS 5837:2005: "Trees in Relation to Construction" and has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be kept in place during the entire course of development. No work, including the excavation of service trenches, or the storage of any materials, or the lighting of bonfires shall be carried out within any tree protection area.  
REASON: To safeguard features that contribute to the character and landscape of the area.
- 11 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E, G and H shall be carried out other than that expressly authorised by this permission.  
REASON: Control is needed to protect the residential amenities of the existing and proposed occupiers, and to protect the visual appearance and context of the Conservation Area.
- 12 The car parking areas (including where appropriate the marking out of parking spaces) shown on the approved plans shall be constructed before occupation of the development and thereafter retained and used for no other purpose.



REASON: To ensure that adequate car parking facilities are provided in the interests of road safety.

- 13 The means of access between the land and the highway shall be constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all ancillary works therein specified shall be undertaken in accordance with the said specification before first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.

REASON: To ensure a safe and adequate access.

51 18/01670/OUT Land south of Middlefield Farm, New Yatt Road, Witney

Mr Leverton declared an interest in this application, the applicant being known to him, and left the meeting during its consideration.

The Senior Planner presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Handley.

Mr Enright expressed his support for the Officer recommendation as the site was located on the 'soft edge' of the town. Mr Good noted that an ecological survey had not been carried out and the Senior Planner confirmed that this was an outline application, not an application for planning in principle.

Mr Handley suggested that the current application could be seen as the first of a phased series of developments and agreed that there was a need to retain this area of open space.

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

Refused

59 18/01684/S73 Land north of Burford Road, Witney

The Principal Planner presented her report containing a recommendation of approval. She drew attention to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations and confirmed that the County Council had raised no objection to the proposal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mrs Crossland and seconded by Mr Kelland.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr Woodruff, the Principal Planner explained that, whilst this was a minor amendment to the approved scheme, given the contentious history of the site, Officers considered it appropriate to refer the application to Members for determination.

Mr Enright agreed that this was a sensitive site which had been granted consent on appeal. He expressed regret that the frontage properties were being constructed so close to the road and advised that nearby residents had been inconvenienced by the construction work.

The Principal Planner advised that Officers were taking steps to ensure that the developers adhered to the approved construction plan.

In response to concerns expressed by Mr Handley, the Development Manager confirmed that the applicants had sought consent for this minor amendment through the planning process.

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

Permitted

(Mr Woodruff requested that his vote against the foregoing decision be so recorded and Mr Handley requested his abstention from voting be noted)

27. 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 an appeal decision was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 5:45pm.

CHAIRMAN