

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
**UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**  
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon  
at 2.00pm on Monday 27 April 2015

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, N G Colston, J C Cooper, C Cottrell-Dormer, Dr E M E Poskitt, G Saul and T B Simcox

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Catherine Tetlow and Simon Wright

77 MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 30 March 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

78 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr T J Morris, Mr T N Owen and Mr W D Robinson.

79 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest from Members or Officers relating to items to be considered at the meeting.

80 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 14/1102/P/OP Land to East of Church Road, Long Hanborough

The Area Planning Manager introduced the application and outlined the site area and indicative plans for the development. It was reported that further representations had been received from Mrs Carole Marshall in objection to the application.

Dr Stuart Brooks addressed the sub-committee in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Mike Baggaley, Hanborough Parish Council, addressed the sub-committee in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Roger Smith of Savills, the applicant's agent, addressed the sub-committee in support of the application. A copy of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Area Planning Manager continued his presentation and advised that committee reports were often written in advance of the consultation deadline. Any comments received after the agenda was published were included in the late representations report. In respect of affordable housing it was confirmed that 45 households on the waiting list qualified through local connection for housing in the village.

The Area Planning Manager clarified that members were being asked to determine the application in outline only with indicative housing numbers. It was acknowledged that an error had been made in the original site notice and this had been rectified immediately and people had been given plenty of time to submit comments.

The sub-committee was reminded that the application had been deferred at a previous meeting and it was explained that following discussion with local members the number of houses proposed had been reduced to a maximum of 50. The Area Planning Manager highlighted the reduction in affordable housing provision, the impact on the viability of the scheme and local nomination rights for the units.

The detailed Heads of Terms for the legal agreement and the suggested conditions contained in the report were outlined to the sub-committee.

In conclusion it was acknowledged that the application had proved contentious but the site had been identified in the emerging local plan as being suitable for development. The Area Planning Manager highlighted that there were no technical objections and the development accorded with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of sustainability.

The Area Planning Manager advised that the reasons for deferral had been addressed and the recommendation was therefore one of approval subject to the applicant entering in to a legal agreement and the conditions shown in the report.

The Chairman read out a statement from Councillor Morris, a local member, who whilst expressing continued concern regarding traffic impact indicated his support for the officer recommendation.

In response to Mr Cotterill the local nomination rights for the affordable housing was clarified.

Mr Cooper questioned the assertion that the principle of development had been previously accepted and suggested that issues around potential appeals were not relevant with the council having a good record in approving development. Mr Cooper also expressed concern at the involvement of local members in setting a reduced number of houses for the site and that the reduction was being achieved by removing affordable units.

The Area Planning Manager advised that local members had approached officers following the last meeting suggesting a reduced number as a means to overcome their individual concerns. Members were reminded that officers had been supportive of 64 units on the site. It was acknowledged that the reduction was due to affordable housing being removed but all other benefits had been retained through the legal agreement albeit pro rata at a lesser total to reflect the reduced impact.

Mr Saul expressed disappointment at the reduction from 50% to 36% in the level of affordable housing and for that reason he was less likely to support the current application. The Area Planning Manager advised that the emerging local plan set a level of 35% in some areas of the District so that would be met by the application.

Dr Poskitt, in acknowledging the plans were indicative only, suggested that it would be preferable if the development was contiguous with the existing housing nearby or the pre-school was positioned in the open area of the site. The Area Planning Manager reminded members that such details could be agreed as part of the reserved matters application.

Mr Beaney questioned whether a precedent was being set in respect of nomination rights and also where it was appropriate for the education authority to receive payment when the school was run by a trust. The Area Planning Manager advised that the nominations policy was set by Cabinet and could be applied to other applications. In respect of education funding it was understood that the education authority was responsible for providing buildings irrespective of who actually operated the school.

Mr Cotterill then proposed the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Colston. On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted, subject to the applicant entering in to a legal agreement and conditions as shown in the report.

3 15/00836/FUL Land North of Chaucers House, 28 Park Street, Woodstock

The Area Planning Manager introduced the report and advised that further letters of objection had been received from Mrs Jill Dunsmore and Mr Michael Hallissey.

The Area Planning Manager outlined the site, proposed design and landscaping proposals and the relationship with neighbouring buildings.

Mr Peter Morgan, representing the owners of 3 Chaucers Lane, addressed the sub-committee in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to questions Mr Morgan clarified that he was speaking on behalf of the neighbours to the site and that there was an historic air raid shelter that could be impacted by development.

Mr Huw Mellor of Kemp & Kemp, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Area Planning Manager continued his presentation and advised that the principle of development was acceptable and was a logical extension to building in the vicinity. It was explained that a lot of pre-application discussion had been undertaken and whilst the design was contemporary it was considered that a flat roof was preferable to a pitched roof.

It was clarified that whilst the access road was narrow the highway authority had not raised objection. In respect of neighbourliness it was considered that there would not be overlooking issues, the windows in that façade were for secondary rooms and additional screening was to be provided.

The access arrangements were explained and it was considered that this was acceptable. The Area Planning Manager advised that traffic speed was low and therefore a refusal reason on traffic grounds was not appropriate. In respect of the Conservation Area it was suggested that the harm was not significant and again refusal on those grounds was not applicable.

In conclusion the Area Planning Manager acknowledged that there was a lot of concern regarding the application and the conditions contained in the additional representations report should address those issues.

Mr Cooper suggested that it was a very individual site with particular issues such as differing ground levels with neighbouring properties. It was highlighted that concern had been raised regarding impact on the character of the area and the access arrangements.

Mr Cooper proposed that the application be deferred for a site visit so that members could assess the site context. Dr Poskitt seconded the proposal.

Mr Cotterill suggested that if a site visit was undertaken the height of the proposed building should be marked out on site. Mr Beaney emphasised the importance of assessing the impact on the existing boundary walls. Mr Cottrell-Dormer asked that trees to be retained should also be marked on the site.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Deferred for a site visit to be held on Thursday 28 May 2015 at 9.30am.

81 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The sub-committee noted that the appeal decisions shown in the report had been reported at a previous meeting and had been included in the report in error.

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers was then received and noted.

82 APPLICATION NUMBER 15/00111/POROW - PROPOSED DIVERSION OF PART OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 168/4 AT THE CHEQUERS PUBLIC HOUSE, CHURCHILL

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing seeking authority for Officers to make a Public Path Diversion Order under Section 257 the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and carry out the required statutory consultation upon it.

The officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cotterill and seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer. On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

**RESOLVED:** That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to make the Order and carry out public consultation, consistent with the draft order attached to the report.

83 APPLICATION NUMBERS 15/00564/FUL; 15/00567/FUL AND 15/00914/FUL – VARIOUS SITES IN CHARLBURY

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing seeking consideration as to whether it would be expedient to undertake formal site visits prior to the likely consideration of the applications on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June 2015.

In addition the Chairman made reference to a forthcoming application at Burford (Application No. 15/00166/OUT) and suggested it would be beneficial if members visited the site prior to consideration.

The Sub-Committee agreed that site visits be held.

**RESOLVED:** That site visits be held on Thursday 28 May 2015.

The meeting closed at 3.05pm.

CHAIRMAN