

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 5 October 2015

PRESENT

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

Officers in attendance: Michael Kemp, Joanna Lishman, Phil Shaw and Paul Cracknell

29 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 7 September 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

30 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr T J Morris and Mr W D Robinson and the Chief Executive reported the following resignations and temporary appointments:-

Mr J C Cooper for Mr A M Graham
Mr A H K Postan for Mr T B Simcox

31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

32 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:

(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:-
15/02135/OUT; 1502786/HHD; 15/02620/S73; 15/02722/FUL; 15/02790/FUL and 15/02069/FUL)

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

3 15/02069/FUL Land at Rollright Stones, Kings Men, Little Rollright

The Development Manager presented his report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Colston proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable the applicants to explore the possibility of providing car parking facilities in an alternative location not in such proximity to the scheduled ancient monument. He suggested that a less formal layout would be more appropriate with limited landscaping to the southern boundary so as not to obscure the wider views from the car park. His recommendation was seconded by Mr Beaney.

Mr Postan indicated that he believed that the protection of the scheduled ancient monument ought to be the primary consideration and that the application should therefore be refused. Mr Cottrell Dormer and Mr Cooper concurred.

On being put to the vote the recommendation of deferral was carried.

Deferred to enable the applicants to explore the possibility of providing car parking facilities in an alternative location.

11 15/02135/OUT Land between Wychwood House and Malvern Villas, Witney Road, Freeland

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Dr Philip Biggin, representing Freeland Residents Action Group, 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 Peter Newell, Chairman of the Freeland Parish Council 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.

Dr Philip Huxley, a supporter of the application, then addressed the Sub-Committee. A summary of the submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

With regard to issues raised by Dr Biggin in his submission, the Development Manager advised that the County Council had raised no objection to the application in terms of educational provision; Government policy offered residents the opportunity to register with a medical practice of their choice without geographical restriction and many of the concerns expressed applied equally to all sites in villages in the South East corner of the District.

The Development Manager went on to explain that recent changes in national planning policy were such that reasons for the refusal of previous applications on the site were no longer sustainable at appeal and advised that the future provision and retention of public open space on the development site could be secured through a legal agreement.

The Chairman then read out a statement from Mr Morris, the local representative, a copy of which is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager explained that the site had initially been considered as unsuitable in the SHLAA as it had been assessed assuming development at the maximum density of some 87 units. The current application for up to 29 units was less intensive and, in consequence, was considered acceptable. He noted that, if approved, the development would contribute to the Council's five year housing supply and advised that it was not considered a windfall site as it had been identified in the SHLAA. With regard to concerns raised by a local ecologist, the Development Manager advised that these had been considered by the Council's ecologist who maintained the view that appropriate mitigation measures could be put in place.

In response to a question from Mr Cotterill, the Development Manager advised that the school site in Freeland was constrained but that the Education Authority was looking to increase capacity at Hanborough to accommodate pupils from that settlement currently having to travel to Freeland.

In proposing the Officer recommendation, Mr Cotterill indicated that he would welcome the provision of a footpath link to the rear of the site. The recommendation was seconded by Mr Owen.

Mr Cooper expressed some concern over the application which he considered to lie outside the established envelope of the village and questioned whether it could be considered as infilling or rounding off. In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst the application could possibly be considered as rounding off, these definitions from the existing Local Plan were becoming less relevant as the emerging Local Plan gained weight. In assessing applications, Members had to place increasing relevance on the emerging Local Plan and determine them on the basis of sustainability and potential harm.

Mr Postan made reference to the level of opposition from both individuals and the local council and their wish to maintain the separate rural identities of the two settlements.

Whilst expressing his support for the application, Mr Beaney sought assurance that the number of dwellings shown would not be increased at reserved matters stage and that the public open space could be secured. The Development Manager advised that the application was specific as to the

maximum number of dwellings and public open space secured through a Section 106 agreement.

In response to a suggestion from Mr Cottrell-Dormer, Mr Cotterill and Mr Owen agreed to incorporate a revision to condition 3 specifying a maximum of 29 units into their proposition.

Dr Poskitt expressed concern regarding the lack of footpath connections with the village and highway safety on the A4095. The Development Manager advised that he would be happy to explore the possibility of a footpath link with the developers.

On being put to the vote the recommendation of conditional approval was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the terms set out in the report and to the amendment of condition 3 and an informative to read as follows:-

3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with plans I4-I12-002 Rev A, X-2, D-5 Rev D, D-6 Rev D, and D-7 Rev C. The reserved matters submission shall be in general accordance with these plans as regards layout and landscaping. All buildings shall be no more than 2 storey and the number of dwellings shall be limited to a maximum of 29.

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

Informative

The applicant is advised that the Council would encourage the provision of a footpath link from the south of the site to enable pedestrian/cycle access to the village and to provide an alternative to the access onto the A4095.

32 15/02786/HHD Rosebank, 31 Brook Hill, Woodstock

The Planning Officer introduced the application and reported receipt of further observations from the occupier of the adjacent dwelling regarding the height of the proposed structure and the removal of a tree.

Dr Ivor Lloyd addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented his report and the Development Manager advised that the dimensions referred to by Dr Lloyd related to permitted development rights.

Dr Poskitt suggested that the structure was excessive and un-neighbourly and expressed concern over the potential impact of the structure on residents at 32 Brook Hill.

Mr Cooper indicated that the impact of the development could not be fully assessed other than on site given the variation of levels and proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Cotterill and on being put to the vote was carried.

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

36 15/02620/S73 1 Upper Brook Hill, Woodstock

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mrs Heloise O'Hagan addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

The applicant, Mr D Allen, then addressed the meeting in support to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented his report.

Mr Cooper suggested that the Council would not be able to sustain refusal of the application on appeal and proposed the Officer recommendation. The proposition was seconded by Dr Poskitt.

Mr Cotterill questioned whether the parapet could be lowered but it was explained that, whilst the parapet extended above the roof level, it shielded guttering which would be exposed if it was reduced in height.

Mr Cotterill proposed an amendment to Mr Cooper's proposition that the application be approved subject to an additional condition requiring the bedroom window in the oriel bay be glazed with reeded glass. The amendment was seconded by Mr Bishop.

The Development Manager cautioned against such a condition given that the application had been previously approved with the window shown as clear glazed.

Mr Cooper indicated that he was not prepared to amend his proposition as suggested and questioned how such a condition could be enforced. Conversely, he suggested that a note requesting the applicant consider the use of reeded glass would be more appropriate.

The amendment, having been put to the vote was agreed and on becoming the substantive motion was carried.

Permitted subject to the following additional condition:-

- 2 Before first occupation of the building the window(s) specified as W7 and W13 on the amended plans, along with the first floor West elevation bedroom window shall be fitted with obscure glazing and shall be retained in that condition thereafter.

REASON: To safeguard privacy in the adjacent property.

42 15/02722/FUL Land East of Willoughby Fields, Wroslyn Road, Freeland

The Development Manager introduced the application and advised Members that the applicant's agent had pointed out an error in the report in that the content of a letter of objection had been incorporated into the applicant's case at the foot of page 45. The agent had also suggested that, as a number of objections had originated from the same properties, the total number of households objecting had been inflated. Finally, he suggested that the Parish Council's comments were misleading.

Mr Peter Newell, Chairman of the Freeland Parish Council then addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cotterill and seconded by Mr Bishop and on being put to the vote was carried. Mr Postan expressed his dissatisfaction with the quality of the design.

Permitted

50 15/02790/FUL Land at The Farm, Gagingwell

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

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and seconded by Mr Cotterill subject to the inclusion of a requirement that the development be retained for agricultural purposes.

On being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.

Permitted, subject to the following informative:

1. The extension to the barn shall only be used for the purposes detailed in the application and for no other purpose and hereafter retained in such use unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

33 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 4:30pm.

CHAIRMAN