

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 1 February 2016

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), R J M Bishop, N G Colston, C Cottrell-Dormer, A M Graham, T J Morris, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, W D Robinson\*, G Saul and T B Simcox

(\* Denotes non-voting member)

Officers in attendance: Michael Kemp, Joanna Lishman, Phil Shaw and Simon Wright

55 MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 4 January 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

56 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

There were no apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

57 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr G Saul declared an interest in application No: 15/03734/FUL (Bull Hill Bungalow, Bull Hill, Chadlington) having acted for the owners in their purchase of the property.

58 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:

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

3 15/02687/OUT Land South of Witney Road, Long Hanborough

The Development Manager introduced the application and reported receipt of three further letters of objection. The illustrative master plan for the development was outlined.

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

Mr Niels Chapman, Hanborough Parish Council, addressed the sub-committee in objection to the application. A summary of the representation is attached at Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr John Ashton, West Waddy, addressed the sub-committee in support of the application. A summary of the representation is attached at Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager continued his presentation and referred to the site visit previously held, the applicant's additional letter outlined in the report and the main issues for consideration.

It was reported that the main changes from the previous application were the inclusion of a new doctor's surgery and a reduction in affordable housing provision from 50% to 35%.

The sub-committee was advised that Counsel's opinion had been sought in respect of issues raised by the applicants. It was clarified that the council's approach had been supported by legal opinion and it was important that the application was determined on planning issues only.

The Development Manager advised that the application needed to be judged against current and emerging local plans together with national planning guidance. The various elements had to be given appropriate weighting and properly balanced and it was prudent to also assess the application as if there was no 5 year housing land supply as regards whether any adverse issues identified amounted to significant and demonstrable harms

The Development Manager indicated that the main considerations related to principle, indicative design and form, residential amenity, visual amenity, traffic and highways, ecology, school capacity, health provision and legal agreements.

In conclusion it was advised that the recommendation was for refusal for the reason shown in the report and the Development Manager indicated that a second reason relating to the lack of a legal agreement should be included.

Mr Morris thanked the Development Manager for his presentation and indicated that it had covered the key issues of concern for residents. Mr Morris suggested that the application did not overcome all of the reasons for the previous refusal.

Mr Morris particularly highlighted the lack of school capacity, the reduction in affordable housing, coalescence with Freeland and traffic issues although it was noted that Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) had not raised a technical objection.

Mr Morris then proposed the officer recommendation of refusal.

Mr Cotterill seconded the proposal and suggested that rather than rounding off development the proposal would destroy the important gap between Long Hanborough and Freeland. Mr Cotterill highlighted concern about the access and the importance of the requirement in the NPPF for developers to work with local communities on developments.

Mr Robinson asked if the new health provision would be additional to the existing facility or was a replacement. The Development Manager confirmed it was a replacement. Mr Robinson suggested that placing the new facility on the edge of the village would increase pressure on the A4095. Mr Robinson expressed support for the refusal reasons proposed.

Mr Graham suggested a key consideration was sustainability and highlighted the pressure on local schools as a major concern. Mr Graham further suggested that the development did not reflect the character of Long Hanborough in its design.

Dr Poskitt concurred with other speakers and indicated that schools at Bladon and Woodstock were also at or close to capacity so any additional pressure for places would exacerbate problems.

Mr Saul expressed his disappointment at the reduction in affordable housing provision as this was a key aim of the council.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Refused for the following reasons:

1. By reason of the scale of development both in its own right and in combination with other approved schemes, the failure to address the education implications for the village, the failure to take the opportunity to create locally distinctive development, the coalescence of the settlements of Freeland and Long Hanborough, the precedent for further such encroachments into the open countryside and the unjustified reduction in Affordable Housing provision the proposal represents a disproportionate addition that will damage the social and environmental character and sustainability of the village and urbanise the road between Long Hanborough and Freeland with inappropriate ribbon development. As such the proposals are clearly contrary to the relevant elements of Policies BE2, BE4 H7 and H11 of the adopted plan, H2 and OS1 H3 and OS2 of the emerging plan and the relevant provisions of the NPPF. The key benefits, in particular those relating to health care and any contribution towards housing land supply are considered to be outweighed by the above significant and demonstrable harms such that the proposal is considered to be unsustainable and unacceptable development; and

2. In the absence of an agreed mitigation package the adverse effects of the scheme on the social, environmental, transport, educational, recreational and housing infrastructure of the area have not been fully and properly mitigated and as such the scheme is contrary to policy BE1 of the adopted WOLP, OS5 of the emerging plan and the provisions of the NPPF.

The sub-committee thanked the Development Manager for his detailed presentation of the application.

Prior to consideration of the next application Mr Haine advised that a request had been received from Councillor Ms Leffman suggesting that a site visit be held prior to consideration of an application in Charlbury at the next meeting.

Mr Haine indicated that this would be a good idea and the committee agreed to hold a site visit on Thursday 25 February 2016 commencing at 9.30am.

31 15/03542/FUL Thornycroft, Woodstock Road, Charlbury

The Planning Officer introduced the application and advised that the proposal was for a single dwelling and outlined the location and site layout. It was noted that there was a large oak tree on site that was to be retained.

Ms Sarah Hunt, the applicant's agent, addressed the sub-committee in support of the application. A summary of the submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer reported receipt of an additional objection letter from a neighbour. The views of the Charlbury Conservation Area Committee outlined in the late representations report were also highlighted.

The Planning Officer outlined that the key considerations were principle, scale, design and form, impact on Conservation Area and AONB, highways, residential amenity and trees.

In conclusion it was confirmed that the recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

Mr Graham advised that he called in the application so that the issues of concern could be fully considered by members. In response to Mr Graham the position regarding trees on site and windows in the development were clarified.

At this juncture the sub-committee was advised that an objector thought they had requested to speak at the meeting. Mr Haine indicated that he would allow the objector to address the sub-committee.

Mr Martin Armstrong, on behalf of Mr & Mrs Kirk, then addressed the sub-committee in objection to the application. A summary of the submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer confirmed that no highway objections had been raised by OCC.

Mr Graham, in acknowledging that no highway objection had been made, expressed concern at the speed of traffic in the vicinity of the access. Mr Graham indicated that the separation distances from neighbours appeared to be acceptable. The Planning Officer confirmed that officers had been back to OCC to clarify their views.

Mr Cotterill asked about trees on site and it was confirmed that a condition was in place to protect the oak tree but others on site were not deemed worthy of retention.

Mr Cotterill suggested that there were a number of issues that required clarification and proposed that the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be undertaken. Mr Morris seconded the proposal.

Mr Cotterill asked that the proposed boundaries of the development be marked out on site so that the impact could be better assessed.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer and Mr Colston expressed concern about the design in this location.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Deferred for a site visit to be held on Thursday 25 February 2016 commencing at 10.00am.

41 15/03734/FUL Bull Hill Bungalow, Bull Hill, Chadlington

The Planning Officer introduced the application and advised that a number of changes had been made following previous consideration of the application and subsequent site visit.

The revised plans were outlined and it was advised that the recommendation was now one of approval.

Mrs Emma Goodman, the applicant, addressed the sub-committee in support of the application. A summary of the submission is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer continued her presentation and advised that the key changes were a reduction in the size of the garage which had also been repositioned and obscure glazing of some windows. It was acknowledged that the house was quite large but it blended in to the area and was not over dominant.

Mr Owen, in proposing the officer recommendation of approval, suggested that it was good to see that the scheme had been revised and it was encouraging that the applicant had been willing to work with officers.

Mr Bishop seconded the proposal and concurred that it was positive to see the scheme being amended to address previous concerns.

Mr Simcox and Dr Poskitt expressed support for the application but Dr Poskitt indicated that she believed that obscure glazing was not needed on some windows.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted.

(Mr Saul left the meeting during consideration of the foregoing application.)

49 15/04234/FUL Pheasant View, Chapel Lane, Enstone

The Planning Officer introduced the application and reported receipt of an additional letter of objection.

The sub-committee was advised that the main considerations were principle, siting, design and form, highways and residential amenity. It was clarified that OCC had not raised objection to the access arrangements, the site was considered sustainable, the height of development had been reduced and it was a self-build project.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the recommendation was one of approval.

Mr Colston indicated that he had no issues with the principle of development on site but the access arrangements through agricultural land were a concern. Mr Colston suggested that use of the current access to Pheasant View would be preferable. The Planning Officer advised that this had been discussed with the applicant but there was already parking taking place on that area and there would be an impact on amenity for Pheasant View and Haywoods if the access was in that location.

Mr Colston expressed concern that using the proposed access could open up land for further development and suggested that if approved the access road should be surfaced with stone and not fenced.

Dr Poskitt highlighted the glazing of the two storey porch as an issue and proposed that a site visit should be held to allow members to properly assess the implications of the development.

Mr Simcox expressed support for the application and proposed acceptance of the officer recommendation. Mr Morris seconded the proposal.

The Development Manager, in response to Mr Morris, confirmed that permission for business use was dependant on the type and extent of use and may require an application in some cases.

Dr Poskitt indicated that she had proposed a site visit but no seconder had been sought. The Chairman acknowledged this and the proposal was duly seconded.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Deferred for a site visit to be held on Thursday 25 February 2016 commencing at 10.30am.

(Mr Morris and Mr Robinson left the meeting at this juncture)

57 15/04335/FUL Old Fire Station, Browns Lane, Charlbury

The Development Manager introduced the application and drew attention to the proposed additional condition shown in the late representations report. The objections of the town council were acknowledged and the sub-committee was reminded that the change of use had prior approval so an application was not needed.

The Development Manager advised that the key considerations were principle, design and form, highways and residential amenity. It was noted that the extension matched neighbouring properties and the double doors were to be retained on to the street.

Mr Graham indicated support but asked about the use of Stonesfield slates as requested by Charlbury Conservation Area Committee. The Development Manager advised that this was covered by condition 6 in the recommendations.

Mr Graham then proposed the officer recommendation including the additional condition in the late representations report. The proposition was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted subject to the following additional condition:

7. Notwithstanding details contained in the application, a schedule of works for the renovation of the garage doors which are proposed for retention, including the submission of samples of any new joinery, ironmongery and external finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before renovation of the doors commences.

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

63 I6/00052/HHD Pinewood, 89 Lower End, Leafield

The Planning Officer introduced the application and outlined the plans to the sub-committee.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer proposed the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Bishop.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted.

59 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISION

Mr Colston sought further detail about a delegated refusal at Foxfield Court, Chipping Norton. The Planning Officer explained that the application sought development in an area of woodland that was subject to tree preservation orders.

In response to Mr Graham it was clarified that the permission at 39 Sheep Street, Charlbury would allow the premises to open until 6pm on a Saturday.

The schedule of applications determined under delegated powers, together with an appeal decision, was then received and noted.

The meeting closed at 4.25pm.

CHAIRMAN