

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 29 February 2016

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), R J M Bishop, N G Colston, J C Cooper, C Cottrell-Dormer, Ms E P R Leffman, T J Morris, T N Owen, A H K Postan, W D Robinson and G Saul

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

60 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 1 February 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The Chief Executive reported the following resignations and temporary appointments:

Mr J C Cooper for Mr A M Graham
Ms E P R Leffman for Dr E M E Poskitt
Mr A H K Postan for Mr T B Simcox
Mr W D Robinson for Mr A C Beaney

62 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr T J Morris advised that, whilst not a disclosable interest, he had a potential conflict of interest in respect of application No. 15/04215/FUL, Land East of Farley Corner, Farley Lane, Stonesfield, an objector to the application being known to him. Accordingly, he indicated that he would leave the meeting during consideration of the application.

63 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman advised that the further information required to enable consideration to be given to application No. 15/04215/FUL, Land East of Farley Corner, Farley Lane, Stonesfield, had not been received and that, accordingly, consideration of the application would be deferred to the next meeting. The Chairman also informed Members that application No. 16/00039/FUL, Elmstead, Crawborough, Charlbury, had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

64 APPLICATION NO. 16/00233/FUL - 18 SANDFORD PARK, CHARLBURY

At the invitation of the Chairman, Members considered whether it would be expedient to undertake a site visit prior to consideration of the above application at the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That, in order to enable Members to assess the potential impact of the development prior to consideration of the above application, a site visit be held.

65 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 15/03797/OUT Land South East of Pinsley Farm, Main Road, Long Hanborough

The Planning Officer introduced the application and made reference to the observations set out in the report of additional representations. She went on to report the further observations received since its completion, details of which are attached at Appendix I to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer advised Members that there was an error at page 44 of the report in that reference to Paragraph 133 of the NPPF at paragraph 5.154 was incorrect and that reference to that paragraph in refusal reason No. 4 should be deleted.

Ms Penelope Marcus addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application on behalf of the Hanborough Action Group. A summary of her submission is attached at Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Niels Chapman then addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application on behalf of the Long Hanborough Parish Council. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Adam Ross of Nexus Planning, the applicant's agents, then addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Cooper, Mr Ross explained that, whilst the applicants had given a commitment to provide 50% Affordable Housing on the site, the form of tenure had yet to be determined. In response to a question from Mr Cotterill, he advised that the applicants were not able to finance the construction of the proposed station car park as they had already agreed to gift the land required and to meet the full Affordable Housing quota. He went on to explain that the car park had been excluded from the application as, at the time it had been submitted, GWR's requirements were uncertain.

In proposing the Officer recommendation of refusal, Mr Morris indicated that he considered the application site to be detached from the village and the scale of the proposed development too great in the open countryside. Whilst he acknowledged the proposed benefits in terms of rail infrastructure, Mr Morris questioned whether these would ever be forthcoming.

The recommendation was seconded by Mr Cotterill who also expressed concern over the delivery of developer contributions in the absence of a legal agreement.

Mr Cooper concurred and expressed his own concern over the nature of the Affordable Housing to be provided. He considered that, given house prices in the District, properties offered at 80% of market value would remain unaffordable to local residents and suggested that the affordability of this form of tenure should be addressed through the review of the Local Plan. Mr Cooper also opined that the local road network had reached capacity.

Mr Owen acknowledged that there was no guarantee of rail infrastructure improvements but went on to express sympathy for the application, indicating that the detriment to local residents had to be weighed against the potential benefits to the wider community. Continued growth in the south east placed increasing demands upon both local infrastructure and established ways of life which would become increasingly difficult to resist.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the Officer recommendation of refusal which, on being put to the vote, was carried.

Refused, condition 4 being amended by the deletion of reference to Paragraph 133 of the NPPF.

46 15/03542/FUL Thornycroft, Woodstock Road, Charlbury

The Planning Officer introduced the report and made reference to the observations set out in the report of additional representations. She advised that, in response to concerns expressed by the occupier of the adjacent dwelling, Whitson, the conservatory attached to that property was to be illustrated on the presentation slides.

Mr Martin Armstrong addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application on behalf of Mr T Kirk. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

Ms Sarah Hunt of Kemp and Kemp, the applicant's agents, then addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of her submission is attached at Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Owen, Ms Hunt confirmed that the separation distance between the proposed new building and the neighbouring property was in excess of 18 metres.

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

Ms Leffman acknowledged the proximity of the proposed development to the neighbouring property but indicated that she saw no grounds upon which to refuse the application. The Conservation Area Advisory Committee had raised no objection and she considered the design of the proposed dwelling to be acceptable in its context. Access to the site was no more difficult than that to any other property in the vicinity and Ms Leffman proposed the Officer recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Robinson disagreed with this assessment, indicating that he considered the proposed development to be un-neighbourly by virtue of its proximity to the neighbouring property. He considered the application to be out of keeping with the area which was generally defined by larger properties set in spacious grounds and suggested that it would be more appropriately located elsewhere on the site.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer concurred and went on to express his concern over the impact of the removal of the existing hedgerow to create the necessary visibility splays for the access to the site.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the application. He considered the modern, innovative, design with its use of high quality materials to be far superior to the more mundane house types seen on larger developments and seconded the proposition.

Mr Cotterill considered the design to be out of character with the area and expressed concern as to the impact upon the Conservation Area. Whilst accepting the principle of development on the site, Mr Colston also considered the design to be inappropriate.

Mr Saul expressed support for the application and Mr Morris noted that the proposed location of the dwelling had been governed by the desire to retain the existing tree on the site. Given the variety of property styles in the vicinity, Mr Bishop considered the development to be acceptable in this context and Mr Cooper stated that, whilst he had no objection to the design, he was concerned over the difference in levels between the application site and the neighbouring property.

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

Mr Robinson proposed that the application be refused by reason of its detrimental impact upon the Conservation Area and the amenity of potential occupiers and the occupiers of the adjacent property.

The recommendation of refusal was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused for the following reason:-

By reason of the erosion of the existing loose knit and dispersed character of development on this approach into Charlbury, the siting, design and scale of the proposed dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the site and character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies BE2, BE4(a), BE5 and H2(a) and (f) of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan and Policies OS2, OS4, H2, EH7 and BC1 of the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 and paragraph 115 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the proposed new dwelling, due to its height and proximity to the boundary with Whitston, would appear un-neighbourly and would create unacceptable living conditions, internally and externally, for both the residents of Whitston and the occupants of the proposed dwelling which would be contrary to Policies BE2 and H2(d) of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and Policies OS2, OS4 and H2 of the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031.

57 15/04215/FUL Land East of Farley Corner, Farley Lane, Stonesfield

Deferred

64 15/04234/FUL Pheasant View, Chapel Lane, Enstone

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant, Mr Marcus Langford, addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

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

Whilst supporting the principle of development, Mr Colston considered the Parish Council's suggestion that it would be preferable to see access to the site taken from the driveway serving the existing property.

Mr Cotterill considered the proposed access to be preferable and proposed the Officer recommendation which was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and, on being put to the vote, was carried.

Permitted

72 15/04522/FUL 18-20 Market Place, Woodstock

The Planning Officer introduced the application and advised Members that the applicants had submitted revised plans deleting the proposed timber cladding from the rear of the building.

The applicant, Mr Andrew Hennell, addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

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

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was proposed by Mr Cooper and seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer who expressed his appreciation of the decision to delete the timber cladding.

In response to a question from Mr Cottrell-Dormer regarding suggestions made in objection to the application, it was confirmed that, whilst the proposed development would be closer to 75 Oxford Street, it would not encroach onto that property.

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

Permitted

80 15/04523/LBC 18-20 Market Place, Woodstock

Listed Building Consent be granted

85 16/00002/HHD 10 Chipping Norton Road, Chadlington

The Development Manager introduced the report.

The applicant's agent, Dr Karl Kropf, addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached at Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

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

Mr Owen indicated that he considered the proposed development to be acceptable and proposed that the application be approved. The recommendation was seconded by Mr Postan.

Mr Cooper, Mr Robinson, Mr Cottrell-Dormer and Mr Colston expressed their support for the Officer recommendation of refusal.

The recommendation of approval was put to the vote and was lost.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then proposed by Mr Robinson and seconded by Mr Cottrell Dormer and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

The Chairman advised that he was of the opinion that the principle of an extension of the property was acceptable and that Members of the Sub-Committee were hopeful that an appropriately designed application would be forthcoming.

90 16/00039/FUL Elmstead, Crawborough, Charlbury

It was noted that the application had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

66 APPLICATION NO. 15/04215/FUL - LAND EAST OF FARLEY CORNER, FARLEY LANE, STONESFIELD

At the invitation of the Chairman, Members considered whether it would be expedient to undertake a site visit prior to consideration of the above application at the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That, in order to enable Members to assess the potential impact of the development prior to consideration of the above application, a site visit be held.

67 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

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

The meeting closed at 4:30pm.

CHAIRMAN