

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 25 April 2016

PRESENT

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

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Kim Smith and Simon Wright

73 MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 29 March 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

74 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr A C Beaney

The Chief Executive reported the following temporary appointments:

Mr J C Cooper attended for Mr A M Graham
Mr W D Robinson attended for Mr T J Morris

75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from members and officers at this juncture.

76 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 16/00271/FUL Woodstock Lodge, Blenheim Park, Woodstock

The Principal Planner introduced the application, together with application 16/00272/LBC, and detailed the site layout to the sub-committee.

Mr Roger File addressed the sub-committee on behalf of the applicant and a summary of his submission is appended as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Dr Poskitt sought clarification as to whether it was proposed that the building would have a flat roof. The Principal Planner confirmed that the roof would have a slight pitch.

The Principal Planner continued the presentation and highlighted the design, proposed elevations, access arrangements, parking and the reinstatement of an opening in the boundary wall. The sub-committee was advised that the key considerations were principle of development, siting design & form, highways and residential amenity.

The Principal Planner confirmed that officers were satisfied that the proposal was sustainable, conserved and preserved heritage assets and was policy compliant. The recommendation was therefore one of approval.

Mr Cooper advised that, in principle, he supported the relocation of the office building and highlighted the positive benefit of the Blenheim Estate to the town of Woodstock. Mr Cooper also concurred that siting the office at Park Farm was impractical due to its distance from the palace.

Mr Cooper however indicated that he had concern regarding some details of the application and these had been clear on the site visit. Mr Cooper explained that he considered the materials to be inappropriate and the car park did not operate well in the proposed location.

Mr Cooper reminded members that as a World Heritage Site it was important to protect the integrity of the site and highlighted a recent refusal of another application at Chaucers House on the grounds that the proposed materials would have a detrimental impact. Mr Cooper emphasised the importance of buffer zones in protecting historic sites.

Mr Cooper then proposed refusal on the grounds that the application was contrary to Policy BE1 I of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan. The proposition failed to attract a seconder.

Dr Poskitt concurred that there was some concerns regarding the application but on balance the development was probably in the right location. Dr Poskitt suggested that the proposal would be visible but acknowledged the amendments that had been made to reduce the impact of the glass in the development.

Mr Haine sought clarification regarding glazing. The Principal Planner advised that the glazing would be tinted non-reflective glass.

Mr Cotterill referred to the roof area and asked if there would be any air-conditioning equipment proposed that could cause noise or be unsightly. The Development Manager confirmed that if approved the external appearance would need to comply with the submitted plans.

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

Mr Cottrell-Dormer indicated that he had initial concerns regarding the development but the site visit had demonstrated the merits of the application. Mr Cottrell-Dormer suggested it may be more appropriate to place the opening directly opposite the Triumphal Arch. In response it was reiterated that a previous opening in the wall was being reinstated.

Mr Colston expressed his support for the proposal and highlighted the positive discussions between the applicant and officers in developing an acceptable scheme.

In response to Mr Cotterill it was confirmed that any further expansion on the site would need to be the subject of further applications.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted

14 16/00272/LBC Woodstock Lodge, Blenheim Park, Woodstock

The officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cotterill and seconded by Mr Cooper and on being put to the vote was carried.

Granted, Listed Building Consent.

17 16/00557/FUL Land South and East of Walterbush Road, Chipping Norton

The Development Manager introduced the application and advised that Chipping Norton Town Council and the highway authority had no objection to the amended plans.

The Development Manager outlined the site location, application history and the proposed layout of the building. It was emphasised that the revised materials now proposed were considered acceptable.

Mr Glyn Jones addressed the sub-committee on behalf of the applicant and a summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager clarified that the principle of development had been previously established and the application was considered acceptable. The recommendation was therefore one of approval.

Mr Saul advised that it would be good to see the new facility developed thus allowing football to return to the town and also provide a useful community space.

Mr Saul then proposed the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Colston.

Mr Colston indicated that the new scheme was a vast improvement on the previously approved design. In response to Mr Cotterill it was confirmed that the building contained the same facilities as the previous scheme.

Mr Robinson asked if the development was single storey as the building appeared to be quite tall. The Development Manager acknowledged the concern and advised that it was being constructed within an existing frame so the height of the building was fixed.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted

22 16/00647/FUL Garden House, West Street, Kingham

The Development Manager outlined the application and showed the site layout, design & form of the house and relationship of the development to neighbouring properties.

Ms Jayne Cashmore and Mr David Neale addressed the sub-committee on behalf of the applicant. A summary of their submission is appended as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Neale, in response to Mr Cotterill, clarified the road layout and shared surfaces surrounding the site.

The Development Manager continued his presentation and advised of a typographical error in the report and that Condition 3, if approved, would need to be clarified to ensure the wording was correct.

The Development Manager advised that the development was considered to be policy compliant, the highway authority had not objected and the property would be appropriate for the site. In addition the proposed design was considered acceptable.

The Development Manager confirmed that the recommendation was for approval.

Mr Haine referred to concerns regarding the driveway being tarmac and clarified that the driveway was proposed to be predominantly gravelled with the first five metres being tarmac to prevent gravel migration.

Mr Colston indicated his support for the development and proposed the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Mr Cotterill.

On being put to the vote the proposition was carried.

Permitted, subject to Condition 3 being as follows:

- 3 Notwithstanding drawing no.5932-08, as soon as development is commenced, the existing means of enclosure on either side of the access to the site shall be reduced to and retained at a height not exceeding 650mm above the level of the highway for a distance of at least (26 metres to the right and the entire perimeter wall to the left) from the said access along Cozens Lane.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety. Policy BE3 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local 2011.

77 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The Sub-Committee considered the list of applications determined under delegated powers and the Development Manager reported details of appeal decisions that had been received.

(Mr Cooper, at this juncture, declared an interest in application I6/00311/HHD, by virtue of living in the vicinity of the development.)

In response to Dr Poskitt it was confirmed that the appeal decision at Hensington Road, Woodstock would be presented to a future meeting.

In respect of the appeal decision at The Merrymouth Inn, Fifield the Development Manager confirmed that the owner could not be forced to re-open as a public house and the planning process would need to be adhered to in respect of any proposed change of use.

Mr Cooper asked about the present position in respect of The Unicorn, Great Rollright. The Development Manager reported that the building had been made safe but discussions were on-going with the owner regarding security at the site. Meetings were being arranged between the various parties to establish a way forward for the site.

Mr Saul highlighted that clear glazing had been installed at Chipping Norton Baptist Church contrary to the decision at the last meeting that they should be obscure glazed. The Development Manager acknowledged the concern and advised that a meeting was to be held with the applicants to resolve the situation.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer advised that he had been made aware of an issue at Penhurst, Chipping Norton in respect of a smoking shelter. In response it was clarified that it related to a building that had been used on site and an application would be needed to convert to a smoking shelter.

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

78 CHAIRMANS CLOSING REMARKS

Mr Haine reminded the sub-committee that this was the last meeting of the municipal year and thanked members for their input over the past year.

Mr Haine wished those members seeking re-election good luck at the forthcoming elections.

The meeting closed at 2.55pm.

CHAIRMAN