

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 6 March 2017

PRESENT

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

Officers in attendance: Catherine Tetlow, Hannah Wiseman, Joanna Lishman, Michael Kemp and Paul Cracknell

59 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 6 February 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

There were no apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

61 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr N G Colston declared an interest in Application Nos. 16/03302/OUT (Land North of A44 Worcester Road, Chipping Norton) and 16/03761/OUT (Land West of Quarhill Close, Over Norton) and indicated that he would leave the meeting during their consideration.

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

62 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:-

16/03416/OUT 16/013408/FUL; 16/03761/OUT; 16/04151/HHD and 16/04241/FUL.

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

3 I6/03408/FUL I Four Winds, Wards Road, Chipping Norton

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Martin Overbury, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Beaney, Mr Overbury advised that the distance between the proposed development and the original properties in Lodge Terrace was some 14.5 metres but explained that single storey extensions and outbuildings had been added to those properties subsequently.

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

Mr Saul indicated that he believed that the Officer recommendation was correct but felt that this was unfortunate as the existing bungalows were in poor condition and a terrace such as that proposed would fit in well with existing properties in the vicinity. However, as the impact of the development would be detrimental to the amenity space of existing properties in Lodge Terrace, he proposed the recommendation of refusal.

In seconding the proposition Mr Graham indicated that he considered the application to be acceptable in all other respects and sought clarification of the distance between the bungalow to be retained and the proposed new dwellings. The Planning Officer advised that this was a gap of some 2.4 metres. Mr Graham reiterated that, given the height of the proposed terrace, the impact upon the amenity of the existing residents remained a sticking point.

Mr Postan suggested that the fact that the development would provide low cost housing suitable for first time buyers should be taken into account and expressed his support for the application.

In response, the Planning Officer agreed that it was important to weigh up the strengths and weaknesses of any application. He acknowledged that the development would provide three good quality properties but, on balance, Officers considered the detrimental impact upon the amenity of existing residents to outweigh the benefits.

Mr Cotterill noted that the pictures provided were not of great quality and suggested that, as Members were to undertake a site visit in Chipping Norton, it would be beneficial to view this site as well. Mr Colston concurred and questioned whether the ridge height could be reduced.

Mr Haine expressed his support for the Officer recommendation but suggested that there was scope for an acceptable form of development on the site and urged the applicant to discuss a revised scheme with Officers.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer also questioned whether the ridge height could be reduced and Mr Postan expressed his support for a site visit.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was lost.

It was proposed by Mr Cotterill and seconded by Mr Colston that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held and on being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

11 16/03416/OUT Land South of Banbury Road, Chipping Norton

As Officers were still awaiting further advice from the Oxfordshire County Council on highways matters in relation to the revised access arrangements, the Chairman suggested that Members might wish to consider undertaking a site visit.

It was proposed by Mr Saul and seconded by Mr Graham that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held and on being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

16/03948/OUT Land to the West of Church Road, Long Hanborough

The Chairman advised that a request had been received from the applicant for the development on land to the west of Church Road Long Hanborough (Application No. 16/03948/OUT) that a site visit be carried out in relation to that application. Whilst it was not clear when the application was to come before Members, the Chairman suggested that, if a site visit had already been held, there would not be any further delay once it came before the Sub-Committee.

Members considered that it would be expedient to visit the site and, having been proposed and duly seconded it was:-

RESOLVED: that a formal site visit be carried out prior to consideration of this application.

27 16/03761/OUT/ Land West of Quarhill Close, Over Norton

The Planning Officer introduced the application and reported receipt of the observations of the County Council regarding the revised access and visibility plan and flood risk assessment. She confirmed that the County

Council had no objection to the application subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions and recommended that condition 12 be amended to incorporate the County's requirements.

Mr Nathan McLoughlin, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

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

Mr Beaney expressed some concern that, whilst the application was in outline, the proposed conditions were more appropriate to a full application but failed to specify the requirements for affordable housing or developer contributions. The Planning Officer advised that these aspects would be addressed in the proposed legal agreement. Mr Beaney also noted that the proposed conditions did not specifically limit the number of dwellings to be built. The Planning Officer explained that the number of dwellings was restricted by the description of development which was defined as up to 18 and the Principal Planner confirmed that it was not necessary to specify this further by condition.

Mr Graham indicated that, whilst he was supportive of the current application and the provision of affordable housing, he had some concern that, as the site was on the edge of the settlement and did not constitute infilling or rounding off, it could be seen to establish a precedent for further development in the vicinity. In response, the Principal Planner advised that, whilst Over Norton was a small village with limited facilities, it lay in close proximity to Chipping Norton. In consequence, development in this location would not necessarily set a precedent for similar development in other similar villages. The emerging Local Plan made provision for some development on the edge of villages and the current scheme could be seen as rounding off as the site did not intrude into the open countryside as some other sites in the immediate vicinity would. The site lent itself to development, related well to the existing settlement and brought benefits to the village in a way that others nearby would not.

In response to a further question from Mr Beaney, the Planning Officer advised that the form of tenure of the affordable housing to be provided on the site had yet to be established but would be determined in consultation with the Council's Housing Service.

Mt Cotterill sought clarification of the arrangements for the collection of refuse and recycling and the Planning Officer advised that it was intended that bins would be brought to the entrance of the site. In proposing the Officer recommendation of conditional approval Mr Cotterill noted that, whilst the previous application had a recommended condition regarding the ability to receive a superfast broadband service, no such condition was proposed in this instance. Officers confirmed that such a condition could be applied and Mr Cotterill revised his recommendation accordingly.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Bishop.

In response to a further question from Mr Beaney it was explained that the future retention and maintenance of areas of open space would be secured through the proposed legal agreement.

Dr Poskitt enquired whether there was scope for a self-build scheme within the development and the Chairman advised that this could be considered as part of the reserved matters application.

Mr Postan indicated that he had found the site visit to be helpful in determining the application and noted that, whilst the green space protected the outward views from the site, the development itself would be unobtrusive. He questioned whether retention of the open space could be protected by the creation of a ha-ha. The Chairman advised that this too was an issue for the reserved matters application.

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

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and developer contributions as set out in the report, to the amendment of condition 12 to incorporate the requirements of the Oxfordshire County Council and to the following additional condition:-

15. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer must submit details for agreement in writing by the Local Planning Authority of evidence that every premise in the development will be able to connect to and receive a superfast broadband service (>24mbs). The connection will be to either an existing service in the vicinity (in which case evidence must be provided from the supplier that the network has sufficient capacity to serve the new premises as well as the means of connection being provided) or a new service (in which case full specification of the network, means of connection, and supplier details must be provided). The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the said agreed details which shall be in place prior to first use of the development premises and retained in place thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of improving connectivity in the District.

(Mr Colston left the meeting during consideration of the foregoing application)

47 16/04151/HHD Oldner Stables, Charlbury Road, Chipping Norton.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

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

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

Mr Saul noted that there was no objection to the development in principle, nor from local residents. The proposed extension was to the rear of the dwelling with limited views from the public domain. He reminded Members that design was a subjective issue and that an application ought not to be refused simply because it was not to an individual's taste.

Mr Postan indicated that, whilst he considered the design to be somewhat awkward, he did not consider it to be of particular harm. In consequence, he proposed that the application be permitted.

In seconding the recommendation, Mr Graham indicated that, whilst he did not like the design, it might have merit in its function. He sought clarification of the relative ground levels between the site and adjacent properties and the Planning Officer advised that, whilst the extension was to be excavated into the site, the ridge height was some 6.5 metres.

Whilst acknowledging that personal preferences in matters of design ought not to influence a decision, the Principal Planner suggested that this application was an example of design from the inside out. Whilst the form of development met the applicant's requirements, its external expression was jarring. Whilst there was an argument in favour of functionality in commercial or community buildings, domestic buildings in a countryside location amongst vernacular structures needed to be designed from the outside in. The current proposal was harmful and jarring and failed to relate well to either the existing or neighbouring buildings.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer concurred with the Officer's assessment and Mr Cotterill questioned whether the south facing glazing would be visible over distance. The Planning Officer advised that, whilst the site was currently well screened, there was no guarantee that this would be retained.

Mr Colston expressed his opposition to the application and Mr Simcox noted that the property would be visible from the public footpath for some distance. Dr Poskitt indicated that she found the proposal unattractive.

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

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

Refused

Following determination of the application, the Chairman indicated that he believed that an appropriate design solution could be found and encouraged the applicant to discuss the matter further with the Council's Officers.

52 16/04251/FUL Land South West of the Hare, High Street, Milton under Wychwood

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Mark Longworth, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and suggested the inclusion of an additional condition requiring obscure glazing of first floor side window.

Mr Haine confirmed that the site was under new ownership and, whilst he believed that the existing car park could accommodate more than the 10 or 11 vehicles suggested, welcomed the creation of the new spaces to serve the public house. Whilst it was helpful to provide these additional spaces, alternative parking provision could be found elsewhere in the vicinity. The licensee of the Hare was content with the proposals and had no concerns that the development would prejudice the future viability of the public house.

Mr Beaney indicated that he believed that the current proposals were the best that the Council could expect to achieve but questioned whether the additional parking for the public house would be provided before the residential development commenced.

Mr Haine advised that the phasing of development would be addressed by way of the legal agreement which would also clarify the various rights of way. He suggested that the spaces should be laid out and retained prior to the commencement of development and not used or obstructed during the construction phase.

The Principal Planner advised that a condition regulating the phasing of the car parking provision could be incorporated and Mr Beaney proposed the revised Officer recommendation, subject to the inclusion of such a condition, the details of which to be determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Cotterill.

In response to a question from Dr Poskitt, the Planning Officer advised that five parking spaces would be provided to serve the two new units and that bins would be taken to the highway. Mr Cottrell-Dormer questioned why the parking spaces could not be located to the front of the dwellings and Mr Haine explained that there was a wish to retain the existing stone boundary wall.

In addition, access to parking in this location would sterilise existing on-street parking

Mr Postan suggested that commercial premises such as this could consider the introduction of valet parking.

The revised Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report, to an additional condition the provision and retention of obscure glazing to the first floor side window, a further additional condition regarding the provision of additional parking to serve the public house and to the applicants entering into a legal agreement regarding parking and rights of access on terms to be determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

63 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISION

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers together with appeal decisions was received and noted.

64 SOHO FARMHOUSE, GREAT TEW (APPLICATION NO.S 16/03803/FUL AND 16/04138/FUL)

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing inviting Members to consider whether it would be expedient to undertake a formal site visit prior to the likely consideration of these applications on Monday 3 April 2017.

RESOLVED: That arrangements be made for a site visit to be held prior to consideration of these applications.

The meeting closed at 4:00pm.

CHAIRMAN