

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 2:00 pm on
Monday 6 August 2018

PRESENT

Councillors: D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman in the Chair), R J M Bishop, N G Colston,
J C Cooper, C Cottrell-Dormer, Ms M E Davies, E J Fenton*, A M Graham, Dr E M E Poskitt,
A H K Postan and G Saul

(* Denotes non-voting Member)

Officers in attendance: Keith Butler, Phil Shaw, Stephanie Eldridge and Ben Amor

16. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 2 July 2018, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Messrs Haine and Jackson, and the Sub-Committee was notified of the following temporary appointment:

Mr Graham for Mr Jackson.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

19. 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 and published on the website. That document also included references to the recently updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it being explained that all future references would be to the revised NPPF, but that some references in the report for this meeting had been to the former NPPF.

The Sub-Committee was advised that application reference 18/01055/FUL relating to New Chalford Farm, London Road, Chipping Norton had been withdrawn by the applicant, and considered the applications in the order in which they appeared in the report.

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:-

p3 17/01966/FUL Land South of William Buckland Way, Stonesfield

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mr Richard Morris addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

The applicant's agent, Mr Alan Divall, then 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.

Mr Graham questioned what Mr Divall meant by 'affordable'. In response, Mr Divall explained that the applicant had met the requirement set by the Council to provide a mix of tenure. Mr Postan enquired as to the applicant's intentions for high quality. Mr Divall explained the Applicant had followed the design guide and that the proposals were similar to developments already undertaken by the Applicant within the District.

The Development Manager then presented his report containing a recommendation of refusal and advised Members that a report would be presented to the Economic and Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the Affordable Housing Policy. He explained that the application had now been reduced to 13 units from 18, of which 50% would be affordable and that the site was undeveloped and highly visible. In outlining the recommended reasons for refusal, he explained that the viewpoints were visually sensitive and would urbanise an area of the AONB. The application could also be considered under paragraph 115 of the NPPF owing to the potential harm to the AONB and the listed villa. In addition the site sat below the usual minimum back-to-back distance of 21m.

Mr Bishop commended the Officer on the quality of the report and felt that it clearly showed the considerable impacts of development on the site. He explained that whilst there was a need for further affordable housing in the village the application benefits did not outweigh the potential harm to the AONB. Mr Bishop drew attention to the 152 letters of objection received and proposed the recommendation of refusal, which was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer.

Mr Beaney queried how 50% of the proposed development could be affordable housing, given that the total number of units proposed was 13, i.e. an odd number. The Development Manager advised that, because of the odd number, six units would be affordable, and there would be a financial contribution in lieu of the remaining half.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the proposal and commented that the application did not, in his view, fulfil the qualities of good design.

Refused.

p22 18/00967/FUL

34 Grove Road, Bladon

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mr Martyn Ward then addressed the Sub-Committee in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr King then addressed the Sub-Committee, in objection to the application and on behalf of Bladon Parish Council. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer proposed that a Site Visit be undertaken, in order to ensure that the Sub-Committee could properly assess the impact of the

proposal in light of the representations made and comments received, including in relation to the levels on the site. This was seconded by Dr Poskitt.

Deferred to enable a Site Visit to be undertaken.

p32 18/01055/FUL

New Chalford Farm, London Road, Chipping Norton

As noted above, this application had been withdrawn prior to the meeting.

p41 18/0134/HHD

The Old Police House, Witney Road, Long Hanborough

The Principal Officer introduced the application.

Mr Lugg addressed the meeting as the Applicant. Mr Lugg explained that he had lived at the site since August 2011 and prior to permission being granted to build 169 houses to the eastern boundary of the Farm. Mr Lugg explained the application related to a modification to increase the eaves height and to install two small glazed windows, replacing the existing glazed dormer windows. He explained the nearest dwelling was around 10 metres from the site and that the site plan showed a dense tree line, which in addition to the application would provide a greater level of screening. In conclusion, Mr Lugg explained that the developer of the adjacent properties had objected to the application because, in his view, the developer did not wish the ability to sell the newly-constructed homes to be prejudiced.

The Planning Officer then presented her report and explained the reasons for the Officer recommendation of refusal. She explained that the proposals would result in the east elevation being significantly increased; the two first-floor windows would give the perception of over-looking and the development was unduly dominating and contrary to a number of policies.

Ms Davies indicated that she did not support the Officer recommendation of refusal and explained that the Site Visit had highlighted that the window panes had previously been approved and the footprint of the modification would be the same. She also considered that the Inspector's reasons for refusal from 2017 were not relevant and stated that Plot 1 was overlooked by eight windows from three adjacent properties. She then proposed permission, and this was seconded by Mr Saul.

Mr Cooper expressed that the Site Visit had been very useful in examining the application and that consequently, he supported the Officer recommendation of refusal.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer conversely explained that he could see no demonstrable harm from the application and expressed support for the application. Mr Bishop also supported the application and explained that he was sympathetic to the circumstances of the Applicant, who was in close proximity to a recently-approved large development to the eastern side of the application site, and added that as the application was an extension, it would not lead to future development on the site.

Mr Saul, in seconding the proposal, explained that the decision could not solely be made on design grounds and highlighted that the distances between properties were considered by him to be adequate.

Permitted.

Contrary to the Officer recommendation, taking into account the points referenced above, and to be subject to conditions deemed appropriate by the Development Manager, following consultation with the Chairman of the meeting.

NOTE: The following conditions were subsequently approved by the Development Manager;

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.

2. That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

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

3. The development shall be constructed with the materials specified in the application.

REASON: To ensure that the development is in keeping with the locality and for the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional windows/roof lights shall be constructed in the East elevation(s) of the building.

REASON: To safeguard privacy in the adjacent property.

20. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The report giving details of applications determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing under delegated powers together with appeal decisions was received and noted.

21. LAND EAST OF WORTON ROAD, MIDDLE BARTON (APPLICATION REFERENCE 18/00398/FUL)

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, which referred to the merits of undertaking a formal site visit prior to the likely consideration of the above application at its meeting on Monday 3 September 2018.

Dr Poskitt referred to the site visit at Bladon which had been agreed earlier in the meeting, and asked whether the Sub-Committee could take the opportunity also to visit the site of a separate proposal in Bladon. The Development Manager undertook to consider this in the light of the current situation in relation to the site.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That a site visit be undertaken on the site on land east of Worton Road, Middle Barton at 9:30 am on Thursday 30 August 2018; and
- (b) That the Development Manager be authorised also to convene a visit to the site at Bladon on that or a later date, if considered appropriate.

Note:

It was subsequently ascertained that there was no current application on the site referred to by Dr Poskitt, and accordingly concluded that a site visit was not appropriate at this time. However, the Development Manager will keep the request in mind should a planning application be lodged.

22. DISCHARGE OF LEGAL AGREEMENT - THE GABLES, CHADLINGTON

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, which requested approval for the discharge of the terms of an extent Section 52 (now 106) Agreement relating to the above land.

The Development Manager explained that the Council was faced with no alternative as the agreement dated back to the 1980s and no longer served a useful planning purpose.

RESOLVED: That the discharge of the section 52 agreement be approved as recommended.

The meeting closed at 3:25 pm.

CHAIRMAN