

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Record of Decisions of the meeting of the
Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee
Held Virtual meeting at 2.00 pm on **Monday, 15 March 2021**

PRESENT

Councillors: Councillor Ted Fenton (Chairman), Councillor Carl Rylett (Vice-Chair), Councillor Owen Collins, Councillor Maxine Crossland, Councillor Harry Eaglestone, Councillor Duncan Enright, Councillor Steve Good, Councillor Jeff Haine, Councillor Nick Leverton, Councillor Kieran Mullins, Councillor Alex Postan and Councillor Harry St John
Officers: Abby Fettes (Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management), Miranda Clark, (Senior Planner Development Management), Esther Hill (Planner); Chloe Jacobs (Career Grade Planner); James Nelson (Trainee Planner); Kim Smith (Principal Planner – Enforcement); Adrienne Frazer and Ben Amor (Strategic Support Officers).

1 Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED: That, subject to an amendment to the deletion of the words ‘existing listed building had been neglected over time and’ on page 4 in respect of minute (ii), the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 8 February 2021, copies of which had been circulated, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2 Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hilary Fenton.

Councillor Postan substituted for Councillor Fenton.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillor St John disclosed that he had previously acted for the applicants in respect of application 20/03306/FUL, but as this had been over 20 years previously, did not consider he had an interest to declare.

Councillor Leverton reported that in relation to application 20/03242/FUL, he had attended the meeting of Filkins Parish Council but had not commented on the application at that meeting.

4 Applications for Development

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, giving details of an application for development, copies of which had been circulated.

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 Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

(i) 20/02422/FUL – Land East of Swinbrook Road

The Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management introduced the application and advised of additional representations received since publication of the report.

The Agent Mr. Paul Slater was then invited to address the Committee. He advised that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for around 70 dwellings and that the design of the proposed development responded to the requirements of the Local Plan allocation and site constraints, integrated with adjoining developments while delivering rural and green edges to the north and Swinbrook Road and included attractive streets and vistas within the site.

Mr. Slater thanked Officers for their assistance with the application and added that concerns from the Town Council and local residents regarding access and drainage and the roads and service infrastructure connecting to the site had been implemented by David Wilson Homes to enable the development to proceed as envisaged in the Local Plan. Mr. Slater highlighted that there were now also no objections from the highway and drainage consultees subject to conditions. He continued that a comprehensive package of contributions would be made available following approval of the application and concluded that the proposal accorded with the Local Plan requirements and would create a sustainable and attractive new development, which integrated with its surroundings, boosted housing supply and addressed associated infrastructure needs.

Officers then highlighted to the Committee that the now amended plans confirmed 72 dwellings would be proposed for the site and that Officers were satisfied that the proposals would meet the required needs for the site and that there had been no technical objection from Oxfordshire County Council. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to additional conditions and S106 recommendations.

In response to various questions from Members, Officers reported that there was one connection to the main sewerage and another for surface water drainage, details of which had been included in a condition and the County Council had commented on the proposed surface water drainage. Officers also responded to Councillor Crossland's concern that the site was beyond walking distance from the town centre by explaining that the County Council considered the number of parking spaces included at the site for residents and visitors was sufficient.

Councillor St John expressed concern that no play areas had been included within the proposals and that the construction management plan did not include access for construction through residential roads included within any conditions. In response, Officers advised that a play area was considered unnecessary owing to the site's proximity to the neighbouring country park. Officers also advised that the site would be constructed in accordance with the plan, which would include a construction route, and temporary gates

15/March2021

would be used at the site to ensure vehicles would not cause blockage when accessing the site.

Councillor Leverton highlighted the objection that had been made by Thames Valley Police and the issue of possible water pressure problems and if this could be conditioned to ensure no negative impact on neighbouring sites. Officers responded that the issue of water pressure had been included within a condition and in informatives.

Councillor Haine commented upon the existing issue of complaints due to workers' cars being parked on residential streets and causing damage and questioned if it could be conditioned that workers' vehicles were parked on site and were required to wheel wash before leaving the site. Officers responded that this would be dealt with by information included with by construction management plan.

Councillor Haine then proposed that the application be approved.

The proposal was then seconded by Councillor Langridge who commented that the development would complement the area and that the proposition was on the understanding that various outstanding matters would be addressed by Officers in consultation with the applicants.

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

Approved, subject to additional conditions, in relation to drainage and the application being built in accordance with the applicant's construction traffic management plan, with access road cleaning to be carried out regardless of the time of year and the CTMP negotiations be completed.

Councillors St John and Postan did not support the proposition.

(ii) 20/02342/FUL – Lane End House, Cross Tree Lane

The Case Officer introduced the application and advised of a required amendment to Condition 6 of the application in that the landscape management plan be changed for a period of five to ten years to ensure that the landscape scheme was retained for a longer period.

Councillor Goode commented that he was against the application and that he supported the concerns of the parish council.

In response to a Members' question, the Case Officer advised that the plans had been amended numerous times and that following amended plans, Officers had sought to improve the biodiversity at the site, following the applicant levelling the site.

15/March2021

Councillor Haine expressed that he considered that officers had undertaken good progress in ensuring increased biodiversity at the site and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Langridge seconded the proposal.

In response to a concern from a Member regarding external lighting and potential light spill, Councillors Haine and Langridge proposed an amendment to the proposal, that external lighting be excluded from the property.

Councillor St John questioned if the Applicant could be conditioned to change the colour of the summerhouse and if it could be conditioned that the building be tied to the existing property as an ancillary building. The Chairman responded that the application needed to be considered on its merits as it was currently presented.

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

Approved, subject to the inclusion of additional conditions in relation to the landscape management plan being extended to a period of 10 years and an additional condition regarding external lighting at the site.

Councillor Langridge abstained from voting.

(iii) 20/03306/FUL – Church Farm, Church End

The Case Officer introduced the application and advised of additional representations received since publication of the report.

An objector, Mr. Dick Pears then addressed the Committee. He advised that he supported the Parish Council's view, which was in support of what the application was seeking to achieve in principle, but explained that the application needed to comply with planning requirements. Mr. Pears drew attention to the village's Neighborhood Plan referendum undertaken in 2018, which had resulted in a 92.4% vote supporting adoption of the Plan, and this he considered therefore gave the Council clear guidance on what village resident's views were for development in the village. He concluded by drawing attention to the Parish Council's comments which clearly indicated which way the Council should proceed with the application.

The Chair of the Parish Council, Nicky Brooks then addressed the Committee. She reported that the village's Neighbourhood Development Plan had given permission for the site so long as any development would not increase the traffic volumes on the neighbouring rural roads. She added that the issue of traffic was a huge unknown with the application and that

Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee

15/March2021

this had been the reason for the Parish Council recommending permission be granted for a temporary period of four years. She continued that before the current partnership, the site had been largely derelict and that the temporary permission sought would enable the application to recoup any costs and to allay residents' fears.

The Agent, Mr. Sam Eachus then addressed the Committee. He advised that in policy terms, the proposals were acceptable in principle and drew support from the NPPF, local planning policy and the Neighbourhood Plan, which specifically allowed for B8 storage use.

He advised that additional information was submitted to address resident's and the Parish Council's concerns and confirmed that the controls that were proposed could be put in place to limit negative impacts and that the main issues raised by local residents related to impact on highways, hours of use and lighting. He continued that the proposed access and turning area was small and would limit the type of vehicles that could access the site to a mid-sized van and that daily access was not expected to be required due to the storage use, to which highway officers had raised no concern. Mr. Eachus confirmed that the proposed hours of use had been revised since the original submission and that the site would be open to the public from 8am to 6pm during the week, 10am to 4pm on Saturdays and 12 noon to 4pm on Sundays. The site would also be closed on major public holidays

such as Christmas and Easter. Mr. Eachus concluded that the Applicants had actively responded to local concerns where possible and were confident that the scheme, as proposed, would result in little harm to the residents of Church End.

Councillor Rylett commented that the area surrounding the application was sensitive and that whilst the opening hours proposed by the applicant lined-up with the Parish Council's wishes, he considered further clarification was required in relation to lighting and vegetation. He commented that he also considered a site visit should be undertaken to consider the impact of potential traffic issues.

Councillor St John commented that once the units were in use, visits would not be daily occurrences. He questioned the fact that B8 use also permitted distribution in addition to storage and if this could raise possible issues. In response, the Case Officer confirmed that Condition 4 restricted the use to B8 storage use only.

Councillor Postan commented that the site clearly had a permitted use and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Haine requested that Condition 8 be amended to include internal lighting and that the hedgerow covering the site entrance was retained. On this basis, he then seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Members expressed support for the proposal and highlighted that given the amended

15/March2021

opening hours; external lighting would only be a small concern during winter hours in the afternoon. Members expressed support for the conditions to close on Boxing Day and Good Friday in addition to the other days already identified and to condition the preservation of the hedge line.

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

Approved, for a temporary period of four years, subject to an additional condition regarding external lighting at the site and the exiting hedgerow to the northern boundary of the site being retained.

(iv) 21/00092/HHD – Stone Cottage, East End

The Case Officer introduced the application and advised that the application was presented to the Committee owing to the applicant being employed by the Council.

In response to a question from Councillor Enright, the Case Officer confirmed the application would not have been referred to the Committee had the applicant not been a Council employee.

Councillor Enright proposed that the application be approved. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Langridge.

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

Approved.

(v) 21/00185/FUL – 79 Milestone Road, Carterton

The Senior Planner Development Management introduced the application and advised that the application had previously been presented to the Committee in December 2020 and was now being presented again following revised plans being submitted.

Councillor Leverton as the local Member then addressed the Committee. He explained that Milestone Road was a notable historic part of Carterton and that he considered the proposals would destroy the existing street scene. He added that he considered the application should be refused to enable Officers to seek a single or two semi-detached properties for the site and therefore concluded that he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Postan then proposed approval of the application.

Councillor Crossland commented that she agreed with Councillor Leverton's view and that two semi-detached properties would be more appropriate than the current proposals.

15/March2021

Councillor Haine highlighted that the approval of the application would result in the demolition of the existing nursing home, which was currently derelict. He then seconded the proposal made by Councillor Postan to approve the application.

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

Approved, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition that the side windows be obscured glaze.

Councillors Crossland and Leverton did not support the proposition.

5 Progress on Enforcement Cases

The report giving details of current situation and progress in respect of enforcement investigations, was received and noted.

6 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers, or withdrawn, was received and noted.

The Meeting closed at 4.38 pm

CHAIRMAN