

Friday, 30 July 2021

Tel: 01993 861522

e-mail - democratic.services@westoxon.gov.uk

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

You are summoned to an exceptional meeting of the Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee will be held in the Council Chamber, Woodgreen, Witney on **Monday, 9 August 2021 at 11.00 am.**



Giles Hughes
Chief Executive

To: Members of the Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

Councillors: Councillor Jeff Haine (Chairman), Councillor Julian Cooper (Vice-Chair), Councillor Andrew Beaney, Councillor Nathalie Chapple, Councillor Merylyn Davies, Councillor Ted Fenton, Councillor David Jackson, Councillor Alex Postan, Councillor Geoff Saul, Councillor Dean Temple and Councillor Alex Wilson

Recording of Proceedings – The law allows the public proceedings of Council, Cabinet, and Committee Meetings to be recorded, which includes filming as well as audio-recording. Photography is also permitted. By participating in this meeting, you are consenting to be filmed.

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record any part of the proceedings please let the Committee Administrator know prior to the start of the meeting.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
To receive any declarations from Members of the Committee on any items to be considered at the meeting.
3. **Applications for Development (Pages 3 - 14)**
Purpose:

Following site visit to consider applications for development

21/00985/FUL
21/00986/LBC
The Old Bank 16 Market Place

Recommendation:

That the applications be determined in accordance with the recommendations of the Business Manager – Development Management.

(END)

Application Number	21/00985/FUL
Site Address	The Old Bank 16 Market Place Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 5NA
Date	27th July 2021
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Defer
Parish	Chipping Norton Parish Council
Grid Reference	431304 E 227125 N
Committee Date	26th July 2021

Application Details:

Change of use of former bank to provide a new community hub incorporating a community hall, meeting rooms, lettable office space and administrative offices. Demolition of existing rear extensions and provision of replacement extensions.

Applicant Details:

The Branch Trust
16 Market Place
Chipping Norton
Oxon
OX7 5NA

I CONSULTATIONS

Parish Council

No objection

OCC Highways

Oxfordshire County Council, as the Local Highways Authority, hereby notify the District Planning Authority that they do not object to the granting of planning permission, subject to the following condition
- Prior to the commencement of any work proposed the submission and approval of a Construction Traffic Management Plan

WODC Env Health - Uplands

ERS Pollution Consultation

I have No Objection in principle to this application.

I've looked at above application in relation to air quality. Although I have no objection in principle to the proposed development, the Council has a statutory duty to improve air quality especially in those areas where it exceeds the national quality objective.

An AQMA is the embodiment of the type of area that LAs are duty-bound to address. It would not be appropriate for a local authority to ignore potential worsening of air quality within an AQMA. The proposed development would make the premises a destination for various community and leisure purposes however I cannot see any documentation that has assessed traffic generation implications or assessed the potential effect on the AQMA.

I must therefore ask for this information to be provided to assist me in

deciding the implications for the AQMA. proposed development is located within the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

I have looked at the application in relation to contaminated land and potential risk to human health. I note that the site is in an area where buildings require full radon protection.

ERS Env. Consultation Sites

Mr ERS Pollution Consultation I've looked at this application in relation to air quality, as the proposed development is located within the Chipping Norton Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

Although I have no objection in principle to the proposed development, the Council has a statutory duty to improve air quality especially in those areas where it exceeds the national quality objective. An AQMA is the embodiment of the type of area that LAs are duty-bound to address. It would not be appropriate for a local authority to ignore potential worsening of air quality within an AQMA.

The proposed development would make the premises a destination for various community and leisure purposes however I cannot see any documentation that has assessed traffic generation implications or assessed the potential effect on the AQMA.

I must therefore ask for this information to be provided to assist me in deciding the implications for the AQMA. I would of course be happy to discuss the matter with the developer or agent to progress this. Please would you pass my comments to the developer for consideration.

David Rudland
Air Quality Officer
West Oxfordshire District Council

WODC Drainage Engineers

No response received to date.

OCC Archaeological Services

No response received to date.

Newt Officer

No response received to date.

Biodiversity Officer

No response received to date.

WODC Planning Policy Manager

No response received to date.

WODC Business Development

I fully support the principle of a community hub in the town centre. Town centres are changing both because of the impact of online shopping and also because of new habits formed during the COVID pandemic. It is important that we do what we can to retain vitality in Chipping Norton and any use such as this proposed which will draw people into the town centre should be encouraged.

I am pleased that the proposal includes some flexible work space but the applicants do need to be confident that the environment they are creating is conducive to work. I THINK the plans show natural light round the sides of the basement area but that is important to consider. Also, the structure of the office ceiling / floor of the community space above needs to be such that any activities in the community hall such as dance classes can take place without disturbing those working below. If not, the workspace may be difficult to let.

WODC Building Control
Manager

No response received to date.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

NB A number of respondents sent in planning objections to the LBC reference and so they have all been reported under this application reference

2.1 36 representations in support of the proposals have been received. The main points raised may be briefly summarised as follows:

Looking beyond the obvious community benefits of the intended use, I am satisfied that the scheme has been informed by a thorough analysis of the historic building and is now truly 'conservation-led', and that the alterations and additions to the Grade II* listed building will both preserve the historic fabric of significance and complement the retained structure with new work of appropriately high quality

I am particularly pleased to see the retention, repair and (in the case of the rear wing) display of the 18th-century roof structures, and the replacement of unworthy, utilitarian rear extensions with well-designed modern additions that will make a lasting, positive contribution both to the listed building and to the character of the conservation area.

Would enable one of the most prominent and architecturally more important buildings in the town centre to be repaired and refurbished to a high standard, providing both an immensely valuable community asset and ensuring its long-term viability and conservation

This building will enable access for all to much needed services in the community, and at a time when we are continuing to experience significant cutbacks in public services, whilst trying to navigate the impact of Covid, it is wonderful to see a project like this take root in Chipping Norton. It is particularly pleasing to see a heritage building in the centre of the town being made accessible for the whole community to use, enjoy and benefit from.

The new community hub would support the work that the school do with children and families. A hub in the centre of town provides a known and trusted location for our most vulnerable members of the community to access.

The central location of the building in town allows access to those that don't have transport.

There are endless possibilities for this hub in a CENTRAL location to be a real presence for good, an obvious place where help can be accessed for a variety of needs. The location of the Church and Parish Rooms cannot provide this.

It will provide a centre for support of all ages from the pre-schoolers to the elderly, whilst offering opportunity of space for any young entrepreneurs. Chipping Norton needs to see regeneration of our Town Centre and this application fulfils this need, whilst serving the whole town.

Helps to breathe a bit more life into an area that has lost some of its services as the banks have closed, without losing the heritage, indeed preserving it, for future generations by keeping the integrity of the frontal facade in place.

Work to the rear garden and back of building will enable safe meeting in outside / well ventilated which we now know is going to be important for years to come, for well being and C19 secure reasons.

2.2 2 Letters of objection have been received making the following points:

I have severe reservations over the demolition of the building in question.

If the plans are to demolish the entire building this looks like it will actually destroy part of our living accommodation. As part of the wall is our living room.

I have been contacted by several parties asking to gain access to my property to have a surveyor look into the supposed levels between the 2 adjoining properties. Why would this be needed if they wasn't concerns on there behalf of damage that may be caused with this development?

I will add that this is causing myslef at the age of 85 and my wife of 77 great stress.

The Proposed Ground Floor Plan and the Proposed North & South Elevation show the room that was the manager's office of the old bank being reduced in size by about a third, to create a new flat external roof area.

The Proposed Roof Plan suggests a parapet wall surrounding the west and south edges of this flat roof, creating a balcony. This balcony would be sited directly above our garden, meaning anyone on it could lean on the parapet wall and look straight down into what is now a totally private area of our garden, restricting our ability to use the garden. This would be a significant loss of privacy.

I ask that consent for this feature be refused, because we feel it is almost inevitable it would become, at some point, a social and smoking area. This would cause a noise and smoke nuisance, which would have negative impact both our use of the garden, and the use of the rooms at the rear of the house

2.3 One letter of comment has been received raising the following points:

Comment: I. General

We support the proposed use of the building for office, religious, social and community use, subject to the caveats below.

We welcome the proposed design having no north or south facing windows overlooking the gardens of 15 and 17 Market Place or The Traphouse, 29 New Street. We support the raising of a part of the garden wall along the Number 15/16 garden boundary.

2. Impact on adjoining buildings

Market Place is an 18c and 19c terrace of mutually supporting buildings, some of which are listed. When New Street was widened in the 1960s, demolition was intended up to but not including the Unicorn public house which was next to Number 15. In fact, the Unicorn became too unstable and had to be demolished. Wooden buttresses then held up the south side of Number 15 for many years before the supermarket was built. In 1997 as new owners of Number 15 we were advised that the structure of Number 15 was unsafe, as the front of building had moved so far forward as to compromise the support to the main structural beams supporting the floors and roof. Permission was sought and granted for the insertion of four tie bars to stop further movement and the building's structure was secured along that axis. Number 15's structure of oak beams, random rubble walls and no foundations make confident assessment of the effect of disturbance to neighbouring buildings impossible. We suggest permissions are constrained to ensure that no changes are made to the loadings and stresses on the party wall between Number 15 and 16, at any level, and that insurances must be put in place to cover the risks.

3. Demolition of listed building

The completed Application Form (Section 6 - Demolition of Listed Building) asks: "Does the proposal include the partial or total demolition of a listed building?" to which applicant has answered no. This is

inconsistent with the plans which show the demolition of a rear extension which is within the curtilage of the Listing Building and thus itself listed. (See "Listed Buildings and Curtilage" - Historic England Advice Note 10.)

4. Materials

The current building features an ashlar façade with a mix of Cotswold stone and Victorian brick to the rear; with roofs in slate, Stonesfield and clay tiles. The proposed use of clay tiles on new roofs is not out of keeping with current roof materials but is out of keeping as proposed for external walls

5. Garden Party wall with No. 15 Market Place

The party garden wall between Nos. 16 and 15 had become dangerous and the previous owners of the site (Natwest bank) had it taken down about 10 years ago and some two thirds of it rebuilt. The remaining third had footings dug but the wall was not built as there were ongoing discussions at the time about the possibility of the owners of Number 15 buying the far end of the Number 16's garden. These discussions ended when Natwest decided to sell the site as whole. The current owners acquired the site in the knowledge that they had an obligation to rebuild this missing part of the wall. Given the amount of site traffic and disruption to Number 15 and the Traphouse at 29

New Street during building works there would be a serious loss of control and security were works to be started before this section of wall was re-instated. We ask that rebuilding this wall before site works start be made a condition of approval.

6. Scale

The principal demolition and new build elements of the application replace an already somewhat site-overburdening Victorian extension with a larger extension which is approximately twice the footprint area (using dimensions taken from plans). Its reach down the garden would represent a loss of light and amenity to the two neighbouring properties, particularly number 17 Market Place to the North. Number 15 is entirely residential and perhaps the only remaining single family residence in the Town Centre. Number 17 is principally residential. In the interest of maintaining diversity of use in the Town Centre, residential amenity should be protected. Given that the building already provides over 700 M2 of space it is surprising that the needs cannot be accommodated within that, without the substantial reworking of the site proposed. Applicant should be asked to justify this need convincingly.

7. Hours of opening

The completed Application Form (Section 22 - Hours of opening) state the topic to be irrelevant whereas in fact the proposed use includes activities in evenings and at weekends. Prior use as a bank had hours limited to weekday office hours. Nuisance to neighbours would therefore increase.

8. Parking and traffic

There is no current nor proposed parking for users, and the site is double-yellow lined and adjacent to a parking-restricted turning area. The owners of Number 16 are already using the building for community purposes and traffic has already become problematic e.g. by hindering access for nearby retail outlets, pavement parking, and blocking the turning bay (a particular difficulty for large lorries).

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

The application seeks planning permission for the refurbishment of the existing buildings and to find them a new viable use. The building has been used for a number of different purposes during its history but was most recently used as a bank (having been so used since the 1950s). The proposed new use is described as a community hub as so would be sui generis, but will encompass a number of different functions serving the community. The building will be used by a number of different groups and for a number of different functions - many of which are currently not provided for within Chipping Norton. The groups using the spaces will include a variety of community outreach programmes assisting all parts of the community and their particular needs. The Branch Trust is a registered Charity with set up with an intent to "reach the most vulnerable in the community journeying with them to unlock their potential partnering with Statutory & voluntary sector to provide the most coherent and effective

service"to provide relief and assistance to those in need by reason of their youth, age, illhealth or disability, social or economic circumstances, unemployment, bereavement or breakdown in relationships; to develop the capacity and skills of those who are socially and economically disadvantaged in Chipping Norton and the surrounding area in such a way that they are better able to identify and help meet their needs and to participate more fully in society; to provide facilities in the interests of social welfare for individuals in Chipping Norton and the surrounding area who have need of such facilities by reason of their youth, age infirmity or disability, financial hardship or social circumstances with the object of improving their conditions of life; to promote social inclusion by preventing people from becoming socially excluded, relieving the needs of those who are socially excluded and assisting them to integrate into society, and for the purpose of this clause "socially excluded" means being excluded from society, or part of society, as a result of one or more of the following factors: unemployment; financial hardship; youth or old age; ill health; substance abuse or dependency including alcohol and drugs; poor educational or skills attainment; relationship and family breakdown; poor housing (that is housing that does not meet basic habitable standards; crime (either as a victim of crime or as an offender rehabilitating into society);

As will be quite apparent from the above description of The Branch Trust, the space they provide will be required to facilitate many different activities and allow them to partner with many different organisations to meet the needs of their users. These include many providers, for instance they are in discussions with the Citizens Advice Bureau to extend their service and have a presence in the Town, to reintroduce Mind (their previous service in Chipping Norton closed 8 years ago and the nearest is Witney) and provide various youth services currently only available in Banbury. The proposal therefore includes a variety of meeting spaces to service those users, from one-on-one meeting rooms for private discussions up to the main community hall space that will provide the community kitchen space to teach life skills as well as provide an accessible space to seat up to 60 people. There are staff offices on the upper floors for the running of The Branch and the lower ground floor includes lettable office space which could provide both co-working space or other offices on a longer term basis to local people - but importantly will also provide an income to assist in the viable future of the facility. Turning to the physical changes, the building was the subject of extensive internal refurbishment during the 1980s and as a result the significance of much of the building's interior is limited. In order to ensure appropriate accessibility the floor levels are proposed to be rationalised and made consistent through the various ranges.

At the heart of the proposal is the need to provide a new community hall with capacity to seat 60 people or accommodate 12 workstations for the community kitchen. This layout has been carefully designed to ensure it will provide sufficient space for all these users and still provide safe circulation space. The ability to ensure rooms are sufficiently well proportioned has become very apparent over the past 12 months with the introduction of social distancing. There are no suitable spaces within the building to accommodate this space and so the other major element of the proposals seek consent to demolish (except for the northern wall) a red brick 19th C rear extension and replace it with a new extension to provide the hall space. That extension is slightly wider and longer compared to the current building. A smaller 20th Century rear extension is also proposed to be replaced with a new extension of a similar scale.

The site is a designated Heritage Asset. At present it does not have a use and Government advice is clear that in order to sustain its significance for the enjoyment of future generations, it must be put to a viable use consistent with its conservation. It recognises the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring. There is enormous public benefit to securing the application building and putting it to a viable new use. These proposals offer just such an opportunity and as such clearly outweigh any perceived harm to significance as a result of facilitating the new use. The submitted documents consider the possibility of retaining the 19th Century rear extension to result in a scheme that causes less harm, however it is clear that in order to provide a community hall (the essential central element of the scheme) the existing space is too small and does not have the capacity to accommodate all proposed use of the space (in particular the need to seat 60 people) and alternatives to alter the existing structure in order to provide such space would result in a building that extended over 7 metres further west, with the associated impact on neighbours rear amenity space - whilst the associated internal space would be narrow and much compromised making it much less capable of serving the many uses it is required for. This questions the viability of the use overall.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

TC1 Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan
TC4 Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan
TC6 Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan
BD1 Historic built environment
BD2 Conservation Area
OS2NEW Locating development in the right places
OS4NEW High quality design
E5NEW Local services and community facilities
E6NEW Town centres
T3NEW Public transport, walking and cycling
EH8 Environmental protection
EH9 Historic environment
EH10 Conservation Areas
EH11 Listed Buildings
CN2 Chipping Norton sub-area Strategy

The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Background Information

5.1 This application and the parallel application for Listed Building Consent seek to undertake some demolition and alteration of this listed former bank building to enable its re-use as a community hub incorporating a variety of mixed use spaces such as community hall, community kitchen, office space, meeting rooms, recording studio etc. The building is prominently sited in the centre of town within the conservation area and secondary shopping frontage but is adjoined on either side and to the rear by residential properties. No car parking is proposed and a tree that is sited in the rear garden area is to be felled to make way for the enlarged rear extension comprising the community hall.

5.2 Members will recall that the application was deferred at the last meeting to enable the comments of Historic England to be received and for Members to undertake a site visit before determining the application. This report is based upon the report presented to the last meeting but where it has been updated an Update heading is used to indicate the most recent information. Taking into account planning policy, other material considerations and the representations of interested parties your officers are of the opinion that the key considerations of the application are:

Principle

5.3 The site lies within the secondary shopping frontages where the policies of both the local plan and the neighbourhood plan seek to retain town centre compatible uses. Cessation of use as a bank is thus to be regretted but this has already occurred and as such the building is currently contributing little to the economic diversity and viability of the town centre. The proposed use as a community facility located in one of the most sustainable central locations within the town is supported by policy and the flow of visitors to the site would drive economic benefits to nearby business uses thereby helping to safeguard their continued survival and prosperity. Your officers assessment, now supported by the consultation response of the Economic Development Officer, is that the reuse is likely to have a positive economic and social impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre and as such that the principle of development is considered acceptable, even though it would cement the loss of the traditional town centre use of the bank.

Siting, Design and Form and Impact on Heritage Assets

5.4 The building has been much amended in the past to facilitate its use as a bank including provision of strong rooms, new staircase, removal of many internal fittings etc. This application seeks further remodelling involving some demolition and levelling of floors but also the revealing of features that had been obscured as part of earlier works. As this is a grade 2* listed building the advice of Historic England is required but has not at the point of agenda preparation been received. There is also a proposed demolition of an existing part natural and part artificial stone rear wing and its replacement in red brick where it would be better if the stone elements could be retained.

UPDATE

Members will recall that during the course of the last meeting an e-mail that had been sent to Officers but not received before their attendance at the meeting . This advises that "Historic England are broadly supportive of the proposals for development at The Branch Centre in Chipping Norton. We have worked closely with the architects through a detailed pre-application process. The architects have responded to comments at meetings and the resulting scheme is, as we saw at pre-app, well designed to take advantage of those areas of the listed building with either little or no significance, and then carefully remodel those areas where substantial change has previously taken place. We are content with the overall massing, form and shape of the rear extension, and furthermore the proposals materials to be used would be complimentary and would not harm the significance of the listed building. We consider that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. We have no objections to raise." These comments have been passed to the Conservation Officer for assessment but on the face of it there would appear to be no undue concerns regarding the impact on the building per se.

5.5 An update regarding the impacts of the siting design and form of the proposals on the historic character and integrity of the structure will be provided when the Conservation Officer comments have been received. This is likely to include the need for a condition to retain the stone walled extension and not replace it with red brick if a point is reached where a positive recommendation can be made

Highways

5.6 It will be noted that Highways have raised no objections to the scheme subject to a CTMP. Given the central location, difficulty of parking and access to the site this seems an eminently necessary requirement to minimise disruption during building works. Your officers are similarly satisfied that when assessing the historic use as a bank (with both staff and visitors using the building) against the proposed use (where as a result of the nature of the new uses it is likely that car modes of transport would be less than the former use) that car parking demand will not be worsened. The highways position is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenities

5.7 This is a key issue and one where Officers are conflicted as to the correct recommendation. At present there is a substantial two storey rear block that it is proposed to demolish and replace with a longer and wider structure. This runs along the shared boundary with the residential property to the North and as such the additional massing has the potential to be particularly unneighbourly as it will mean an even greater extent of the main private amenity space serving that property is subject to overbearing and overshadowing impacts. To set against this is the fact that the location where the extension is proposed is currently occupied by a large tree which would need to be felled. However this tree is widely visible in the Conservation Area (eg across the Sainsbury's car park) and as such would have an impact on the Conservation Area. Were the building to be a conventional domestic extension it would be recommended for refusal. However it is not a conventional domestic extension. It will help to create a facility with substantial community benefits and as such there is an argument that the needs of (and benefits to) the many could be seen as outweighing the harm to the one? Officers have explored whether the hall could be redesigned so as to lessen the impacts on that neighbour but the applicants are concerned that this would reduce its capacity and value.

5.8 With regards to the neighbour to the south the structure will come closer to the boundary and a side facing window will be re opened. As set out in their representations a first floor balcony area could be created and additionally the increased use of the garden would bring with it additional disturbance over and above the use it currently enjoys. It is however considered that with careful conditions regarding obscure glazing, not using the balcony area to sit out, how and when the garden can be used etc that it would be possible to ameliorate these issues to some degree.

UPDATE

5.9 In that the proposals were not in a position to be determined as a result of the lack of responses from the heritage consultees and with site visits now being more possible under Covid regulations, because the position is so finely balanced Members agreed that it would be useful for them to visit the site to assess whether the harms are so great to the neighbour that even with the extent of community

benefit a refusal is justified or whether amendments should be sought to try to reduce the harms or whether it is acceptable as tabled. In order to aid that assessment the following facts may be relevant:

Usually a two storey extension along a shared boundary is limited to an 8 foot (2.4m) overlap before the harms arising are considered to justify refusal. The current extension overlaps by 9m and so is already well in excess of that distance. The proposed extension would be 14m long at two storey level with a further 5 m of single storey extension/screen wall beyond that. 4m is usually considered the maximum length of single storey overlap before harms arise and so even that element in itself is longer than usually considered acceptable. The impacts are compounded as the fall of the land increases the relative height the further away from the building.

Questions that may be relevant in deciding whether to accept the scheme as now tabled are:

Is the harm already so bad that it cannot be made worse?

Is it appropriate to blight even more of the garden when it is already compromised/harmed?

Does the loss of impact from the tree balance the additional massing of the new extension?

Is the looser/natural/skeletal form of the tree in winter less harmful than that of a permanent built structure especially when the sun is lower in the sky?

Is the loss of the tree acceptable in and of itself given its contribution to the Conservation Area?

If the side wall of the extension where it is longer than the existing extension were set away from the boundary or the roofline set down would that help to reduce impact?

Would it help if the materials were changed to lessen the impact?

Could the internal storage space be re configured to enable the width to be reduced?

Does the benefit arising from the use mean that the harms to the neighbouring property should be accepted even though they are harmful and worse than would usually be accepted?

If the community use ceases or in future is changed to an alternate commercial use, the harms would persist without the compensatory benefit so does this alter the weight that should be given to it?

Having further considered matters following the debate at the last meeting Officers have concluded that it is in the interests of all parties that clear advice is given in order to ensure that the debate has some structure (even if it is merely so that members can disagree with the position taken) . The on balance assessment is that the degree of harm as things stand is too great but that the scheme could be reconfigured with relatively small impacts on the applicants but significant neighbour benefits to seek to ensure that the acknowledged community benefits are not at the expense of neighbour amenity. This would involve a small reconfiguration of the internal space, setting the extended part off the boundary and lowering the ridge line at this point accompanied by a change in materials to break up the mass. If members agree and the applicants are accepting of this general approach a condition could be imposed to that effect in order to ensure that the application was not delayed further. A verbal update as regards this aspect will be given at the meeting.

Other matters

5.10 Members will note that concerns have been raised regarding Radon. These can be addressed by an informative and Building Regulations. Similarly whilst the site lies in the AQMA it is not considered that the extent of use will worsen the position as regards pollution from motor vehicles as many of the clientelle will not be car owners.

Conclusion

5.11 There is no doubt that this use will offer many social and other advantages to the town and it has garnered substantial support. The building is a particularly important heritage asset graded 2* but subject to the final responses from consultees regarding the remodelling and refurbishment it would appear that these can be undertaken without harms arising to the value of the building. Members will as a result of the site visit have had the opportunity to assess the increase in the size of the rear hall, the loss of the tree and the impacts upon neighbours and so be in a position to decide whether whether the benefits outweigh the adverse neighbour impacts or alternatively whether the principle is fine but non the less the scheme should be modified to seek to reduce them to a more acceptable level.

Please see also parallel Listed Building Consent 21/00986/LBC

COMMITTEE REPORT

Application Number	21/00986/LBC
Site Address	The Old Bank 16 Market Place Chipping Norton Oxfordshire OX7 5NA
Date	27th July 2021
Officer	Phil Shaw
Officer Recommendations	Defer
Parish	Chipping Norton Parish Council
Grid Reference	431304 E 227125 N
Committee Date	26th July 2021

Application Details:

Internal and external alterations to convert former bank to provide a new community hub incorporating a community hall, meeting rooms, lettable office space and administrative offices. Demolition of existing rear extensions and provision of replacement extensions.

Applicant Details:

The Branch Trust
16 Market Place
Chipping Norton
Oxon
OX7 5NA

1 CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer No response at time of agenda preparation

Parish Council No response received to date.

Historic England Interim e-mail advising of putative no objections with formal response to follow

2 REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 None received in respect of LBC although as advised in respect of 21/00985/FUL some planning comments were received.

3 APPLICANT'S CASE

Please see report in respect of application 21/00985/FUL.

4 PLANNING POLICIES

EH9 Historic environment
The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) is also a material planning consideration.

5 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

5.1 Please see report in respect of application 21/00985/FUL.

