

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the
Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee
Held in the Council Chamber at 2.00 pm on **Monday, 20 September 2021**

PRESENT

Councillors: Councillor Jeff Haine (Chairman), Councillor Julian Cooper (Vice-Chair), Councillor Andrew Beaney, Councillor Merylyn Davies, Councillor David Jackson, Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt, Councillor Alex Postan, Councillor Geoff Saul and Councillor Alex Wilson

Officers: Abby Fettes (Interim Development Manager), Stuart McIver (Career Grade Planner) and Phil Shaw (Business Manager - Development Management)

25 Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 23 August 2021, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26 Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ted Fenton.

Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt substituted for Councillor Nathalie Chapple .

27 Declarations of Interest

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

28 Applications for Development

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

RESOLVED: That the decision on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal to be as recommended in the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

21/01126/HHD Lansdowne Cottage East End, Swerford, Chipping Norton

The Interim Development Manager, Abby Fettes introduced the part retrospective application for the erection of a rear conservatory and detached greenhouse.

The following people addressed the Committee:

A member of the public, Mr Wengraf, had been registered to speak however he confirmed that he was only observing and would not address the Committee.

Mrs Fettes continued with the presentation and outlined the reasons that officers felt the application was considered to be acceptable, along with the policies it complied with. She advised that the recommendation was one of approval, subject to the conditions outlined in the report

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

20/September2021

Councillor Beaney confirmed he had no issue with the conservatory, however, he raised a concern relating to light pollution within the greenhouse, at night, and therefore requested that permitted development rights be removed.

Councillor Haine asked the planning officer if this request would be in order and she confirmed this would be acceptable.

Councillor Wilson confirmed he was in the same mind set as Councillor Beaney.

Councillor Postan proposed that the Officers recommendation should be accepted with an additional condition removing permitted development rights.

Councillor Beaney seconded the proposal.

Councillor Jackson confirmed he was content with the oak framing and could not see an issue with the application.

The Officers' recommendation of approval, subject to an additional condition relating to the removal of permitted development rights, was put to the vote, and carried unanimously.

Approved

21/01189/FUL Old Rectory Cottage, Church Street, Kingham

The Planning Officer, Stuart McIver introduced the application for a change of use of land to increase the domestic curtilage; removal of garden structures and walls; erection of a pool house and gym, garden store, greenhouse, art studio and an outdoor pool along with associated landscaping.

The following people addressed the Committee:

Amy Powell, speaker on behalf of applicant.

Councillor Poskitt requested clarification of the landscaping regarding the obscurity of the swimming pool. Miss Powell confirmed the pool would be enclosed with two sets of Cotswolds stone walls, which were two metres high.

Mr McIver continued with the presentation and stated the archaeology report which is a prerequisite for the start of works if approved is still outstanding.

Councillor Beaney noted that condition seven in the report related to planting and future planting. He also asked for clarification as to whether the archaeological report needed to be a condition.

Mr McIver advised that the application would not be determined until the information regarding the archaeological scheme of investigation had been received and deemed acceptable by Oxfordshire County Council Archaeological Services.

Councillor Beaney therefore proposed approval as per Officers recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

Councillor Postan highlighted the importance of maintaining a 'soft edge' and queried if a request for tree planting may help with this. He also suggested the removal of permitted development rights. Mr McIver confirmed that this could be added. Councillor Postan agreed with Councillor Poskitt regarding additional light pollution from the swimming pool at night.

Councillor Haine noted that the wall was two metres high, so did not feel that additional planting was necessary.

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

20/September2021

The Chairman clarified that Councillors Beaney and Cooper were happy to add 'removal of Permitted Development' rights as a condition.

Councillor Poskitt reminded Members that nothing would happen until the archaeological report had been received and subject to no objection from Oxford County Council. The Chair agreed this was correct.

Councillor Beaney proposed the officer's recommendation as written, subject to the additional condition relating to the removal of permitted development rights. This was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

The proposal was then put to the vote, and was carried unanimously.

Approved

21/02022/FUL - Enstone Airline Hangars, Enstone Airfield North, Banbury Road, Enstone

The Business Manager, Mr Shaw introduced the part retrospective application for the provision of a car park to the North side of a maintenance hangar, accessed from 'Green Lane'. Mr Shaw advised that this application was part retrospective because the fence needed permission due to the public highway that it backed onto. In addition, the fence was to be reduced to one metre in height, with two panels to be removed. It was noted that landscaping could now also be established.

Councillor Beaney referred to paragraph 5.3 of the report, and suggested an additional condition to ensure that the area was always used as a car park.

Officers agreed that this was a reasonable request and could be added.

Councillor Beaney therefore proposed that the Officers recommendation be approved with the additional condition restricting future use of the space as a car park. This was seconded by Councillor Wilson.

The proposal was then put to the vote, and was carried, unanimously.

Approved

21/02110/FUL Car Park Guildenford

Interim Development Manager Abby Fettes introduced the application for the expansion of the Guildenford car park northwards, to accommodate approximately 150 vehicles, to include two new footbridges, one alongside the existing road bridge and the second into the churchyard across the millstream. The report highlighted that this site was located in Cotswolds Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a flood zone. The Interim Development Manager reminded Councillors that this proposal had come before members last year and was refused on technical grounds as it had been felt there were other sites in Burford that could be considered in more detail.

The following people addressed the Committee:

John White Burford Town Councillor – In support of the application

Councillor Derek Cotterill Ward Councillor In support of the application.

Councillor Beaney requested clarification because he noted that the Church were supportive of the planning request according to the Ward Councillor, however, Historic England had objected. Who has the rights Historical England or the Church? The Interim Development Manager clarified that Councillor Beaney was referring to ecclesiastical exemption and that

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee

20/September2021

this application falls outside of that as its not works to the church. Mrs Fettes concluded her presentation by elaborating on technical issues including the impact on the historical setting, flood risk and biodiversity.

Councillor Postan stated that Burford was a gateway to the Cotswolds, attracted many tourists and visitors and therefore felt that the car park was needed. He felt that the alternative to be looked at was too far away and narrow for some people to use effectively. He also felt that the area was currently classed as a recreational area, which he felt went against Council policy. In addition, he advised that flooding issues were usually resolved within 24 hours, but the river could do with silting regularly which would help. Councillor Poston therefore proposed that the planning request be accepted.

Councillor Haine asked Councillor Postan to reference a policy reason for the proposal, as it was against the officer's recommendation, and suggested that it could be beneficial for Councillors to consider a site visit.

The Chairman asked for a seconder for Councillor Postan's proposal, however, no seconder was forthcoming.

The Chairman then proposed that the proposal be deferred until after a site visit had occurred and other sites had been fully investigated. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

The proposal for a site visit was put to the vote and was carried.

Councillor Poskitt suggested that the Highways Department needed to comment on the current planning request.

Councillor Postan reminded members that the Planning Officer had given three reasons for refusal, and felt that only one of them would be dealt with by a site visit. Additionally, he felt the walking time and speed between car parks and the Church should be taken into account. The Chair noted the request.

Councillor Jackson suggested that during the site visit, Councillors could also look at alternative sites.

Councillor Haine advised that the site visit be set for 14 October at 09:30am.

Councillor Jackson apologised in advance as he was unable to attend.

Deferred for a site visit

21/02181/FUL Land South East Of North Fourshire Farm, London Road, Moreton In Marsh

The Business Manager, Phil Shaw introduced the application for a change of use of land, to be used as a residential caravan site for an extended gypsy family with a total of seven caravans, together with the laying of hardstanding, erection of five amenity buildings and construction of access. The report also asked members to consider if the site was sustainable.

The following people addressed the Committee:

Mr Peter Tufnell on behalf of the Kitebrook Action Group (KAG).

Mr Shaw continued his presentation, concluding that he understood the need for a settled base but not necessary this site. The site was away from existing settlements, with no footwall, cycle path or lighting along the roadside. The site also had very limited public transport and was in open countryside with no amenities. Mr Shaw concluded that the site as viewed from the roadside was an attractive area, however the plans did not take this into consideration when creating access.

20/September2021

Councillor Beaney proposed that the Officers recommendation be accepted.

Councillor Wilson queried the drainage and flooding of the road, Mr Shaw confirmed that the drainage engineer had not objected to the application.

Councillor Jackson noted the 'Forest replenishment clause' on page 66 of the report. And stated that although this was not a reason for rejection, it should be noted, because it affected the Enforcement Team. Mr Shaw agreed and confirmed that Planning officers could only deal with the regulations of planning control.

Councillor Postan felt that in order to preserve the applicant's way of life, better sites needed to be found.

Councillor Poskitt aired her concerns regarding the proximity of the site to the road and traffic, and did not feel that this site was suitable for small children. She also had concerns that this was a cramped site, with cars, animals and caravans. She reiterated that she did not feel the site was suitable for families, particularly with small children and was not sustainable.

Councillor Davies stated that she was deeply uncomfortable with regards to the Highways comments and felt they should be asked to help resolve the issues raised.

Mr Shaw reiterated that that if suitable sites were found, the planning team would support those applications. He reminded Members that West Oxfordshire already had eight sites which was well above the requirement and Members should be proud of this achievement.

Councillor Saul advised that he agreed with Mr Shaw because there was no path, it was unsafe, and therefore not compliant with policy H7. He did, however, have sympathy for the applicant in trying to find a home base.

Councillor Jackson seconded Councillor Beaney's original proposal to accept the recommendation of refusal.

This was then put to the vote and was carried. Councillor Davies voted against the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Beaney noted that there were many trees along that road that may need protecting.

Mr Shaw confirmed this could be taken away and looked at.

Refused

29 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers and Appeal Decisions

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

There were no Appeal decisions.

Councillor Beaney thanked the planning officers for all their hard work and commented that there were not many housing sites coming through. A short discussion ensued between Councillors and Mr Shaw, regarding potential larger housing sites that may be forthcoming.

Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee
20/September2021

The Meeting closed at 3.31 pm

CHAIRMAN