

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee**  
Held in the Council Chamber at 2.00 pm on **Monday, 8 November 2021**

PRESENT

Councillors: Councillor Ted Fenton (Chairman), Councillor Joy Aitman (Vice-Chair), Councillor Maxine Crossland, Councillor Harry Eaglestone, Councillor Duncan Enright, Councillor Jeff Haine, Councillor Richard Langridge, Councillor Nick Leverton, Councillor Dan Levy, Councillor Lysette Nicholls, Councillor Carl Rylett, Councillor Harry St John and Councillor Ben Woodruff

Officers: Phil Shaw (Business Manager - Development Management) and Adrienne Frazer (Strategic Support Officer)

**31 Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2021 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**32 Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bolger and Good.

**33 Declarations of Interest**

A declaration of interest was received from Councillor Fenton relating to application number 25 determined under delegated powers, which concerned Cokethorpe School. Councillor Fenton formerly worked at the school.

**34 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 decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for approval or refusal to be as recommended in the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

At the last minute, due to unavoidable circumstances, the officers responsible for the applications under consideration were unable to attend the committee. The Business Manager – Development Management stood in and supported the meeting. In the light of these circumstances it was agreed by the committee that all recommendations and conditions were subject to clarification and also that the committee delegated authority to the Chairman and officers to amend conditions if further information came to light or, alternatively, that the application(s) be brought back to a future committee to resolve.

The Chairman noted that this committee was to have been the Senior Planner (Development Management), Miranda Clark's, final meeting before moving on. The Chairman, committee, and Business Manager – Development Management thanked Miranda Clark for her work over the last twenty plus years and sent her their best wishes for the future.

The Chairman, committee, and Business Manager – Development Management also sent their best wishes for their wellbeing to the Interim Development Manager, Abby Fettes, and the Senior Planner (Development Management), Miranda Clark.

20/02720/FUL Building 2 And 3 Windrush Park Road, Witney

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, introduced the application for the demolition of an existing redundant, asbestos clad, industrial building (building 2 and part of building 3F) to provide new car parking for 135 cars together with associated works.

A public submission was received from Jeremy Hadfield representing Hale Architecture in support of the application. Mr Hadfield gave an overview of his client's aspirations to create a new carpark and two new industrial units which were covered by the three linked applications being heard at this committee. He advised that his client's intention was to refurbish and revitalise the site.

Following a question from Councillor St John about whether the surface water would be going into the public foul water sewer, Mr Hadfield explained that following an assessment there was a surface water strategy in place which included a climate change plan; and that the discharge would be the same as at present, that is, discharging into the existing network.

Councillors Langridge and Leverton asked about the creation of the car park, the building that is to be demolished and the type of buildings being created and particularly whether this would increase the demand for car parking. Mr Hadfield advised that the building being demolished was obsolete; that the ancillary office space being created was no more than 10% of the new build space and that there would be no additional transport on site. He explained that 20% of the car parking spaces would be electric vehicle charging points and that the car parking spaces would be of the same number as currently but would be located closer to the offices. He added that this was particularly important to the NHS staff whose offices were on site.

Councillor Levy asked about arrangements for people who travelled to the site not by car. Mr Hadfield informed the committee that each new building had secure bicycle storage and that the section 106 agreement included the provision of two new bus shelters on Burford Road.

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, then presented his report. He advised that the history of the site as a former aerodrome explained the layout of the site. He suggested that it was expected that moving the car park further into the estate would increase its usage. As a result of this the roads on the estate were likely to have fewer cars parked along them making access for HGV vehicles easier. He confirmed that the buildings being removed were obsolete. The Business Manager – Development Management then recommended approval of the application subject to the condition on drainage being clarified to state that the surface water drainage would not discharge into the foul sewerage system and would meet Thames Water's comments on the application including:

*"No development shall be occupied until confirmation has been provided that either:- all water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows to serve the development have been completed; or - a development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan. Reason - The development may lead to no / low water pressure and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to accommodate additional demand anticipated from the new development".*

Councillor Woodruff proposed that the application be approved as per officers' recommendations subject to the conditions detailed in the report and including the conditions about drainage. He stated that he knew the site and that the buildings were tired and needed improvement.

Councillor Enright joined the meeting.

This was seconded by Councillor Langridge who welcomed the investment in the area and the positive addition to the area's employment facilities.

The officers' recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried.  
Councillor Enright abstained.

### **Approved**

The Chairman noted that because the three applications on Windrush Park Road, Witney were closely connected, and that the committee spent the majority of its time considering the first (above) application, comments noted on the first application (above), also applied where relevant to the other two applications on Windrush Park Road.

#### 21/02248/FUL \_\_\_\_\_ Gateway House, Windrush Park Road, 21, Witney

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, introduced the application for the erection of nine industrial units, to include external ancillary service areas, car and cycle parking.

A public submission had been received from Jeremy Hadfield during application number 20/02720/FUL Building 2 And 3, Windrush Park Road (above) in support of the application.

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, presented his report containing a recommendation of approval. He advised that conditions were needed on the following issues: drainage of surface water, as in the first application and for CCTV to be provided in line with Police recommendations.

Councillor Fenton asked about the quality of insulation of the office spaces. The officer advised that this would be covered by building regulations.

Councillor St John asked about the proportion of each of the specific classes of industrial space being created. Officers agreed to clarify the proportion of usage for each class.

Councillor Levy noted that the Town Council had objected because there was not enough access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Chairman noted that there is an access condition in the application. The Business Manager – Development Management advised that there is a cycle way along Burford Way.

The Chairman gave Mr Hadfield the opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Mr Hadfield advised the committee that safe routes to the site had been indicated to Oxfordshire County Council Highways Department. He also advised that the buildings had been designed flexibly for both B2 and B8 class of usage.

Following a question from Councillor St John about preserving dark skies, the officer advised that appropriate secure lighting would be included in the design.

Councillor Langridge proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations subject to the conditions detailed in the report and above.

This was seconded by Councillor Leverton.

08/November2021

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

**Approved**

21/02929/FUL Land At Windrush Park, Windrush Park Road, 21, Witney

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, introduced the application for the erection of 2 industrial units (Use Class E(g)iii, B2 and B8), to include external, ancillary service areas, car and cycle parking.

A public submission had been received from Jeremy Hadfield during application number 20/02720/FUL Building 2 And 3, Windrush Park Road (above) in support of the application.

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, presented his report containing a recommendation of approval. He advised that the car parking would be closer to the office spaces than previously and that the condition on drainage from application 20/02720/FUL Building 2 And 3, Windrush Park Road would also apply to this application.

Councillor St John asked about the available turning space for HGV vehicles. The officer advised that there was enough space although it may be difficult to accommodate four HGVs simultaneously.

Councillor Haine proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations subject to the conditions detailed in the report and above applications.

This was seconded by Councillor Woodruff.

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

**Approved**

21/02896/FUL The Newlands Inn, 45 - 47 Newland Street, 31, Eynsham

The Business Manager – Development Management, Phil Shaw, introduced the application for the conversion of a public house to a residential dwelling and presented his report containing a recommendation of refusal. He advised that although the applicant states that the public house is not commercially viable, they had not provided the evidence required to show enough effort had been made to market it or to justify the claim of it not being commercially viable and that this is the reason for the recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Levy felt that the application should be refused due to the thriving market for public houses in Eynsham. With the plans to develop the village in mind, he felt that the public house would be a success and he knew of no evidence that the applicants had tried to market it.

Councillor Levy proposed that the application be refused as per officers' recommendations.

This was seconded by Councillor Rylett who stated that there were strong feelings in the community to retain it as a public house. He asked what would be needed for the applicant to be able to re-apply. The officer advised that the Planning Department would look for evidence of marketing the venue for its current use and would assess the results of the marketing. He

08/November2021

advised the committee that during the pre-application stage the applicants were advised about the information that was needed around marketing and were informed of the tests that would need to be passed with respect to marketing.

Following a discussion Councillors Woodruff, Leverton and Langridge expressed their support for the officer recommendation.

The officers' recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was carried.

## **Refused**

### **35 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers**

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers was received and noted. The following issues were raised:

#### Item Number 1

Councillor Fenton requested that further information regarding the variation of condition 3 (materials) in this application be sent to him.

#### Item Number 9

Councillor Eaglestone raised the issue of the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). He asked when the CIL would be in place so that funding from all new build homes could be provided to the community.

Councillor Haine responded saying the matter had been discussed with senior officers that morning, however introducing a CIL is takes time. He anticipated it taking a further 6 months to complete.

#### Item Number 31

Councillor Eaglestone raised the issue of complaints from local people about the social club on the Eagle Industrial Estate, Witney. The officer advised that Planning has no control over these issues; this was a matter for Environmental Health and planning permission was not needed for smoking shelter in that location.

#### Item Number 62

Councillor Eaglestone raised a query relating the external lighting. The officer agreed to liaise with Councillor Eaglestone outside the meeting.

#### Item Number 80

Councillor Fenton requested that further information regarding the construction of 160 dwellings and provision of public open space in this application be sent to him.

Finally the Chairman thanked Mr Shaw (Business Manager – Development Management) for stepping in to support the meeting at the last minute.

The Meeting closed at 2.50 pm

CHAIRMAN