

## WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the

### **Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee**

Held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxfordshire OX28 1NB  
at 2.00 pm on **Monday, 10 March 2025**

#### PRESENT

Councillors: Michael Brooker (Chair), Andy Goodwin (Vice-Chair), Julian Cooper, Steve Cosier, Rachel Crouch, Nick Leverton, Michele Mead, David Melvin, Andrew Prosser, Sarah Veasey, Alistair Wray and Liam Walker.

Officers: James Nelson (Principal Planner), Curtis Badley (Planning Officer), Ana Prelici (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Anne Learmonth (Democratic Services Officer) and Mat Taylor (Democratic Services Officer).

Other Councillors in attendance: None.

#### **102 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andrew Lyon, Councillor Phil Godfrey and Councillor Adrian Walsh.

Councillor Liam Walker substituted for Councillor Adrian Walsh.

#### **103 Declarations of Interest**

24/02926/FUL Clanfield Tavern.

Councillor Wray declared that this application was in his ward but he was not pre-determined.

24/03162/FUL 9 Milestone Road, Carterton.

Councillor Michele Mead declared that she was a resident of Milestone Road and the application was in her ward but she was not pre-determined.

Councillor Nick Leverton declared the application was in his ward.

Councillor David Melvin declared he was a resident of Carterton but was not the ward member.

#### **104 Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Councillor Steve Cosier asked that his apologies for absence be recorded in the minutes for the last meeting Monday 10 February 2025.

Councillor Sarah Veasey proposed that the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 10 February 2025 be agreed by the Sub-committee as a true and accurate record. This was seconded by Councillor Alistair Wray, was put to the vote and was agreed unanimously by the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee **Resolved** to:

- I. Agree the minutes of the previous meeting held on Monday 10 February 2025 as a true and accurate record.

**105 Applications for Development**

**106 24/02033/FUL Bridge House, Bridge Street, Shilton**

James Nelson, Principal Planner presented the application for photovoltaic solar panel installation comprising of 42 panels on the roof of the spa building and 120 ground mounted panels.

The Principal Planner thanked Members for attending the site visit and gave an overview of the visit.

The Principal Planner's presentation addressed the following points:

- The application site was to the east of Bridge House and included a pool house and gym, with paddock accessed by a gate to the existing field.
- The application had been deferred for a site visit.
- Bridge House, a Grade II building, was situated within the Shilton Conservation Area.
- The merits of the application were met in Local Plan policies OS3 and EH6 which supported renewable energy sources and highlighted the climate and ecological emergency.
- The Principal Planner presented a slide from Historic England which referred to the mounting of solar panels to listed buildings, surrounding areas and potential impacts. The use of hedgerow screening would shield the view of the solar panels and reduce the impact.
- It was considered that the installation of the solar panels would have a limited urbanising effect. The solar panels and infrastructure would be removed once the use had finished.
- The heritage harms were considered low and were outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme.
- The officer recommendation was for approval subject to the ecologist report.

The Chair then invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application, which raised the following points:

- The Members found the site visit useful as it gave a clarification on the site lay out and clarified where the solar panels would be situated both on the roof and within the paddock.
- The Members asked for clarification on the type of planting to be used for the hedgerows and how this would link to biodiversity net gain. The Principal Planning officer confirmed that the hedgerow planting would be a key consideration and condition 4 in the report would cover this, to safeguard the character and landscape of the area.
- The Members asked for clarification on which way the solar panels would face. The Principal Planner confirmed that the solar panels placed in the paddock would be south facing and the solar panels on the roof would be southwest facing. Members asked if this would have an impact on the character of the village, it was clarified that the proposed planting would act as a screen.

10/March2025

- Members raised concerns that the application was in Shilton Conservation area. The Principal Planner explained that the NPPF gave guidance for owners of historic buildings to enable the use of solar panels with the least impact on the historic building.
- Members raised concerns around the impacts of “Glint and Glare” from the solar panels and neighbouring properties. The Principal Planner confirmed that there would be no significant impact as private views are not a material consideration. The paddock would be retained if the solar and panels and infrastructure were removed in the future.
- Members asked if it was possible for only part of the application to be approved and not include the solar panels in the paddock. The officer explained that each application would have to be considered on its own merits.

Councillor Andrew Prosser proposed to approve the application in line with the officer’s recommendations. Councillor Steve Cosier seconded the proposal and it was put the vote.

**Voting record** – 5 for the proposal and 5 against. The Chair took the deciding vote against the proposal.

The Chair asked for advice from the Principal Planner as the vote was split. Before casting their vote, the Chair commented that the Committee should refuse the application on the basis that the ground-mounted panels were unacceptable and that if the applicant was to amend the proposal to remove this element of the scheme, the application would then be considered to be acceptable. However, the proposal that had been voted on was to refuse the scheme.

The Sub-Committee **Resolved** to:

- I. Refuse the application against officers’ recommendation.

**107 24/02926/FUL Clanfield Tavern, Clanfield**

The Chair advised that the two applications for Clanfield Tavern would be heard together, and each application would be vote on separately. This application was heard as part of the discussion on 24/02927/FUL Clanfield Tavern, Clanfield.

**108 24/02927/FUL Clanfield Tavern, Clanfield**

The Chair advised that the two applications for Clanfield Tavern would be heard together, and each application would be vote on separately.

Curtis Badley, Planning Officer, presented the applications:

- 24/02926/FUL, for conversion of ancillary accommodation to pub letting bedrooms, formation of a first floor fire exit along with erection of an external fire staircase, a new structure opening within an existing garden wall and installation of a roof light.
- 24/02927/FUL internal and external alterations to include changes to all floor layouts, formation of a new opening on the first floor for fire exit and erection of fire staircase. Internal works to include refurbishment works throughout along with formation of a plant room above existing toilets on the ground floor with ceiling hatch access from

## Lowlands Area Planning Sub-Committee

10/March2025

comms room, conversion of ground floor storeroom to bedroom with an ensuite, remedial works to staircase. External works to include a new structural opening within an existing garden and installation of a roof light.

Clare Ward, agent for the applicant, addressed the Sub-Committee which raised the following points: the improvement of the pub would result in both employment and economic opportunities within the local community, improved accommodation in the area and the help of additional parking would alleviate the current reduced parking on and around the site.

The Planning Officer's presentation addressed the following points:

- Clanfield Parish Council had objected to the applications due to concerns around no additional parking provision as the current carpark at full capacity.
- The application was in line with Local Plan policies E3, E4, E5 and OS2 with a view of supporting re-use of traditional buildings, support effectiveness of existing businesses and sustainable tourism and supporting development and retention of local services.
- The applications would maintain the character of the building and the heritage assets in the surrounding area.
- The proposed design was considered to be of a high quality and conserved the original building.
- Oxfordshire County Council Highways had not objected to the applications and did not consider there to be a significant detrimental impact on the highway.
- The Officer's recommendation was to approve both applications.

The Chair then invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application which raised the following points:

- Members asked for clarification on the fire escape staircase materials and the location of the fire staircase. The Officer confirmed the staircase material was black metal. The conservation officer had agreed this material would not impact the heritage of the building. The staircase would be set behind the buttress and would only be used as a fire escape. The ground floor door would be retained.
- The Members raised concerns around parking issues in Clanfield. The applicant had submitted a separate application regarding parking. Officers clarified that this could not be considered as part of the applications before the Sub-Committee. The Pub was already present as a business and OCC Highways had not objected on grounds of highway use and parking.
- Members asked for clarification on the current use of the building and if there would be further extension to the building. The Officer confirmed the previous use was residential and included kitchens which were not required with the proposed changes. The work would be internal and for refurbishment and did not require extension to the building.

10/March2025

24/02926/FUL Clanfield Tavern

Councillor Liam Walker proposed to approve the application in line with Officer's recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Steve Cosier and put to the vote.

**Voting record** - 6 for the proposal, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

The Sub-Committee **Resolved** to:

- I. Approve the application in line with Officer's recommendations.

24/02927/FUL Clanfield Tavern.

Councillor Liam Walker proposed to approve the application in line with Officer's recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Steve Cosier and put to the vote.

**Voting record** - 6 for the proposal, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

The Sub-Committee **Resolved** to:

- I. Approve the application in line with Officer's recommendations.

109

**24/03162/FUL 9 Milestone Road, Carterton**

James Nelson, Principal Planner presented the application for the conversion of an existing seven bedroom 12 person house in multiple occupation (HMO) into a seven bedroom 14 person house HMO, along with erection of single and two storey extensions and associated bicycle storage areas within rear garden (part retrospective).

Trish Quartly, spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points: the overdevelopment of the site, parking problems within the surrounding streets, overlooking of neighbouring properties and access for other residents and incorrect plans submitted.

The Principal Planner's presentation addressed the following points:

- The application was before the Sub-Committee due to Carterton Town Council's objections regarding overdevelopment of the site, concerns regarding parking and the retrospective plans being unclear.
- The site was within a residential area of Carterton and did not fall within a special designated area such as a conservation area. The site was on a corner plot at the junction of Milestone Road and Marlborough Close.
- The application was acceptable in principle and complied with the general principles of policy OS2. Policy H4 covered the use of Houses in Multiple Occupation would help younger households to access housing. Within West Oxfordshire there were presently very few HMOs. The application contributed to a balanced mix of housing within this area.
- The application was in line with policy H6 and would not impact the character of the surrounding area.
- Oxfordshire County Council Highways had not objected to the application.

10/March2025

- The design and proposed extension would not result in impact regarding overbearing appearance or loss of light and outlook. No impact was identified to adjoining dwellings to the north, east and south of the property. The application was recommended for conditional approval.

The Chair invited the Sub-Committee to discuss the application, which raised the following points:

- Members raised concerns regarding the size and scale of the development. The minimum living space for occupants and the use of shared rooms.
- Concerns were raised about parking and the number of spaces on the property. The impacts on the local resident's access to their properties and on road parking.
- Clarification on provision for cycle storage. The officer confirmed there was both bicycle and bin storage provided on the site.
- Members asked for clarification on the part of the application that was retrospective.
- The use of the property as HMO use. The officer confirmed that there was no change of use from a C3 dwelling.

Councillor Steve Cosier proposed the application be refused against officer recommendations due to the application being contrary to policies OS2, OS4 and H6. This was seconded by Councillor Andy Goodwin and put to the vote.

**Voting record** – 7 for the proposal, 0 against and 4 abstentions.

The Sub-Committee **Resolved** to:

- I. Refuse the application against Officer's recommendations due to the application being contrary to policies OS2, OS4 and H6.

#### **110 Applications Determined under Delegated Powers**

The report giving details of the applications determined under Delegated Powers was received, explained by the officers and noted by the Sub-Committee.

#### **111 Appeal Decisions**

The report giving details of the appeals decisions was received, explained by the Officers and noted by the Sub-Committee.

The Meeting closed at 3.41 pm

CHAIR