

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Monday, 12 December 2016 at 6.30 pm
in the The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway,
Wantage, OX12 9BY

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Sandy Lovatt (Chairman), Janet Shelley (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Stuart Davenport, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Dudley Hoddinott (substituting for Catherine Webber) Bob Johnston, Ben Mabbett and Chris McCarthy

Officers: Emily Hamerton, Martin Deans, Nicola Meurer, Peter Brampton and Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel

Number of members of the public: 36

PI.159 Chairman's announcements

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

PI.160 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

Councillors Monica Lovatt and Catherine Webber had tendered their apologies for the meeting; Dudley Hoddinott substituted for the latter.

PI.161 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations

Bob Johnston declared that in relation to application P16/V2253/O, as the county councillor for the Wootton parish, he had attended the parish council meeting, but left before the application was considered.

PI.162 Urgent business

None.

PI.163 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications

None.

PI.164 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters

None.

PI.165 P16/V2253/O - 6-8 Cumnor Road, Boars Hill, Oxford

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V2253/O for outline planning permission to demolish the existing two-storey building and garage and to erect a new building consisting of nine apartments and related works at 6-8 Cumnor Road, Boars Hill, Oxford.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and addendum, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Carol Wilson, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The proposal is of much higher density to what is currently there;
- It will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area, which is mostly bungalows;
- There is a chronic parking problem in the area already; and
- It fails to meet Design Guide criteria.

Adrian James, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The density is no more than that of the existing flats;
- The proposal is 2.5 storeys, which is what is currently on site;
- A parking survey was conducted during the previous week, finding a lot of space on adjacent roads;
- With the removal of the salon, parking requirements will be reduced;
- Number 10 will have more light than currently due to the design; and
- The design has changed completely based on objections received.

In response to questions raised, officers reported that:

- The change of use should have been included in the description; and
- Parking and turning are to be secured by condition;

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; although some members believed that issues could be addressed by condition, the majority were not content with the bulkiness and believed that it would be overbearing, unneighbourly and out of keeping with the street scene. Committee were not satisfied with the neighbours and parish council not being directly consulted by the applicant prior to submission of the application.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared lost on being put to the vote.

A motion, moved and seconded to refuse the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P16/V2253/O for the following reasons:

Having regard to the scale, bulk, massing, design and location of the building, the proposal will have a materially harmful impact on the character of the area and on the amenity of the occupants of No.10 Cumnor Road. This is contrary to Core Policy 37 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part One, saved Policy DC9 of the Local Plan 2011 and advice within the Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015 and the NPPF. This harm outweighs the benefits of the proposal and no material considerations exist to warrant a departure from the Development Plan.

PI.166 P16/V1903/FUL - The Gate House, Reading Road, Upton

Janet Shelley, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and did not take part in the debate or voting for this item.

The officer presented the report on application P16/V1903/FUL to replace the existing family dwelling with a single family dwelling at The Gate House, Reading Road, Upton.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Stuart Norman, a representative of Upton parish council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The building currently being constructed is not on the previously approved footprint – it has moved 5 metres to the North;
- This is now a retrospective application, which in principle opens the floodgates for those who want to build first and apply for planning permission later; and
- Overlooking is now an issue.

Alex Smith, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The plans are inaccurate with different design, massing and positioning 5 metres to the North of the approved scheme;
- The current building is significantly closer, resulting in it being excessively overbearing and over dominant, exacerbated by the ground levels;
- There will be a significant loss of amenity with the privacy of their back garden being adversely affected;
- Screening would have to be a suitable height;
- The access has been widened without authority;
- The turning area, rubble area and run off are all causing problems; and
- The mitigation of raising cill heights is not enough.

Neil Perry, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The change in location of the footprint was an error, not an intention, for which they apologise; and
- The application meets all policy criteria.

Janet Shelley, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The proposal is overbearing, over dominant, unneighbourly and with little landscaping to soften the impact;

- It will have a harmful effect on the amenity to the neighbours;
- The original location was insisted on for a reason; and
- It contravenes policy DC9 due to its scale, massing and unneighbourliness.

In response to matters raised, officers reported that:

- There has not been a refused application for this site, just amendments following pre-application advice; and
- The swimming pool was built in its current form with assumed permitted development rights.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; although not satisfied with the retrospective nature of the current building in construction and impact on the neighbouring property, the committee did not think that there were sufficient material planning reasons to refuse the application.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/V1092/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit.
2. Approved plans list.
3. Drainage details to be submitted - foul water.
4. Tree protection - submission of a timed programme.
5. Materials in accordance with application.
6. Wildlife protection- the development shall be implemented in accordance with the mitigation strategy outlined in the bat survey report.
7. Archaeology- An archaeological watching brief, to be maintained during the period of construction/during any groundworks taking place on the site.
8. Access, parking and turning in accordance with application.
9. Access arrangement to be reinstated once the building works are finished.
10. Permitted developments rights removed.

Informative:

Your attention is drawn to the need obtain a European Protected Species (EPS) Licence before any development or demolition can proceed. You must be aware that to proceed with the development without first obtaining an EPS Licence could result in prosecution.

PI.167 P16/V1092/HH - 9 Turnpike Road, Cumnor Hill

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V1092/HH to demolish the existing garage and erect a two storey side extension at 9 Turnpike Road, Cumnor Hill.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and addendum, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Officer update: Due to the application being retrospective, the time limit condition will be removed.

Dudley Hoddinott, a representative of Cumnor parish council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The building work has been completed and it does not agree with the drawings in the plan or building regulations;
- There is an additional staircase, two separate driveways, a kitchen has been installed and two meter boxes which would indicate a separate dwelling not an extension;
- If it is an extension, it is out of scale; and
- The correct use should have been declared.

Gordon Joyner, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Reference to 'intentional and unauthorised development', which can be used to refuse planning applications since last year;
- Enforcement policy is inadequate; and
- Residents were consulted seven different times, which was very confusing.

Dudley Hoddinott, also one of the local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- If approved, work should accord with the approved plans;
- What is there bears little relation to the plans;
- The outside wall has not been broken through to make an open plan living area, but plastered and decorated;
- There is no intention for this to be an extension; and
- It does not respond to the local history of the area.

In response to matters raised, officers stated that:

- The enforcement team are waiting for substantial completion before making an assessment;
- The application would need to be considered on the basis of what is in front of them in the report;
- If enforcement consider the development to be an individual unit, the applicant would need to apply for planning permission as such

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; they did not consider a decision could be made pending the enforcement assessment.

A motion, moved and seconded to defer the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P16/V1092/HH to wait for an enforcement assessment.

PI.168 P16/V0714/HH - Beech House, School Lane, Milton

Stuart Davenport, the local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and did not take part in the debate or voting for this item.

The officer presented the report and addendum on application P16/V0714/HH for a first floor extension over a converted garage, new entrance hall and new garage at Beech House, School Lane, Milton.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and addendum, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

John Simmons, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed extension is too bulky, too close and would have a detrimental effect on the conservation area;
- There is plenty of land behind the home to extend;
- Access to the party wall is an issue with the 45cm gap, which could exacerbate damp; and
- Overshadowing and a loss of amenity for the neighbouring property, a non-designated heritage asset.

John Wattam, the applicant, spoke in support of the application:

- They are extending to modernise the building and create a multi-generational home for the future;
- The proposals are within keeping of the current dwelling, there are 20th century properties in the locale;
- There has been no objection from the conservation officer;
- The reduction in the build depth ensures the predominance of the Old School House;
- An extension to the rear would not meet their requirements, would add to the built area and result in a loss of garden.

Stuart Davenport, the local ward councillor, spoke to the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

A motion, moved and seconded to approve the application, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/V0714/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years.
2. Approved plans list.
3. Submission of material details.
4. Tree protection.
5. Car parking provision.
6. Garage accommodation.
7. Ancillary accommodation.

The meeting closed at 9.20 pm