

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday 29 November 2023 at 7.00 pm
in Meeting Room 1, Abbey House, Abbey Close,
Abingdon, OX14 3JE

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Scott Houghton and Jill Rayner
Officers: Nathaniel Bamsey (Planning Officer), Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Holly Bates (Planning Officer) and Emily Hamerton (Development Manager).

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Mark Coleman, Hayleigh Gascoigne and Diana Lugova.
Officers: Katherine Canavan (Planning Officer), Nathalie Power (Planning Officer) and Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer).

56 Chair's announcements

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

57 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mike Pighills who was substituted by Councillor Scott Houghton.

58 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2023 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

59 Declarations of interest

Councillor Jill Rayner declared that, she was ward member for item 7 on the agenda, P23/V0798/FUL. Councillor Rayner confirmed she would stand down from the committee and not participate in the debate or vote for this item.

60 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

61 Public participation

The committee noted the list of the members of the public who had registered to speak at the meeting.

62 P23/V0798/FUL - Cobweb Buildings, The Lane, Lyford, OX12 0EE

Councillor Jill Rayner declared a non-registerable interest in this item as she was local ward member. Councillor Rayner stood down from the committee during the consideration of this application and did not participate in the debate or vote.

The committee considered planning application P23/V0798/FUL for the erection of two commercial buildings with parking and landscaping (as amplified by signage plan received 24th May 2023, and as amended by planting plan received 30th May 2023), at Cobweb Buildings, The Lane, Lyford, OX12 0EE.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that permission had previously been granted on the site in 2005 for a series of workshops for the storage and distribution of golf buggies. Although the application had previously been dismissed on appeal permission was secured under a personal permission and tied to Jeneta Limited. A number of different businesses now occupied the site and whilst this did amount to a breach of condition it was likely that this had been the case for more than 10 years and therefore was immune from enforcement action. The officer went on to highlight that in 2017 planning permission had been granted for two commercial buildings and included parking and boundary landscaping. The officer advised the committee that the two buildings had been constructed but had not been built in accordance with the approved plans. The officer went on to highlight the differences being that building one had been built 22 metres further south than was approved. Building two was built seven metres further south than shown on the approved plans and was in use as a car workshop not as an office as had been approved. There had also been reconfiguration of the approved parking area and an increase to the size of the car park on the eastern edge. The officer advised that the landscaping had been amended to take account of these changes.

The officer informed the committee that the key concern which had been raised during the course of the consultation process related to large vehicles and car transporters travelling to and from the site through the surrounding villages. Light spill and the proposed lighting had also been raised as concerns. The officer advised the committee that the proposed landscaping would act to screen the increased parking and proposed lighting. The planning officer went on to note that the nature of the site's use had caused an increase in the number of vans and car transporters using the site but that in light of the approved commercial use and the widening of permitted development rights for commercial uses this increased use was not substantially different in highways terms.

The officer informed the committee that following discussions with the local highways authority two additional conditions were proposed. These conditions were designed to ensure vehicles were directed away from the villages of Lyford and Charney Bassett and to allow enforcement where this was not adhered to. During the committee item this was amended to one condition for a travel plan and a legal agreement to secure a routeing agreement, on the advice of the highways officer.

The planning officer went on to highlight that the two lighting columns on the southern boundary had been disconnected and removed and that the majority of the lighting on the two commercial buildings faced into the yard. She advised that a condition was proposed to restrict the constant use of the lights to between 7am and 7pm and for them to be sensor operated outside of these times.

The officer concluded with an update on the proposed conditions which included an additional condition recommended in advance of the committee meeting by the highways officer for a travel plan, as well as the landscaping condition requiring planting to be completed within 3 months so as to give trees the best chance of becoming established and providing appropriate screening. The officer confirmed the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions which had been set out.

Mike Trippit spoke on behalf of Lyford Parish Meeting, objecting to the application.

Trevor Brown, a representative of Charney Bassett Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Henry Venners, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Jill Rayner, a local ward member, spoke on the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the meeting. The committee asked the highways officer whether they were satisfied that the turn right sign on the A420 was sufficient to prevent large vehicles from accessing and leaving the site via the nearby villages. The highways officer advised the committee that the signs in isolation would not be sufficient. The Highways Officer recommended a routing agreement be attached to any permission to avoid business traffic to and from the site through the nearby villages. This would be secured by legal agreement (s106) before planning permission could be granted. The highways officer went on to advise that it would not be possible to stop all large vehicles from driving through local villages but that it would be possible to stop the vast majority. He went on to advise that drivers would be notified of failure to comply in the first instance but if they failed to comply a second time they would be banned from visiting the site. The highways officer advised this had worked effectively elsewhere in the county. The committee enquired as to why the highways officer felt that a legal agreement was required and he advised that this was to ensure that the County Council also had enforcement ability.

The committee noted that in order to travel to and leave the site without travelling through any local villages there were a number of turns which had to be made and asked the highways officer if there would be signs displayed beyond just the exit to the site. The highways officer confirmed that there would be no signs beyond the site as private company signs cannot form part of the highways network signage but that all vehicles accessing the site would be advised in advance of the routing agreement.

The committee then asked for an explanation as to why officers felt that the storage of more vehicles on the site did not necessarily mean there would be an increase in the number of vehicle movements to and from the site. The highways officer advised that in the main parking associated with the site was storage and those vehicles would therefore be leaving the site on a low loader rather than being driven. He went on to confirm that the movements from the site had been calculated based on the gross floor area of the commercial units and the maximum potential usage as opposed to what was actually happening on the site.

The committee asked the planning officer to comment on how a legal agreement to allow for enforcement as per the highways officer's suggestion would work. The planning officer confirmed that a legal agreement would sit alongside the planning permission and that a decision could not be issued until the legal agreement had been drawn up and signed. The planning officer advised officers were of the view that a routeing agreement secured by condition alone would be sufficient to secure an enforceable agreement. The committee noted that a delay to issuing the decision would impact upon the requirement to complete the landscaping by February 2024 and whilst this was regrettable addressing the issues raised in regards to traffic was of higher importance. Subsequently, and having regard to advice from the highways officer, committee favoured a legal agreement as the most appropriate method to secure the routeing agreement.

The committee enquired as to what the enforcement steps would be should there be issues with light pollution. The planning officer confirmed that the lighting conditions would be enforced in conjunction with the environmental protection team. She went on to advise that issues of light pollution and nuisance to neighbours were covered by separate environmental health legislation.

In relation to concerns about lighting the committee enquired as to whether it was possible to require mature and significant planting was implemented. The planning officer advised that a planting scheme had been submitted as part of the application and this indicated a good level of buffer planting but that within the wording of the landscaping condition specifics of what would be planted where could be requested. She also advised the committee that a standard element of the condition was that any trees which failed or were damaged within the first five years would be replaced.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application with additional conditions in relation to signage and a travel plan and a section 106 legal agreement to cover the routing agreement and changes to the landscaping details condition to incorporate timing, maturity and size, was carried on being put to the vote.

The committee reflected they were keen to secure the section 106 legal agreement in order that the County Council were also involved in enforcement of the routing agreement. The committee noted that enforcement of this was of key importance.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V0798/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. In accordance with approved plans and materials

Within set timeframe of permission being granted:

2. Sustainable drainage scheme
3. Lighting – removal of lighting columns within set timeframe
4. Biodiversity enhancement strategy
5. Detailed landscape / planting mitigation strategy
6. Details of hard landscaping, parking area and boundary treatments
7. Signage

Compliance:

8. Restricted uses within the definition of commercial
9. Lighting – no additional other than shown on plans
10. Lighting – operational times, and directed down

11. Parking and vehicle storage only in areas marked as parking on plans

Additional condition, recommended in advance of planning committee by Highways Officer:

14. Travel Plan

63 P23/V1800/HH - 25 Parklands Besselsleigh Abingdon, OX13 5PN

The committee considered planning application P23/V1800/HH for single storey side and rear extension to an existing dwelling (as amended by application form and site survey received 20 October 2023), at 25 Parklands, Besselsleigh, Abingdon, OX13 5PN.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application had been referred to the committee at the request of the local ward member. The planning officer advised the committee that the location plan submitted included all land required to carry out the development which included the access road for the property from the adopted highway. He confirmed this was a technical requirement for the validation of the application and was not the applicant claiming ownership. The planning officer also advised the committee that there had been a previous application on the site for the erection of a detached garage on land to the west of the dwelling. The applicant had been informed that in line with the biodiversity plan submitted with the original application for the development this land was not residential curtilage and therefore the development was not acceptable. The officer stated that the application before the committee had removed any development on this land and that the application did not propose change of use of this land and nor did its inclusion in the application boundary constitute a change of use.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application sought a small front extension which would reduce the length of the driveway slightly and that the proposal followed the existing garage wall. The extension would extend beyond the existing rear of the house by 3.8 metres and the plans indicated that this would create a new bedroom to the rear of the property. The planning officer advised that the property benefitted from all permitted development rights and there was no planning condition preventing the conversion of the garage. He informed the committee that much of the proposed development could be carried out under permitted development rights and indicated that a small area of the extension would exceed the permitted development limits hence the need for the application.

The planning officer concluded that officers considered the impacts of the application acceptable when the permitted development fall back was considered and that the loss of a parking space was acceptable due to the ability for displacement across the estate roads.

Jane Cranston spoke on behalf of Besselsleigh Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Scott Lawrie spoke objecting to the application.

Peter Gray, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Mark Coleman, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the meeting. The committee thanked the planning officer for their clear report and noted the majority of what had been applied for

could be carried out under permitted development rights. The committee went on to ask the planning officer to confirm that the application was to create extra living space in the house and not to create an additional bedroom. The planning officer advised that as the submitted plans showed a bedroom it was a requirement to take account of this, however they went on to confirm that any room type could have been indicated on the plans and the space later turned into a bedroom which would not require planning permission.

The committee noted that the highways authority had not submitted any objection to the application on the basis that Parklands was not highway land. The planning officer confirmed this but advised that they had considered highway safety implications in their report.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm if as stated on the application form the proposal included the erection of a 1.8 metre wall. The planning officer advised that this was not shown on the plans or detailed in the description of development and therefore did not form part of the application to be considered.

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

The committee noted that the application sought permission for a small expansion on what could be done under permitted development rights and that it did not see this as a reason to refuse the application.

The committee had concerns over the loss of a parking space at the property and the high levels of parking on the road at the site but was of the view that the requirement to provide an additional parking space would be more detrimental to the character of the development.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V1800/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Commencement of development within three years
2. Approved plans list

Prior to commencement

3. Tree protection details
4. Great crested newts protection

Compliance

5. Materials in accordance with submitted details

Informative

6. Amenity land informative
7. Great crested newts informative

64 P23/V1736/HH and P23/V1737/LB - Wellshead Cottage Harwell OX11 0HD

The committee considered planning applications P23/V1736/HH and P23/V1737/LB for single and two storey rear extensions to cottage (amended plans received 30 August, 4 and 23 October, with additional ecological information received 4 October 2023), at Wellshead Cottage, Harwell, OX11 0HD.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application related to a detached Grade II listed property located on a corner plot. The site was accessed from the west and was located nearby Englefield and Wellshead House, both Grade II listed properties. The planning officer also informed the committee that the site fell within the Harwell conservation area.

The proposed extensions were located to the south east corner of the building and the second storey comprised a new bedroom and ensuite which would include new windows. The planning officer advised it was officers' opinion that the new windows were of limited impact as they would be obscured and only top opening and the side facing windows were sufficiently oblique to prevent harmful overlooking.

The planning officer highlighted to the committee that no objections had been raised by the heritage officer.

Cath Convery spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Hayleigh Gascoigne, a local ward councillor, spoke on the application.

The committee enquired about the narrow access to neighbouring properties if repairs were required and if there was a right of access. The planning officer confirmed this issue had been raised by both the neighbour and the applicant and it had been established that the land was owned solely by the applicant. Whilst the planning officer did appreciate that the properties were close she advised that this was a civil matter, the extension would be set marginally further away than the present built form and that the heritage officer had not raised any concerns on grounds of maintenance.

The committee went on to ask the planning officer to confirm if the local highways authority had responded to the consultation. The planning officer confirmed that the local highways authority had responded and raised no objection. She went on to advise that the current parking standard for villages was up to two spaces for a four bedroom house and that the garage could be used for parking.

The committee also asked the planning officer to confirm how far the proposed windows were from neighbouring properties. The planning officer confirmed that the closest point would be 92cm from the rear elevation. The planning officer went on to advise that the bathroom window would be obscure glazed and non-opening save for a top hung vent and that the bedroom window did not directly overlook and it was therefore not harmful enough to warrant refusal in officers' opinion.

Motions, moved and seconded, to approve the planning permission and listed building consent applications were carried on being put to the vote.

The committee noted that there was no objection to the application from either the parish council or the heritage officer. It reflected that the proposed development sits on its own site and that the problematic window would be obscure glazed and non-opening. The committee noted the materials condition as set out in the officer report.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V1736/HH, subject to the following conditions:

STANDARD

1. Time limit - Full Application
2. Approved Plans List
3. Approved Supporting Documents

COMPLIANCE

4. Samples of materials
5. Car Parking & Garage
6. Obscured Glazing (Opening)

RESOLVED: to approve the listed building consent application P23/V1737/LB, subject to the following conditions:

STANDARD

1. Time limit – LB-CA Consent
2. Approved Plans List
3. Approved Supporting Documents

PRECOMMENCEMENT

4. Samples of Materials
5. Joinery Details
6. Groundworks Methodology

65 P23/V1862/HH and P23/V1863/LB - The Vale Cottage High Street Uffington Faringdon, SN7 7RP

The committee considered planning applications P23/V1862/HH and P23/V1863/LB for internal and external repairs and improvements, including works to repair internal partition wall, replacement of uninsulated concrete and timber floor with breathable flooring, installation of underfloor heating system, repair of internal wall coverings, repair and replacement of porch roof covering, and replacement of front door. Repair of boundary wall. Installation of new air source heat pump (additional heritage and acoustic information submitted 17 September and 18 October 2023 respectively), at The Vale Cottage, High Street, Uffington, Faringdon, SN7 7RP.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was before the committee as the applicant was a ward councillor. The property was a listed semi-detached property located within the Uffington conservation area.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application was for a replacement front door and porch, minor repairs to window frames, wall repairs and an air source heat pump. The planning officer confirmed that the existing wall height would be maintained. Internal alterations included repairs to an internal partition wall, the installation of underfloor heating, repair of rotten timber and the addition of internal insulation.

The planning officer concluded that with the submission of additional information in relation to the new floors and the specifications of the air source heat pump there were no technical

objections to the applications and they were therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the officer's report.

The committee enquired as to the assessments which had been carried out to allow for the installation of an air source heat pump in a listed building. The planning officer confirmed that environmental health had assessed the proposal and wished to ensure there would not be excessive noise generation from the air source heat pump due to its size and location but the concern was overcome through the submission of acoustic information. The planning officer went on to advise that the heritage officer had requested further information to ensure that the installation would not interfere with the historic fabric of the building and this information was submitted addressing this concern.

Motions, moved and seconded, to approve the applications were carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V1862/HH, subject to the following conditions:

STANDARD

1. Time limit - Full Application
2. Approved Plans List
3. Approved Supporting Documents

COMPLIANCE

4. Materials in accordance with application details

RESOLVED: to approve the listed building consent application P23/V1863/LB, subject to the following conditions:

STANDARD

1. Time limit – LB/CA Consent
2. Approved Plans List
3. Approved Supporting Documents

COMPLIANCE

4. Materials in Accordance with Application

The meeting closed at 8.54 pm