

# Planning Committee Monday 12 December 2016

**Addendum Report** 

## Item 7 - P16/V2253/O - 6-8 Cumnor Road, Boars Hill, Oxford

## Additional Representations

One neighbour representation has been received, reiterating previous objections to the amended proposal, namely lack of parking, additional traffic, visibility at access point and impact on neighbouring amenity during construction and after.

# Officer Response

These comments are noted and discussed in the report

## <u>Item 8 – P16/V1903/FUL – The Gate House, Reading Road, Upton</u>

No updates

# <u>Item 9 – P16/V1092/HH – 9 Turnpike Road, Cumnor Hill</u>

# Additional Representations

Two further letters of objection have been received since the agenda was published. Comments can be summarised as:

- The property is now clearly a pair of semi-detached houses with two front doors, two junction boxes, two gardens and two sets of stairs.
- There is a large brick wall dividing the property
- The 'new content listed within the last 7 days' on the website now shows an internal garage with a side door into the utility area with no sign of the secondary staircase or side access front door with utility boxes.

# Officer response

Concerns regarding the differences between what has already been constructed on site and what is proposed, has been covered within the officer's report and below. No new information has been submitted for this application since 6 October 2016. The case officer made minor amendments to the file names of previously submitted plans in the week of 28th November  $-2^{\rm nd}$  December and this triggered plans to incorrectly be shown as newly added plans on the website. The plan including a garage referred to is the existing site plan (as approved in the previous planning permission P16/V1080/HH).

#### Information Circulated to Members

Officers are also aware that members have received emails from an objector detailing the business and other developments that the applicant is involved in, together with advice from a planning barrister drawing attention to the fact that the implementation of "intentional unauthorised development" is a material consideration to which weight can be given in a planning decision.

## Officer Response

Objectors are concerned that the developer intends to create a second dwelling on the site. Members will be aware that any previous developments carried out by the developer are not a material planning consideration.

The material consideration of intentional unauthorised development was introduced by the government on 1 September 2015, and, although principally related to unauthorised development in the green belt, does apply everywhere else. The consideration applies to *post facto* applications and appeals for unauthorised development. The key point with the current case is that the current planning application seeks planning permission to authorise what is being built as an extension to the house. It is not an application *post facto* for the creation of a new dwelling. There is no *de facto* second dwelling on the site at this point in time, so there is no unauthorised development of such significance as to raise a substantive policy issue.

#### Clarification of Enforcement Position

To clarify the current enforcement investigation, the enforcement team consider that what is being constructed on site is a completely new development and not a variation on the previously approved scheme. The current application seeks planning permission for a completely new extension to the house.

# <u>Item 10 – P16/V0714/HH – Beech House, School Lane, Milton</u>

# Additional Representation

Milton Parish Council – No objection "Wish Planning to decide using their expertise".

# Officer response

These comments are noted.

# <u>Update</u>

The proposal to extend the Milton Conservation Area has been formally adopted and the application site now falls within the conservation area. In her comments in paragraph 2.2 of the committee report the conservation officer has stated that her opinion about the application would be unchanged were the site to fall within the expanded conservation area. This remains the case.