

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 4 January 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, Paul Barrow, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills, Janet Shelley

Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Martin Deans (Planning Officer)

Remote attendance:

Officers: Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer) and Susannah Mangion (Planning Officer)

90 Declarations of interest

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the meeting procedure to be followed. He also explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

91 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jenny Hannaby who was substituted by Councillor Paul Barrow.

92 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2022 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

93 Declarations of interest

Councillor Paul Barrow declared an interest in item 7 on the agenda due to application P22/V1247/FUL being in his ward and so he would not take part in the debate or vote on this application.

94 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

95 Public participation

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

96 P22/V1247/FUL - Antwick Stud, Letcombe Regis, Wantage, OX12 9JD

The committee considered planning application P22/V1247/FUL for the conversion and extension of stable buildings to form three family homes with amenity space, parking, and associated works, on land at Antwick Stud, Letcombe Regis, Wantage.

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 called into the committee by a local ward member, Councillor Paul Barrow. The application was for part of the Antwick Stud site and was for the proposed conversion of the three existing stable blocks into residential homes. The remainder of the Antwick Stud site beyond those units was not considered with the proposed change of use application. The planning officer also noted that there were two other residential buildings in use on the Antwick Stud site.

The planning officer informed the committee that two of the three stable conversions would include a single-storey extension to form an enclosure and each conversion would have a glazed corridor which would form a connecting corridor between the different rooms. The planning officer also noted that the built form of the proposed development would not be higher than the existing stable buildings. Although the site was within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and was bordered to the south by a conservation area, the planning officer believed that the limited development was acceptable. Several proposed conditions for the

approval of the application were also noted, such as the removal of the two mobile homes on site and for the control of outside lighting.

As there were no objections from technical consultees and the planning officer believed that the application would have a limited impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, neighbours, highways safety, the conservation area, and trees it was believed that the principle of development was acceptable and therefore that the application should be approved, subject to conditions.

Councillor Jeanne Lapsley spoke on behalf of Letcombe Regis Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Neil Warner, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Paul Barrow, a local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer about the glazed corridors, whether they would cause light pollution, and if there were potential mitigation measures that could be conditioned. In response, the planning officer informed members that any amendment of the glazed corridors would require the committee to defer consideration of the application with a request that the application be redesigned. In addition, the planning officer noted that the government guidance on dark skies did not consider domestic lighting to be a significant polluter and therefore, as the lighting referred to in the application was domestic, that light pollution from these corridors would only have a local effect.

Members then discussed an older pending application on the site for the creation of more stables, but the planning officer stated that the council was informed that the current application was the applicants preferred choice and that the older application for more stables would likely be withdrawn if this application was approved as the applications were mutually exclusive. Also, members were informed that any further change of use to the land would be require a new application.

Members then inquired about the details of the proposed external lighting condition in the officer recommendations. As concerns about light pollution were raised, the committee discussed this condition in detail but were satisfied that granting approval of the application with this condition would allow the council to control the amount, strength, and timing of outside lighting in order to effectively limit the extent of light pollution.

In response to a question about access to the land behind the development, the planning officer informed the committee that the land could potentially be accessed from byways or from the existing access drive to the west of the stables.

Ultimately, members did not believe the application should be deferred to request a redesign and could be determined at this meeting. On balance, members agreed that the application should be approved subject to the officers' recommended conditions.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P22/V1247/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans

Prior to Commencement:

3. LS2 - Landscaping Scheme
4. LS4 - Tree Protection
5. MC1 - Materials Details
6. MC25 - Drainage Details (Surface Water)
7. MC26 - Drainage Details (Foul Water)
8. Details of Ecological Compensation and Enhancement

Prior to Occupation:

9. HY7 - Car Parking
10. HY10 - Turning Space
11. MC19 - Removal of Mobile Homes

Compliance:

12. RE2 - PD Restriction on Extensions and New Outbuildings
13. RE5 – PD Restriction on Fences/Walls
14. RE7 – Boundary Details in Accordance with Plan
15. RE29 - Refuse Storage
16. Development in Accordance with Ecological Avoidance and Mitigation Measures
17. No external lighting other than in accordance with approved details
18. CIL: General Consent

97 P22/V1890/FUL - Cedar Glen, Harris's Lane, Longworth, Abingdon, OX13 5EH

The committee considered planning application P22/V1890/FUL for the erection of a new 4 bedroom detached dwelling (as amended by site plan received 22 August 2022, additional drainage information received 1 September 2022, amended and revised information received 14 September, additional plan received 28 September 2022 and additional information (highways technical note) received 13 October 2022) and revised site plan and visibility splays rec 23 November 2022), on land at Cedar Glen, Harris's Lane, Longworth, Abingdon.

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 brought to committee by request of the planning manager. The planning officer informed the committee that the site used to contain a bungalow with outbuildings, now demolished. Permission was granted in 2022 for a replacement dwelling. The proposed application looked to erect a new dwelling on the north side of the site. Due to the realistic position that the development to the south of the site would go ahead, the planning officer considered the proposal as being an infill development, and thus acceptable.

The planning officer noted the concerns by the parish council that it believed the applications footprint resembled that of a previously refused application and that it was not an infill development, and so would not conform to the Longworth Neighbourhood Plan. However, the planning officer informed the committee that, as the reason the 2019 application was refused was due to the development not being considered infill, unlike the current proposal with the realistic fallback position, this change to the material circumstance of the site now made this application acceptable under the neighbourhood plan as applications should be assessed against the current situation and not the circumstances that were present when the neighbourhood plan was first adopted.

As there were no objections from the technical consultees and the planning officer believed that the application should be considered an infill development, meeting the requirements in both the neighbourhood plan and the local plan. The officer recommended that the application should be approved, subject to conditions.

James Corris, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Members then inquired about whether the application should be allowed as it would be built in the garden area of the already approved dwelling to the south. However, the planning officer informed the committee that these concerns related to the previous 2019 proposal for three dwellings on the site, not the currently proposed two dwellings, and that the Neighbourhood Plan allowed for infill development even on garden land.

The committee then discussed the likelihood of the applicant using the fallback position of building the dwelling on the south of the site. As work had already commenced for the demolition of the bungalow and Community Infrastructure Levy liabilities were being discussed between the council and the applicant, members believed that this fallback was realistic and therefore that it should be given planning weight in their determination of the application.

Due to realistic fallback position, the committee agreed with the officer's assessment that this application would be considered an infill development, in conformity with the neighbourhood plan, and therefore that the application should be approved.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P22/V1890/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Commencement 3 years
2. Approved plans

Compliance:

3. Ecology implementation
4. Surface water drainage Implementation
5. Foul drainage implementation
6. Landscaping implementation
7. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
8. Materials in Accordance with Application
9. Access, Visibility, Parking & Turning
10. Gates, bin and cycle store
11. Obscure glazing

Informatives:

12. Bats Informative
13. Works within the Highway
14. CIL: General Consent (Vale)

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm