

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 9 November 2022 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), Jerry Avery, Ron Batstone, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley  
Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Lauren Davies (Planning Officer), Stuart Walker (Planning Officer), Lewis Dixey (Planning Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Debby Hallett (Ward Member) and Emily Smith (Ward Member)  
Officers: Sharon Crawford (Planning Officer)

#### **69 Chair's announcements**

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

#### **70 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Val Shaw, who was substituted with Councillor Jerry Avery.

#### **71 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Janet Shelley declared an interest in item 9 on the agenda due to application P22/V0416/FUL being in her ward and so she would not take part in the debate or vote on this application.

#### **72 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

#### **73 Public participation**

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

**74 P22/V1120/FUL - Site Of 1 Sugworth Crescent Radley Abingdon, OX14 2JR**

The application was withdrawn from the agenda due to the applicants request and was moved to the Planning Committee meeting on 30 November 2022.

**75 P21/V3123/FUL - Whitwick Grosvenor Road Oxford, OX2 9AX**

The committee considered planning application P21/V3123/FUL for the demolition of existing building comprising dwellinghouse and self-contained flat; erection of 3 no. 5-bed detached dwellings, each with parking, private amenity space, bin and bicycle storage. Improvements to vehicular access from Grosvenor Road. (As clarified by revised tree protection and service routes plan received on 7 January 2022 and Biodiversity Assessment received 8 March 2022 and as further clarified by full Biodiversity metric, photomontage and appeal note accompanying Agent's email dated 26 April 2022 and Plot size analysis received on 18 May 2022 & as amplified by Analysis Draft v2 - AO & Plot Size Analysis Plan Rev A received 18 May 2022). (As amended by drawing nos 20130 - PV0010 - C and 20130 - PP1011 – C altering access arrangements), on land at Whitwick, Grosvenor Road, Oxford.

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.

Due to technical difficulties, the development manager presented this item. The development manager introduced the report and highlighted that this was called into the committee by a local ward member, Councillor Debby Hallett.

The development manager informed the committee that the application sought permission for construction of three detached five bed houses from the site of an existing dwelling and self-contained flat, accessed through private roads. The site was also noted as not being within the Oxford Green Belt. The main concerns of neighbours and the parish council were that the proposal was overdevelopment and harmful to the character of the area. Although within the density parameters for the area, policies indicated that lower density was required where higher density would harm the character of the area.

The development manager also spoke about the concerns that residents and the parish had over the designs of the dwellings. It was noted by members that the design of each dwelling is different, but they do have similar features and use the same materials. In addition, the officers report stated that the distance between these proposed dwellings and the neighbours was in excess of requirements and so would be considered acceptable. Ultimately, as there was no objection from technical consultees, subject to conditions, the officers recommended that the application be approved.

Gilliane Sills and David Wyatt spoke objecting to the application.

Matt Chadwick, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Debby Hallett, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the discussion of the application. Some members expressed a desire to defer the application in order to get more clarity about the private road leading to the site and about the proposed condition put forward by the applicant that they were willing to make improvements to the road within their site boundary. Although this improvement was welcomed by the committee, as the road was not owned by the applicant or agent, it was unknown how this condition would be applied.

Although the houses proposed in the application would be set back from the road, the committee felt that the use of the same materials for each of the proposed dwellings, and their similar designs, would make them out of character with the unique building designs from site to site. Members noted that deferring the application to propose a condition that insisted on different materials used for the three buildings could be proposed. In addition, the committee also raised concerns about the loss of biodiversity on site and about the potential loss of trees.

For these reasons, some members believed that deferring the application in order to get more information about these issues would be beneficial. However, the committee felt like this deferral was not appropriate and a decision could be made at the meeting.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer the application in order to get more information about the road and traffic issues, material and designs used in the buildings, and about the impact on biodiversity and trees on site was lost when being put to the vote.

A major concern raised by the committee was that the proposal was harmful to the character and appearance of the area due to the level of development and the loss of greenery. Another concern the committee had was that the use of the same materials between the three buildings would also be out of character with the area due to the unique building design site to site. It was noted by the committee that these points would put the application in contravention with the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan, and the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P21/V3123/FUL, for the following reasons:

1. The site occupies a prominent, spacious and verdant location on the edge of Harcourt Hill which provides an appropriate step change in terms of density from the open rural land to the south to the higher density development to the north and north west. Having regard to the siting, layout and provision of new building across the whole plot width, the proposal to build three substantial houses on the site would cause considerable harm to the locally distinctive character and appearance of the surrounding area and provides insufficient opportunities to improve biodiversity. Biodiversity improvements should be provided on site to secure development more in keeping with the spacious and

verdant character of the area and the adjacent open countryside. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies CP23 and CP46 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 part 1, and Policies HS1, HS3 and G2 of the North Hinksey Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst the council is mindful of making efficient use of land, the harm to the character of the area in this case outweighs the benefits and the proposed development would be contrary to the advice in Paragraph 124 d) and e) of the NPPF.

2. The area is characterised by a wide variety of building styles and materials with no two neighbouring plots in the vicinity being the same. The proposed use of the same materials across the three substantial dwellings would create a uniformity of materials that does not respond positively to the site or the surroundings and would harm the unique and varied character of the area. As such the proposal is contrary to policy CP37 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 part 1, and Policies HS1 of the North Hinksey Neighbourhood Plan, the accompanying Parish Character Assessment (Harcourt Hill Character Area), advice in the Joint South and Vale Design Guide and the NPPF.

**76 P22/V2109/LB - Beaulieu Court Cottage Beaulieu Court Sunningwell Abingdon, OX13 6RQ**

The committee considered listed building consent application P22/V2109/LB for the addition of one Velux conservation style rooflight in north elevation of main roof to match those existing, on land at Beaulieu Court Cottage, Beaulieu Court, Sunningwell, 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 the committee as the applicant was related to a member of the planning service.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application was for the addition of a single roof light to a grade 2 listed building, which would be in addition to the five existing rooflights following the granting of listed building consent in 2018. As there was no perceived harm to the character of listed building and no objection from conservation officers, the application was recommended for approval.

The councillors asked the planning officer if this application would have come to the committee if it was not submitted by a relative of the planning service and they confirmed that it would not have. Overall, the committee was satisfied with the planning officers report and recommendations and could see no material planning reason for refusal.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve listed building consent application P22/V2109/LB, subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions:

1. Commencement within 3 years
2. Development completed in accordance with approved plans

Compliance Conditions:

3. Details and materials in accordance with application

**77 P22/V0416/FUL - Land south of Curie Avenue and west of Eighth Street Harwell Campus Didcot, OX11 0DF**

The committee considered planning application P22/V0416/FUL for the erection of two employment buildings, with associated landscaping and car parking (as amended by plans and documentation received 23 August 2022, 16 September 2022, 5 October and 20 October 2022), on land south of Curie Avenue and west of Eighth Street, Harwell Campus, Didcot.

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 due to the objection of East Hendred Parish Council.

The planning officer highlighted that the original application was a hybrid application for four buildings, two being outline and two in detail, but that this application was seeking permission for two buildings. Building one was a contemporary design approximately 65 metres long, 56 metre wide, and 14.6 metres at the highest point. Building two was a more conventional design 85 metres long, 56 metres wide, and 12.6 metres high. Vehicle access was from Curie Avenue and there was a separate Heavy Goods Vehicle access into a shared service yard with enough parking spaces for those currently provided on site.

The planning officer considered the principle of development acceptable. As there was no adverse impact on flood risk, ecology, archaeology, highways safety, subject to further detail on the proposed planning conditions, the adjoining woodland, or permitter landscaping, the planning officer recommended the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Steven Roberts, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Janet Shelley, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee was satisfied with the planning officers report, and the conditions laid out in them, and found no material planning reasons to refuse the application.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/V0416/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development in accordance with approved plans

Pre-commencement:

3. Construction traffic management plan
4. Sustainable drainage scheme
5. Foul drainage scheme
6. Biodiversity offsetting
7. Biodiversity enhancement plan
8. Rare plant species mitigation strategy
9. Landscape scheme
10. Landscape management plan
11. Rooflights to prevent light spill
12. Community Employment Plan
13. Tree protection implementation

Pre-occupation:

14. Demolish/vacate buildings on Innovation Quarter
15. SUDs compliance report
16. Car parking in accordance with plan
17. Cycle parking in accordance with plan
18. EV charging points
19. Public art

Compliance:

20. Materials
21. Ecological Mitigation
22. Travel Plan
23. External Lighting

Informatives:

1. Biodiversity offsetting
2. Thames Water

**78 P22/V1786/HH - HillsvieW 13 Sunningwell Road Sunningwell Abingdon, OX13 6BJ**

The committee considered planning application P22/V1786/HH for the application to raise existing roof ridge to form chalet bungalow with rooms in the roof (part retrospective) (As amended by plans received 01.09.22), on land at HillsvieW, 13 Sunningwell Road, Sunningwell, 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 this was called into the committee by a local ward member, Councillor Emily Smith. The application itself was part retrospective and fell within the Oxford Green Belt. Work had originally commenced on the site under the assumption that it was allowed via permitted development rights. However, as a prior approval application was required, this was not the case. In response to this site background, a condition for this application for the removal of those works within two months was proposed and agreed by the applicant. It was emphasised however, that these works were not material considerations to this application.

The planning officer informed the committee that in order for an application to be acceptable it would need to meet the criteria for developments in a green belt or be considered to be a special circumstance. As the applicant retained the right to build a single storey extension to the rear of their property through permitted development rights, something the applicant considered a fallback position in case this application was refused, this would be considered a material planning consideration for the application and so provide the special circumstance needed for the proposed development to be acceptable in a green belt.

The reason the planning officer believed this permitted development position would provide the circumstances which would allow for the approval of the application was that the fallback development would have a larger increase in the overall footprint of the property over a larger area than that proposed in the application. In addition, as the development in the application would be contained within the existing footprint of the building while ensuring the height of the building was in keeping with the others in the area, that distance between the rear windows and the rear neighbour would be in excess of the design guide, and that it would allow for a restriction to be put on further permitted development rights, the planning officer believed this application should be approved.

Ultimately, as the planning officer believed that the proposal would not be considered overbearing on the neighbours on either side, had sufficient parking, was fully contained in the existing footprint, and had a simplified design in comparison to the permitted development option, which is a material consideration, it was recommended for approval.

John Hughes, Richard Adams, and Stuart Morgan spoke objecting to the application.

Kathy Hills, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Emily Smith and Debby Hallett, local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the discussion of this application. When discussing the impact the proposed development would have on Sunningwell Road, it was noted that there were lots of variety in houses and lots of bungalow conversions in the area.

The committee also agreed with the planning officer's report that the proposed development was a better option than the applicant using their permitted development rights for a single storey rear extension as the application presented to

the committee was neater, contained within the existing footprint of the building, of a lower total volume increase, and fitting in with the character of the area with the potential of a condition to restrict further permitted development rights. An additional potential condition was also raised for the rooflight height to be over 1.7metres, and this was agreed by the committee to be appropriate.

Ultimately, as the permitted development fallback scenario was considered a realistic one which would be more harmful than proposed application, and the application was not out of character with the area or harmful to neighbours' amenity, the special circumstances that allowed for this development was considered to be met and the committee agreed to approve the application subject to conditions.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/V1786/HH, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Approved plans

Compliance:

2. Materials in accordance with the application
3. Permitted development restriction for extensions
4. Maintain parking spaces free from obstruction
5. Removal of unauthorised works
6. Rooflight sill height (extension)

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm