

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 6 January 2021 at 6.00 pm



A virtual meeting

Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Jerry Avery, Ron Batstone, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Mike Pighills and Janet Shelley

Officers: Paul Bateman, Holly Bates, Martin Deans, Lewis Dixey, Sarah Green, Emily Hamerton, Susannah Mangion, Susie Royse and Josh Sharp

Also present: Councillor Paul Barrow and Councillor Catherine Webber

Number of members of the public: 7

PI.194 Chair's announcements

The Chair ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to a virtual meeting.

PI.195 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Robert Maddison.

PI.196 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting, held on Wednesday 11 November 2020, were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting. It was agreed that the Chair sign them as such.

PI.197 Declarations of interest

None.

PI.198 Urgent business

None.

PI.199 Public participation

Vale of White Horse District Council - Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 6 January 2021

The committee had received statements which had been made by the public in respect of the applications. These had been circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

PI.200 P20/V0225/FUL - Former Scout Hut, Main Street, East Challow, Wantage, OX12 9SL

The committee considered application P20/V0225/FUL to demolish the former scout hut and replace it with a new four-bedroom house. Replace existing storage building with a detached garage with storage space in the roof. (Additional parking and hardstanding details as shown on ECHL.P01F) at the former Scout Hut, Main Street, East Challow, 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 reported that the committee had deferred consideration of this application at their meeting on 11 November 2020, to facilitate a site visit. The application had been amended to reduce the mass of the building and omit an encroachment into an adjacent field.

The planning officer also advised that East Challow Parish Council and some neighbours had raised concerns regarding the alleged overdevelopment of the site. Planning officers did not consider that the proposal constituted overdevelopment. There would be some impact, but this would be minimal; it would be upon the outlook experienced from the neighbouring properties, which was a material consideration. However, given the size of the proposed dwelling, and the distances involved, planning officers had concluded that the effect on outlook would not be sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission.

The planning officer also reported that the concern of some neighbours regarding the loss of a community facility had been considered. With the assistance of photographic slides forming part of the presentation, demonstrating the present poor state of repair of the interior of the scout hut, the planning officer reported that the facility had not been used for over 16 years and that no interest had been shown in resuming this use. Additionally, local community facilities had been improved with the refurbishment of the East Challow village hall.

Local objections on the basis of highways safety and the public right of way had also been considered by planning officers. The county highways officer had been consulted and had raised no objection, stating that, given that the previous use would have had some traffic associated with it in this location, there were no objections in principle to the proposed residential development. However, highways and planning officers were of the view that the control of the demolition and construction traffic was considered to be a reasonable requirement. The submission of a demolition/construction traffic management plan (D/CTMP) had been secured and a recommended condition referred to this.

Mr. Duncan Wolage, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Paul Barrow, speaking as the local ward councillor and as an East Challow parish councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the protection of the public right of way, the planning officer confirmed that the aforementioned D/CTMP would provide an adequate safeguard. The senior planning officer advised members that the committee's concern in this regard could be highlighted by means of an appropriate Informative, in the event of planning permission being granted. The committee agreed to this proposal.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P20/V0225/FUL, subject to the following conditions and with the addition of the Informative in respect of the protection of the public right of way:

1. TL1 - Time limit - Full Application (Full)
2. Approved plans

Pre-commencement Conditions:

3. MC25 - Drainage Details (Surface Water) (Full)
4. MC26 - Drainage Details (Foul Water) (Full)
5. Demolition/Construction Traffic Management (details required)
6. LS1 - Landscaping Scheme (Submission) (Full)
7. RE18 - Slab Levels (Single Dwellings) (Full)

Pre-occupation condition:

8. HY6[I] - Access, Park. & Turn. in accord. Plan

Compliance Conditions:

9. MC3 - Materials in Accordance with App. (Full)
10. RE11 - Garage Accommodation (Full)

Addition of Informative; D/CTMP to safeguard public right of way.

PI.201 P20/V1492/HH - 1 Gooseacre, Radley, Abingdon, OX14 3BL

Councillor Diana Lugova, a local ward councillor, stood down from the committee for consideration of this item.

The committee considered application P20/V1492/HH for a proposed garage extension (amended Plans received 5th October showing the garage set down and moved off the shared boundary with number 2 Gooseacre) at 1 Gooseacre, Radley, 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. Consideration of this application by the committee had been deferred at its meeting on 2 December 2020, owing to an expiration of time under the principles of the council's constitution. A site visit had been conducted on 14 December 2020.

The planning officer reported that amended plans had been received on 5 October 2020, depicting the garage with a reduced roof height of 4.0m, compared to the 4.9m originally proposed, with an altered pitch roof design, and set off the neighbouring boundary by an additional 300mm. Officers considered that the extension to the garage was compliant with

the requirements set out in Policy CP37 of the Local Plan Part 1 and the guidance contained within the Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015 Supplementary Planning Document. The garage would remain single-storey and subordinate to the main dwelling. The proposal was considered to be proportionate in scale to the main property, with a sympathetic form, through the use of a dual pitched roof form and matching building materials.

Mr. Brian Hicks, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent a statement from Mr Hicks to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Lewis, the applicants, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Bob Johnston, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee expressed concern about the potential harm that the development might make to an attractive mature tree on the site. It noted from the applicants that amended plans had relocated the wall away from the boundary fence and the height of the proposed development had been reduced significantly. Also, building works would be minimised, along with potential harm to the tree, through building upon an existing concrete base. The committee noted that the forestry officer had examined the issue of protecting the tree and had concluded that it did not meet the criteria to be protected by a tree preservation order and that imposing a planning condition was not an appropriate solution. However, an Informative, strongly advising to safeguard the tree during works, could be apposite.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission, with the inclusion of a tree Informative, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P20/V1492/HH, subject to the following conditions and with the addition of an Informative regarding tree safeguarding:

Standard:

1. Commencement of development within three years
2. Works in accordance with the approved plans

Compliance:

3. Materials in accordance with approved details

Informative:

4. Party Wall Informative
5. Tree management informative

Additional Informative: safeguarding of tree on application site.

**PI.202 P20/V2385/FUL - 17 Bow Bank, Longworth, Abingdon, OX13
5ER**

Councillor Jerry Avery, the local ward councillor, stood down from the committee for consideration of this item.

The committee considered application P20/V2385/FUL for a two storey side extension to create two dwellings at 17 Bow Bank, 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 reported that Longworth was identified as a 'Smaller Village' under Policy CP4 of the Local Plan Part 1, which managed development in the smaller villages and stated that limited infill development might be appropriate within the existing built areas of these settlements, or if it was allocated within an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan or future parts of the Local Plan 2031. The committee was also advised that Policy 1 of Longworth Neighbourhood Plan stated that proposals for limited infill development inside the village's built-up areas would be supported, provided they were in-keeping with the character of the local dwellings and landscapes, and that they were proportionate in scale to existing buildings in the vicinity.

The committee was advised that in terms of the type of development that was acceptable under the neighbourhood plan, the limitations were imposed "on any single site". Longworth Parish Council had objected to the proposal as it had considered that it would give rise to a terrace of four homes (the full wording of Policy 1 of the Longworth Neighbourhood Plan was provided at paragraph 5.2 of the report). The parish council's conclusion in respect of this application appeared to be based on including an existing dwelling that was not on the site, the dwelling at 18 Bow Bank. Planning officers considered that the application site itself would comply with the policy, as there would be one terrace of three homes on the site; the existing semi-detached dwelling, plus two additional homes, that is, a terrace of three homes on a single site. Consequently, planning officers had concluded that the proposal complied with Policy 1 of the Longworth Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed development also accorded with the definition of 'limited infill' in that neighbourhood plan.

The Longworth Parish Council were not able to be present at the meeting to address the committee; Councillor Jerry Avery, the local ward councillor, read that council's statement of objection to the committee meeting.

Mr. Michael Gilbert the agent, was unable to be present at the meeting through telecommunication difficulties, but his statement of support had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P20/V2385/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Commencement
2. Approved plans

Prior to commencement:

3. Surface water drainage
4. Foul water drainage

5. External materials
6. Access details

Compliance:

7. Hedge protection
8. Bin storage and collection point in accordance with plans
9. Parking in accordance with plans
10. Visitor parking space
11. Removal of Permitted Development Rights – windows or rooflights

Informatives:

Community Infrastructure Levy - General Consent
Works within the Highway

**PI.203 P20/V0348/FUL - Land adjoining No. 38 Barrow Road,
Shippon, OX13 6JF**

The committee considered application P20/V0348/FUL for the variation of conditions 2 - Approved Plans and 6 - Landscaping Scheme of application P16/V3165/FUL. (Proposed 4no. dwellings and works there to.) (Amended plans and additional information received 24 April 2020, amended site plan showing waste vehicle tracking received 1 May 2020 and amended plans and information received 29 July 2020). (Additional ecology information received 22 October 2020 and NatureSpace Report received 27 November 2020) on land adjoining No. 38 Barrow Road, Shippon.

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 reported that this application and application P20/V0369/FUL, on land adjoining the same address (also on the meeting's agenda), should be treated as separate applications and were not dependent upon one another.

The planning officer reported that the application sought a variation to an existing planning permission granted in 2017. The principle of allowing four dwellings on the site had been established by that planning permission. The application was in respect of a variation to approved plans, which included the re-positioning plots 3 and 4 and amending their layout and detailed design. The planning officer also reported that there were three listed buildings in close proximity to the site; the location of these listed buildings were shown on a map at paragraph 1.3 of the report.

The planning officer drew the committee's attention to the ridge heights of the proposed dwellings, as St. Helen Without Parish Council and four neighbours had objected with regard to the height above ground level of the proposed dwellings. Referring to paragraph 5.9 of the report, the planning officer confirmed that the buildings would be 8.1m in height (plots 1,2 4) and 7.6m in height (plot 3). The site levels were not intended to be lowered, as in the previous application. In terms of actual height, the ridge of plots 1 and 2 would be 0.23 metres above the approved ridge for those plots. The actual ridge height of plot 3 would be the same as approved plot 3, with plot 4 being 0.45 metres higher than the approved plot 3. Some objectors had communicated to the council their own estimated height values, measured from ground level, which were incorrect. All

measurements being considered as part of the application had been taken from a datum and were heights above sea level. The planning officer acknowledged that the height of the dwellings in some cases would be slightly more than those approved, but advised that height should not be considered in isolation, but as part of the overall impact of a development.

Councillor Michael Page, a representative of St Helen Without Parish Council spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent a statement from the parish council to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. David Churchouse, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent Mr. Churchouse's statement to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Alex Cresswell, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Catherine Webber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee expressed concern at the cramped form of the development and considered that it clustered in a way which would be harmful to the local character of the area. Notwithstanding the explanations regarding the height measurement of the buildings, the committee remained concerned about the ridge heights of the development. It considered that the development would adversely harm visual amenity and would be harmful to the character of the area and setting of listing buildings.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P20/V0348/FUL, for the following reasons;

1. The proposal would result in the development being clustered and overdeveloped in one part of the site;
2. The development would result in a cramped form of development which would be out of character for the area.
3. Coupled with the increase in ridge heights, more complex building design and changes to the northern boundary wall, the development would adversely harm the visual amenity and be harmful to the character of the area and setting of listing buildings

**PI.204 P20/V0369/FUL - Land adjacent to No.38 Barrow Road,
Shippon, OX13 6JF**

Part way through the consideration of this application, members took a vote prior to the meeting guillotine of 8:30pm to continue.

Owing to telecommunication difficulties, Councillor Mike Pighills did not hear full debate and did not vote on this application.

The committee considered application P20/V0369/FUL for the erection of 2 no. dwelling houses with associated operations. (Amended plans and information, including reduction

from three to two dwellings, received 29 July 2020), on land adjacent to No.38 Barrow Road, Shippon.

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 reported that the application should be considered as a stand-alone application on its own merits, even though a related application had just been determined by the committee. This full application sought the erection of two dwellings on part of the wider paddock site. It was proposed that the two houses would be built on the area where approved plot 4 under P16/V3165/FUL was to be located, but which under the variation application P20/V0348/FUL would instead be open land. Therefore, should the variation application and this application be permitted, there would be a total of six dwellings on the paddock site rather than four.

The planning officer reported that the of the Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan recognised that development proposals should take account of locally important vistas, specifically naming Shippon. The planning officer advised that the effect of the application on the vista to Barrow Road was a material consideration and that historically a similar building on this site had been permitted, therefore the committee would need to make a judgment upon its importance when determining this application. The application was not considered to be overdevelopment by officers and was regarded as limited infill.

Councillor Michael Page, a representative of St Helen Without Parish Council spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent a statement from the parish council to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Richard Bahu, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent a statement from Mr. Bahu to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Alex Cresswell, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Catherine Webber, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee expressed a concern about the possible loss of a 300-year-old chestnut tree which already was the subject of a tree preservation order. In answer to a question, the agent advised that in the event of permission being granted, steps would be taken to safeguard tree during building works.

The committee had concerns that the application was contrary to the neighbourhood plan, had an impact on the character of the local area because of complexity, clustering and prominence, and represented intensification of the site. The committee also considered that there would be a harmful effect upon nearby listed buildings and the Barrow Road vista.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P20/V0369/FUL, for the following reasons;

1. The proposal would result in an intensification of development on this part of the site, coupled with the prominent location and complex building design, the development
- Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

would adversely harm the visual amenity and be harmful to the character of the area and setting of listing buildings.

2. The intensification of development would have a detrimental effect on views across the site which have been identified as an important local vista in policy SS4 of the Wootton and St Helen Without Neighbourhood Plan.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm