

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Tuesday, 15 February 2022 at 7.00 pm in I
Floor Meeting Space, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton
Park, OX14 4SB

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, Diana Lugova, Ben Mabbett, Mike Pighills and Eric Batts (In place of Janet Shelley)

Officers: Paul Bateman and Emily Hamerton

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Matthew Barber, Hayleigh Gascoigne and Janet Shelley

Officers: Helena Ahier, Edward Church, Michael Flowers, Alick Nattan, Nathalie Power, Bertie Smith, Stuart Walker and Hanna Zembrzycka - Kisiel

Guests: Edward Church, Senior Countryside Officer/Ecologist, Ian Marshall, Principal Transport Engineer, Oxfordshire County Council

35. Chair's announcements

The chair ran through housekeeping arrangements appropriate to an in-person meeting which was being simultaneously broadcast.

36. Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence. However, Councillor Janet Shelley was unable to attend the meeting in person and Councillor Eric Batts attended in person as substitute. Councillor Shelley attended virtually as local ward member and did not vote on any of the items.

37. Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held Wednesday 29 September and Wednesday 20 October 2021 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

38. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

39. Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

40. Public participation

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

41. Care Home site, Centre West Phase, Kingsgrove

The committee considered application P21/V2040/RM in respect of a Reserved Matters application for the construction of a 72-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated access, parking, landscaping, plant and site infrastructure, pursuant to outline planning permission P19/V1269/FUL. Details submitted in accordance with conditions 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 43, 48 and 54. As amended by plans and information received 29 September 2021, 28 October 2021 and 17 December 2021, at Care Home site, Centre West Phase, Kingsgrove.

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 reminded the committee that it had deferred consideration of this application on 7 December 2021 for a further revision of the proposal. The reasons for deferral related to the layout of car parking spaces and concerns regarding a lack of a continuous pedestrian pavement on the external road outside the proposed development. Wantage Town Council had objected on the grounds of pedestrian safety. The amended plans now incorporated a continuous footpath on the south side of the site, which necessitated the loss of two parking spaces, which was acceptable to the council's officers. Wantage Town Council continued to object on the basis of insufficient parking spaces and the need for a marked pedestrian route.

Mr Andrew Ryley, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

In response to a question regarding the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group's objection on the basis of the purported need for a financial contribution towards the expansion of Wantage primary care networks, the planning officer responded that this was not a material consideration for a reserved matters application. Such issues would require resolution at outline application stage.

The committee concluded that the amended application was acceptable and that the application should be permitted.

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

RESOLVED: that the Reserved Matters for planning application P21/V2040/RM are approved, subject to the following:

Condition:

1. Approved plans.
2. Travel Plan implementation.

Informative:

1. Details pursuant to conditions 8, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 43, 47, 48 and 54 of outline planning permission P19/V1269/FUL are agreed for this phase through the approval of the Reserved Matters application.
2. The applicant is reminded of the obligation of compliance with the relevant conditions on the outline application that apply to this phase (e.g., CEMP & LEMP implementation).

42. Former Esso Research Centre, Abingdon Road, Milton Hill, OX13 6BD

The committee considered application P21/V1171/FUL for the erection of 4no. commercial buildings for purposes within Classes B2 and B8 together with access and servicing arrangements, parking, landscaping, boundary treatment, gatehouse building, public art installation and associated works. (as per amendments received 30 November 2021 and Transport Assessment Addendum received 10 January 2022 and additional and amended information received 18 January 2022) at the former Esso Research Centre, Abingdon Road, Milton Hill.

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 council's conservation officer, senior countryside officer and the Oxfordshire County Council's principal transport engineer were present at the meeting to answer any question from the committee. The planning officer also reported an incorrect date in paragraph 7.4; "Developer Contributions – Delivering Infrastructure to Support Development (2017)"; which should read "2021".

The planning officer also reported that since submission of the application in May 2021, there had been several amendments submitted by the applicant to address technical issues raised by the landscape officer, drainage engineer, environmental protection officers, countryside officer, forestry officer, conservation officer, urban design officer and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), the highways authority. These changes included landscape, drainage, environmental protection, conservation and tree issues. The latest amendments included a building extent reduction (unit 1), removal of two units to provide for the strengthening of a landscape buffer (units 3A, 3B), landscape buffer strengthening along western unit façade, and building extent reduction to avoid the root protection areas of two trees (unit 5). The Oxfordshire County Council did not object to the amended scheme. The conservation officer had withdrawn their adverse comments on the basis of the revised scheme. Overall, council officers considered that the proposal would not cause unacceptable landscape, visual or arboricultural harm to result in a conflict with policy CP44.

The planning officer also reported that there was no Neighbourhood Plan for Milton Village.

With respect to the proposed conditions, the planning officer reported that condition 12, Landscape Management Plan, had originally been listed as a Pre-Commencement condition. It was now proposed to have this as a Compliance condition. This was acceptable to the committee. Additionally, officers considered that the applicant should aim to attain the Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) rating of Excellence and therefore a new condition dealing with this issue would be added.

The planning officer provided the committee with a slide presentation, giving an indicative three-dimensional view of the units, which included the access roads. The applicants had worked with the OCC in respect of the content of the S.106 agreement. The committee were shown photo slides of the site, its access points and highways and the proposed landscaping scheme. The highways impact was acceptable, and officers had concluded that the application would benefit the local economy.

The speaker on behalf of Milton Parish Council was unable to address the committee but the parish council's statement had been submitted to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Councillor Sally Povolotsky, Oxfordshire Councillor, spoke objecting to the application. Councillor Povolotsky's statement had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Ms. Carole Hooper and Mr. John Seaton of Rowstock Residents Association, spoke objecting to the application. Statements by the Rowstock Residents' Association had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Stephen Morgan-Hyland of Milton Hill House Hotel, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Mr. Stephen Morgan-Hyland had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Richard Batham-Read, of Equation Properties, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. A statement by Equation Properties had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Tim Rainbird, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the height of the proposed development, the agent stated that 18m. high buildings already had permission and that tall buildings were necessary to facilitate vertical racking systems.

In response to a question from the committee regarding delivery timings and noise mitigation, the agent replied that 24-hour deliveries would be a feature of the operation. Also, noise consultants had been commissioned to undertake a backyard night-time survey. Substantial mitigation would result from the operational management plan agreed with the environmental health officer, entailing, inter alia, acoustic alternatives on key boundaries.

Mr. David Frisby, by prior arrangement, responding on behalf of the developer, answered a question from the committee regarding roundabout traffic, stated that traffic surveys had been undertaken in consultation with OCC and that the Rowstock roundabout would be improved.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the reasons for including both B2 and B8 use, Mr. Rainbird replied that both use classes were important for the success of the development and its commercial operation, and that the two classifications maximised market attractiveness. Replying to a question suggesting inadequate parking provision, Mr. Rainbird replied that the OCC had agreed that the arrangements were fit for purpose and that overflow space was now provided where unit 3 had been removed from the final proposal. Generally speaking, B8 occupiers required fewer parking facilities.

The committee noted that the Operational Noise Management Plan, included in a proposed condition, relied on the co-operation of drivers and sought assurances as to its enforceability. Mr. Rainbird replied that as a planning condition, there would be an obligation in the site's lease to comply with the Plan. Legal controls would therefore bind the occupier to the plan.

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

Councillor Matthew Barber, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Providing clarification on queries regarding noise generation, Mr. Alick Natton, environmental health officer, reported that day and night movements of heavy goods vehicles were compared against existing figures and fed into a noise model, with impacts averaged over time. Mr. Ian

Marshall stated that Rowstock Residents Association had requested traffic measurements to only be morning and evening movements, but that OCC were content with traffic flows being measured over a 24-hour period. OCC employed a robust methodology, used by all highways authorities.

In response to a question regarding public transport, Mr. Marshall reported that to promote cycling and walking, part of the highway mitigation works included a toucan crossing and an upgrade of the existing northbound footway on the A4130 (to a minimum 3m. width, to allow for a shared-use route for cyclists and pedestrians), from the Packhorse Inn bus stops/byway (299/13/30) up to the Steventon Lights Junction, without compromising the A4130 running lane widths. Also, the OCC would include improvements to the Rowstock roundabout to slow down traffic at this location and that the authority had an option for drawing down finance to fund improvements.

In response to a question from the committee concerning alternative sites, the planning officer reported that the market assessment made by the economic development unit and the policy team was up to date and had taken into account all relevant information.

Whilst acknowledging the work and details which had gone into formulating and amending the application, the committee had concerns in respect of scale, nature, overdevelopment and visual harm. Noise and disturbance at night were also concerns, as were apparently inadequate transport mitigation measures. The absence of a completed S.106 legal agreement also did not provide reassurance. In conclusion, the committee considered that the proposal did not comply with Core Policy 28.

A motion moved and seconded, to refuse planning permission was carried on being put to the vote (Councillor Mike Pighills was unable to participate in the vote owing to technical difficulties).

RESOLVED: that planning permission for planning application P21/V1171/FUL is refused, for the following reasons:

1. The proposal represents an overdevelopment and would result in a visually harmful development which is not sympathetic to the semi-rural character of the surrounding area by reason of the size, bulk, scale, height and massing of the proposed built form. On this basis the development conflicts with the Core Policies 28, 37 and 44 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1;

2. Due to 24hr operation of premises, the proposal would result in noise and disturbance late at night in the vicinity of the site to the detriment of the neighbouring properties and business. The location of the proposed buildings and the nature of the proposed business operation (linked to the Class B2/B8 uses), relative to nearby neighbouring properties and businesses would be harmful to their amenity, contrary to Core Policy 28 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Development Policies 23 and 25 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2; and Paragraphs 185 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate transport mitigation measures to ensure the development would not impact the highway network and highway safety and fails to deliver adequate sustainable transport. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Core Policies 33 and 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Development Policies 16 and 17 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2, as well as paragraphs 110, 111 and 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

4. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement relating to financial contributions towards traffic and air quality impact mitigation, public transport and travel plan monitoring, the proposal would place increased pressure on these facilities and fail to provide the environmental and social services needed to support this development. This is considered

contrary to Core Policies 7, 33 and 35 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Development Policies 16, 17 and 26 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

NB Reason 4 could be overcome by entering into a section 106 agreement with Oxfordshire County Council.

43. Dulcina, Newmans Close, Upton, OX11 9JA Dulcina, Newmans Close, Upton, OX11 9JA

The committee considered application P21/V3077/HH for the partial demolition of existing dwelling. Erection of new front and rear extensions. Conversion of existing loft space into habitable accommodation. Refurbishment and associated internal reconfiguration (parking arrangements and fenestration detail clarified on plans submitted 28th and 31st January 2022) at Dulcina, Newmans Close, Upton.

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 Mr. Edward Church, the council's ecologist, was present in case the committee had any questions regarding great crested newts.

The planning officer reported that some figures shown in the report required correction; the distance from the southern boundary stated as "1.6m" in paragraphs 5.9 and 5.17 should read "1m. -1.4m".

Although the cumulative extent of the development would be significant, planning officers considered that its juxtaposition to existing dwellings, the size of the plot and relationship to other dwellings in the street scene, were all acceptable. The bathroom window at the southern end of the development would be obscure glazed and installed shut. The distance between Dulcina and the nearest dwelling was not considered to represent an unacceptable level of harm. The committee was shown slides depicting demolition operations on the site and views from the south of rear gardens.

The planning officer also reported on the effect of the proposal upon protected animal species. A survey of great crested newts indicated that these reptiles were sparsely distributed and featured mainly in the north. This application would not have an impact upon the newt population.

Dr. Derek Whitmell, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. James Basey, the agent, spoke in support of the application. In response to a question from the committee regarding ridge height, Mr. Basey responded that the design incorporated dormer windows.

A statement from Mr and Mrs Stimson, local residents, had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

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

A statement by Councillor Sarah Medley, a local ward councillor, had been sent to the committee by the chair 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 P21/V3077/HH subject to the following conditions:

Standard

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

Pre-commencement

3. Tree Protection Details to be submitted

Compliance

4. Materials in Accordance with Application Details
5. Obscured Glazing (Opening Top Hung Casement Only)
6. Rooflights (Sill Height No Lower Than 1.7m from finished floor level)
7. Car Parking area to be implemented and kept free of obstruction to use

Informative

8. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

44. Dunraven House, 32 London Street, Faringdon, SN7 7AA

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

The committee considered application P21/V3079/LB for the replacement of existing rotting wooden slimline double-glazed windows on the first and second floors to the rear of the property at Dunraven House, 32 London Street, Faringdon.

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 building was a grade II listed dwelling in the Faringdon Conservation Area. The committee concluded that the window replacements would be sympathetic to the historic and architectural interest of the building and complied fully with national and council policies.

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

RESOLVED: to grant listed building consent for application P21/V3079/LB subject to the following conditions:

Standard

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

Compliance

3. Details and materials in accordance with the application details.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm