

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 30 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), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills, and Janet Shelley  
Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Nathaniel Bamsey (Planning Officer), Stuart Walker (Planning Officer), and Helena Ahier (Planning Officer)  
Guests: Councillor Bob Johnston (Ward Councillor)

#### Remote attendance:

Officers: Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer) and Susannah Mangion (Planning Officer)  
Guests: Councillor Debby Hallett (Ward Councillor)

### 79 Chair's announcements

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

The chair then paid his respects to Paul Bateman, former democratic services officer servicing the planning committee, who passed away on 9 November 2022 and held a minute's silence in his memory.

### 80 Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

### 81 Declarations of interest

Councillor Diana Lugova declared an interest in item 6 on the agenda due to application P22/V1120/FUL being in her ward and so she would not take part in the debate or vote on this application.

### 82 Urgent business

The development manager informed the committee that the planning service had withdrawn application P20/V2298/FUL on the land at Yarnells Hill, Oxford, from the agenda following legal advice.

### **83 Public participation**

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

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

The committee considered planning application P22/V1120/FUL for the erection of two dwellings with associated access and landscaping (as amended by plans received on the 25th of August 2022), on land at Site Of 1 Sugworth Crescent, 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.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was called into the committee by Councillor Diana Lugova. The planning officer informed the committee that site was in the parish of Radley but was considered to be within the built-up area of Kennington, within the Oxford Green Belt. There was previously a single dwelling on the site, but this was demolished leaving the site vacant.

The planning officer also indicated that permission was previously granted for a new dwelling to the north of the site, and that this application sought to subdivide the plot and erect 2 semi-detached houses on the south side.

As this application fell within the Oxford Green Belt, it would be considered inappropriate development unless there were certain exceptions. As the planning officer believed that the application could be considered limited infilling in a village, they recommended permission be granted subject to conditions.

Chris Henderson spoke on behalf of Radley Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Alex Edge, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

Members then asked why officers considered the site was in the built-up area of Kennington, when it was in Radley, and the planning officer confirmed that it was considered to be in the built-up area of Kennington village in planning terms but was in the parish of Radley.

The committee also noted that the application was for a pair of semi-detached houses in addition to the previously approved plans for the north of the site for an additional dwelling, meaning there would be three dwellings on the site in total if the application was approved. Members believed that if three properties were put forward together then they would not be approved as it would be considered overdevelopment and out of character with the surrounding area.

As the committee agreed that this application was overdevelopment of a green belt site and that the semi-detached buildings and their frontage onto the road were out of character with the surrounding area, the members agreed that the application should be refused.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P22/V1120/FUL, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed erection of two dwellings in addition to the single dwelling previously approved is considered to constitute overdevelopment of the site which would harm the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to policy CP13 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1, policy PP.2 of the Radley Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 137 of the NPPF.
2. The semi-detached design of the proposed dwellings is contrary to the unique character of the area particularly in relation to Sugworth Crescent to the north and the proposed hardstanding is considered to be overly prominent in the street scene. Therefore, the proposed development would be out of keeping with and harmful to local character, contrary to policy CP37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 1 and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

**85 P20/V2298/FUL - Land at Yarnells Hill, Oxford**

The application was withdrawn from the agenda.

**86 P22/V1545/FUL - Public Open Space Pointer Place, Marcham Abingdon, OX13 6FN**

The committee considered planning application P22/V1545/FUL for the improvements to public open space, including footpath connections, landscaping, and swales (as amended by plans and documentation received 8 August 2022), on land at Public Open Space, Pointer Place, Marcham, 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 due to the objection of Marcham Parish Council. The application itself was seeking to regularise a breach of planning control in the Willow Farm development and reinstate what was required in the original application. The planning officer noted that the parish council objected as it wanted to see additional linkages of the site to the north, and to the east where 90 dwellings had been approved. However, as the reserved matters application only contained the south link westwards, and not a link to the north, the Planning Enforcement officers were only pursuing the link shown on the approved plans. If the application was approved, it was confirmed that Planning Enforcement officers would pursue planning breaches in the adjoining site to ensure that the footpath would link, and that surfaces would be tarmacked.

The planning officer also noted the concerns of residents about the provision of a bench. The original plans had indicated there would be four benches and the planning officer advised the committee an acceptable compromise had been reached with the provision of one bench.

Overall, as both the hard and soft landscaping were considered acceptable, that the application did not diminish the character of the area, and that it was considered acceptable in drainage terms, the application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Councillor Michael Hoath spoke on behalf of Marcham Parish Council, objecting to the application.

A statement was read out on behalf of Councillor Catherine Webber, a local ward councillor who could not attend the meeting, objecting to the application.

The committee asked about the possibility of implementing a link from the site to the eastern development. However, the planning officer indicated that as the land was owned by a private third party it would not be possible. Also, when asked about the link to the north not being implemented, the planning officer confirmed that enforcement action could only be taken on what was in the detailed layout plan, and therefore only the south linkage could be pursued.

Members also asked the planning officer about footpath treatment and the necessity of making it a tarmacked surface, but as the path would be used by buggies and wheelchairs, the officers considered this to be a necessity. Finally, in response to a question about the placement of the proposed bench, the planning officer also confirmed that it would be placed in a public open space and not by a private garden.

The committee expressed their concern that the footpath and linkages were not implemented when the application was first completed and that the lack of a five year housing supply at that time had led to disconnected developments, but they agreed that this application was a good compromise to remedy the situation and so should be approved, 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/V1545/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. Within the next planting season and no later than 12 months of the date of this permission, all hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details (as shown on the listed drawings in condition 1). Thereafter, the landscaped areas shall be maintained for a period of 5 years. Any trees or shrubs which die or become seriously damaged or diseased within 5 years of planting shall

be replaced by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

3. Notwithstanding surface material details stated on drawing 13-1385-PACK-ICS-01-XX-DR-C-0100 Rev P02, the footpath connection shall be tarmac surfaced and within six months of the date of this permission, all drainage works, panel fence removal and the footpath shall be completed.

4. Tree Protection during construction.

## **87 P22/V1851/FUL - Wrens Hobbit Betty Lane Oxford, OX1 5BW**

The committee considered planning application P22/V1851/FUL for the change of use from highway to private garden (amended ownership certificate received 1 Sept 2022), on land at Wrens Hobbit, Betty Lane, 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.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to committee by the request of the planning manager. The planning officer then informed the committee that the application was for the change of use from a highway to a private garden enclosed by a timber fence. The site itself was within the Oxford Green Belt, adjacent to the applicant's dwelling, and separated from the A34 by land of unknown ownership – although that land was not materially relevant to the application.

The planning officer noted that despite being designated as a highway, Oxfordshire County Council, the highways authority, did not have the title for the site and had no objection to the application.

Although the parish council believed that the application would harm linkages from Betty Lane to the garden centre to the north, the path through the land was not a recognised public right of way in the definitive map. In addition, the planning officer presented the definitive map to the committee and showed members the existing bridleway that linked Hinksey Hill to the garden centre and did not consider the route to be inappropriate or inaccessible.

The planning officer also noted the key planning consideration for the application about the longer-term implications its approval would have on sustainable transport aspirations. However, as the route was not a formally recognised right of way, there were no proposals or initiatives to create a route, and the existing informal route was not considered safe or accessible for pedestrians and cyclists, officers believed there were no reasonable right of way or sustainable transport reasons for refusal.

Furthermore, the planning officer believed that through approving the application, conditions could also be placed on the land to limit hard surfacing, inappropriate boundary treatment, and to prevent outbuildings, and so meet the green belt requirements.

Overall, as the highways authority did not object and the application would not interfere with the sustainable transport requirements in the local plan, officers recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions.

Paul Barney, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

The committee noted that the site was currently considered a public highway, but also that there was no objection from the highway's authority about its change of use into a private garden. In addition, members recognised that there was currently no known owner of the site as Oxfordshire County Council possessed no title and the land was not registered with the land registry. The planning officer also informed the committee that it was the applicant's intent to take possession of the land over time if an owner did not come forward.

Members then asked about access for utilities and the planning officer confirmed that, as part of the stopping up process, the applicant had to consult with utilities to ask if they had any objections, but none had come forward. In addition, the planning officer confirmed that if the change of use was granted it would not prevent access for those utilities.

At this stage, members considered adding an additional condition onto the approval about requiring the applicant to provide land for the use of a footpath if a future plan for one was made and funded, however the committee considered this condition would not meet the necessary planning tests and so was not included.

A question was raised about the application being part retrospective. Although the planning officer confirmed that this should have no material impact on the decision about the application, a highways officer had seen a chain and some garden pots being placed across a part of the highway. As the stopping up process required that the highway had not already been fenced off, the chain and pots were requested to be removed, which the applicant had since done. The Oxfordshire County Council highways officer had also indicated that the chain and pots had not precluded public access as it did not extend the full width of the site.

Finally, the planning officer clarified a point about the condition involving the removal of permitted development rights and confirmed that all outbuildings would not be permitted, and the provision of hard surfacing and a garden shed would also need planning permission.

Overall, members believed that as the highways authority had no objection, and the land was going to be controlled through conditions, the application was acceptable.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/V1851/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Commencement 3 years
2. Approved plans

Compliance:

3. External lighting
4. Gates shall be inward opening only
5. Permitted development restriction on outbuildings and boundary treatments

Informatives:

6. Works within the Highway
7. Highway markers
8. Drainage

**88 P22/V2414/HH - Dunraven House 32 London Street Faringdon, SN7 7AA**

The committee considered planning application P22/V2414/HH for the installation of electric vehicle charging point and outdoor power socket, including electric cabling, on land 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 introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to the committee as the application was a district councillor and local ward member. The planning officer then presented the design and placement of the proposed electric vehicle charging point and power socket at the back of the building. The planning officer believed that the proposed application was acceptable and so recommended it was approval subject to conditions.

The committee then asked if this application would have come to the committee if it was not applied for by a ward councillor and the planning officer confirmed that they did not believe it would.

Members were satisfied with the officer's report and could not see any material planning reason for refusal.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/V2414/HH, 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

**89 P22/V2278/LB - Dunraven House 32 London Street Faringdon, SN7 7AA**

The committee considered planning application P22/V2278/LB for the installation of electric vehicle charging point and outdoor power socket, including electric cabling, on land 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.

Members considered the listed building application with the prior householder application and were also satisfied with the officer's report and could not see any 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/V2278/LB, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

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

Compliance:

3. Details and materials in accordance with the application details

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm