

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Tuesday, 14 February 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), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Hayleigh Gascoigne, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison and Janet Shelley  
Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Lewis Dixey (Planning Officer), and Stuart Walker (Planning Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer) and Katherine Canavan (Planning Officer)  
Guests: Will Pedley (Oxfordshire County Council Senior Transport Planner), Tim Willisam (Environmental Health Officer), and Katherine Hamer (Oxfordshire County Council Principal Transport Planner)

### **108 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.

### **109 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Pighills, who was substituted for Councillor Hayleigh Gascoigne, and Councillor Val Shaw.

### **110 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Cheryl Briggs declared an interest in item 7 on the agenda due to application P22/V2285/O being in her ward and so she would not take part in the debate or vote on this application.

### **111 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **112 Public participation**

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

## **113 P22/V0248/O - Land East of Kingston Bagpuize**

The committee considered planning application P22/V0248/O for a hybrid planning application comprising: 1) outline planning permission, with all matters reserved except for access, for development of up to 660 (use class C3), extra care development of up to 70 units (use class C2), a local centre of up to 0.5ha (use classes C2, E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(e), E(f), E(g)(i), F1, F2), a one form entry primary school on an area for educational provision of up to 2.2ha, playing field and car parking, informal open space, landscape and sustainable drainage areas, access, footpaths, cycle ways, infrastructure and associated engineering works (including a noise attenuation bund and acoustic fence) and 2) full planning permission for construction of a three arm roundabout to the A420 (Oxford Road), a four arm roundabout to the A415 (Abingdon Road) and link road between (as amended by information received 22 June 2022, 5 July 2022 and additional transport information received 18 August 2022 and additional air quality information received 29 November 2022), on land East of Kingston Bagpuize.

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 its scale. The proposal was a hybrid application, seeking outline permission for up to 660 houses with associated infrastructure, a care facility with up to 70 bedrooms, a local centre with a mixture of uses, primary school, informal open space, and sought full planning permission for a link road and two roundabouts.

The planning officer informed members of several updates to the report since publication; a correction to paragraph 5.39 of the report in which it was the landowner who purchased the land not the applicant, and to confirm the highways contribution figures with £1,574,768 sought for the Frilford junction improvement, and improvements delivered prior to 200 occupations, and £121,682 for the Marcham interchange improvement, delivered prior to 299 occupations. Oxfordshire County Council officers confirmed they would contact the applicant prior to 50 occupations as to whether they required the applicant to direct deliver the works or to make these contributions to the council for wider schemes. In addition, an

update was given from Thames Water that the Kingston Bagpuize sewage treatment work improvement project was on schedule to deliver as planned with March 2024 for storm tank capacity and December 2024 for permit compliance. Therefore, the planning officer was satisfied that the Environment Agency's objection was overcome, and the application would be acceptable.

The planning officer highlighted to the committee that the site was allocated in the local plan for around 600 houses and was to the east of Kingston Bagpuize, but within the parish of Fyfield and Tubney. On housing delivery, the planning officer highlighted that the site was expected to deliver 165 dwellings towards the council's 6.29 years deliverable supply outlined in the council's five-year housing land supply statement, from November 2022.

The outline element of the application reserved all matters for future consideration but provided parameter plans for land use, green infrastructure, and heights, along with indicative plans and a design and access statement.

The indicative access and movement plans showed the general arrangements of blocks on site, their arrangement, location of certain facilities and open spaces, and the indicative vehicle access points into the site from the link road. It was also noted that the heights of the proposed development were two to three stories. The planning officers also considered that the detail provided in the design and access statement was acceptable to inform a future reserved matters application.

The planning officer then addressed some potential issues but concluded that, the principle of development was acceptable as the site was allocated in the local plan, the quantity of development was acceptable, urban design, density, amenity and open spaces were satisfactory and also that the provision of affordable housing, space standards, housing mix, and type of housing could be secured to be local plan policy compliant. In addition, the planning officer considered the development would not cause unacceptable landscape or visual harm and were also satisfied that the application was acceptable on flood risk, drainage, heritage, and biodiversity grounds.

On highways, the planning officer advised that access into the site was satisfactory and that offsite mitigation works at Marcham, Frilford, and in Kingston Bagpuize, along with bus service contributions could be secured, which meant that the application was acceptable.

On air quality, the planning officer informed members that no mitigation would be required, that air quality matters had been independently assessed, and that the application would be compliant with local plan policies. It was also noted that the application would be acceptable and policy compliant regarding climate change, but the planning officer proposed that an additional informative on water usage could be added if the committee was to grant permission.

On health provision, the planning officer informed members that a request from the local primary care network for a contribution to expanding healthcare facilities had been received. In response to this, the applicant and National Health Service health board were exploring the option of providing health facility accommodation on site – potentially consulting rooms and a pharmacy in the local centre – and this could be secured through a legal agreement. Also, should on site provision not be possible, an offsite contribution would be required instead.

In summary, as the site was a strategic allocation in the local plan, it would contribute to the sustainable growth in the district, and provided a contribution towards the provision of housing in the current five-year housing supply target. In addition, as there were no technical reasons for refusal, the planning officer recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Councillor Dimitrios Hatzis spoke on behalf of Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council, objecting to the application. Councillor Virginia Grant spoke on behalf of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Vicky Bilton, the applicant, Roger Smith, the agent for the application, and Sean McIntyre, Duncon Laxen, Craig Smith, James Bird, and Paul Birkenshaw spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Eric Batts, a local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

The planning officer was assisted in answering the committees' questions on the application by several other technical officers from Vale of White Horse District Council and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC).

The committee asked about the vehicular impact on air quality and the air quality assessment for the application. In response, the senior transport planner confirmed that OCC officers had examined this in detail and were content with quality of the air quality assessment and were

satisfied that all the inputs were robustly identified. The environmental health officer also confirmed that the council worked with OCC to examine the air quality assessment and was also satisfied that the application was acceptable in air quality terms.

On public transport, members asked where the Section 106 money from the application would be directed to and to what specific bus routes it would help fund. The senior transport planner at OCC clarified that there were no specific plans to direct the money to specific public transport routes at that stage but that members should be confident that the funds would be used for Community Infrastructure Levy compliant ways. In addition, the OCC principal transport planner added that this funding would be of benefit to the public transport service as required in a new policy and that the contributions would be for bus services serving the application site. In addition, the principal transport planner confirmed the provision of new bus stops along the A415, with formal crossings, and to better utilise the stops at Oxford Road.

Members then asked about OCC use of Section 106 money for infrastructure improvements and that, if the County Council decided to use the money for a wider scheme rather than the specific upgrades to Frilford and Marcham, would this be in place by the specific occupation trigger points. The OCC transport officer confirmed that they would look to implement either scheme in a similar time frame to allow for the allocated housing to come forward in timely manner.

In addition, the planning officer confirmed that associated infrastructure to the application, such as the link road and roundabout were the full part of the application and as they were expected to be a key access for construction, that they would be delivered early on if the application was approved.

A point of clarification about the mitigation of air quality in Marcham prior to occupation was also raised at this stage and the planning officer confirmed that this offsetting prior to occupation was no longer needed due to the air impact reports reviewed by the independent assessor.

Members then asked about the risk of foul water pollution to Bagpuize Brook, the reason for the Environment Agency's original objection, but were satisfied with the response from the planning officer that the Thames Water mitigation works would be sufficient and therefore that the Environment Agency's concerns would be addressed satisfactorily by conditions. On improvements to the wider sewage network, members also noted that this was beyond the scope of the planning regime and was for Thames Water to provide the infrastructure to serve the development.

The committee then asked about the health facility in the local centre and were satisfied with the planning officers' response that that a legal agreement would secure either the provision of those facilities or a contribution to a different project.

Finally, members also asked about pre-planting of trees, but the planning officer confirmed that this could be encouraged but not conditioned.

Overall, members were satisfied that the application complied with all the relevant local plan policies and were specifically happy with proposals around Electric Vehicle charging points, solar panels, an extra primary school and a care facility, and also around the provision of a space for healthcare in the local centre. Members discussed the potential of S106 money not being invested directly in highways improvements to the Frilford junction but going into the wider scheme, and also about the proposed second cricket pitch needing a perimeter fence or availability for other uses but did not believe these constituted reasons for refusal.

Therefore, as members were satisfied with the proposed conditions, subject to the inclusion of an additional informative on water use, they agreed that the application should be approved.

A motion, moved and seconded, to delegate authority to approve the application to the head of planning was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the head of planning to approve planning application P22/V0248/O, subject to the following:

a) A S106 agreement being entered into to secure affordable housing, a primary school and land for expansion, onsite play, and sports provision, Frilford junction and Marcham interchange highway improvements and financial contributions towards traffic impact mitigation, public transport, travel plan monitoring, public art, street naming, waste bin provision, education and the management of public open spaces, sport and play areas; and

b) the following planning conditions:

Standard:

1. Reserved matters to be approved
2. Reserved matters time limit for submission
3. Time limit for implementation
4. Approved plans & document list
5. Environmental Statement

6. Quantum of development
7. No more than 660 dwellings and one 70 bed care home (class C2) to be constructed

Details to accompany / support Reserved Matters:

8. Reserved Matters to be no less than 50 dwellings
9. Housing mix to be Strategic Market Housing Assessment compliant
10. Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity
11. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
12. Details of existing and proposed levels, slab and finished floor and roof levels
13. Details of noise mitigation

Pre-commencement:

14. Phasing plan to be agreed
15. Design brief for southern green edge
16. Construction Environmental Management Plan
17. Sustainable drainage
18. Groundwater monitoring
19. Foul drainage
20. Contaminated land
21. Community Employment Plan
22. Archaeological Scheme of Investigation
23. Archaeological Evaluation
24. Tree Protection
25. Landscaping
26. Great Crested Newts District Licence
27. Great Crested Newts Licence Mitigation

Pre-occupation:

28. Suds compliance report
29. No occupation until off site foul water network upgrades to accommodate the development have been completed or a phased occupation plan agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water.
30. Residential Travel Plan
31. Travel plans for commercial uses
32. Final unit within a development parcel not to be occupied until all connecting roads and paths are complete
33. Electric Vehicle charging points for all dwellings
34. Management plan for play areas
35. Contaminated land verification report

Compliance:

36. Construction hours

Informative:

1. Planning Obligation
2. Superfast broadband - 30 plus dwellings
3. Water usage

**114 P22/V2285/O - Land adjacent to 45 Northcourt Road, Abingdon, OX14 1PJ**

The committee considered planning application P22/V2285/O for the outline application to consider the matters of access, layout and scale for a 2 bedroom chalet bungalow, 2-storey with an integral single garage (as amended through revised plans), on land adjacent to 45 Northcourt Road, 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 a local ward member, Councillor Helen Pighills. The planning officer also informed members that there had been several updates to the report since its publication; at 1.7 in the report there was doubt about the 2018 permission being extant as the bungalow element of the permission could not be carried out due to a measurement error, and in 5.7 of the report that the width of the site was 26 metres not 25 and the building would have a depth of 7.5 metres.

The planning officer informed the committee that the proposal was an outline application for a single dwelling to determine if the principle of residential development on the site was acceptable. As it was an outline application, matters of scale, footprint, and height would be fixed if approved but the appearance of the building and landscaping would not be considered until the reserved matters stage. In addition, the planning officer noted that the site and No. 45 were accessed by a shared driveway, there was a protected tree located on the site's northern boundary, and a grade II listed building to the south.

The planning officer informed members that permission was granted to build a dwelling on the site in 2018 but a recent topographical survey was taken which showed that this bungalow could not be built due to inaccuracies in the measurements and for this reason, this new application had been submitted.

The revised application reduced the width of the dwelling, increased the buffer between itself and No. 45 from 7 to 7.4 metres, would be the same



height as previously approved, and would retain a 5-metre parking space. Based on this, the planning officer believed that there would be a sufficient separation distance between the proposed dwelling and No. 45 and that there would be appropriate garden space. The planning officer also informed members that that tree officer believed the protected tree to the north of the site would be protected and that there were no heritage concerns raised.

Overall, as the planning officer believed that the principle of development for a two bed bungalow was approved in the 2018, and that sufficient detail was provided in the current application, they recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Rosemary Buchan spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Helen Pighills, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the discussion of the application. Members asked if there were legal implications around the application due to an existing legal agreement between the applicant and the occupants of No. 45 around alterations to any application on the site, and in response the planning officer informed members that any legal proceedings relating to that agreement would take place outside the planning process and that any matters arising from that would be addressed separately.

Members then asked about the distance between the bay window of No. 45 from the proposed house as some concerns were raised about neighbouring amenity. However, the planning officer confirmed that, as the site was originally measured incorrectly, the new application would not be further back in comparison to the bay window than the previous application and was therefore policy compliant regarding neighbouring amenity. Members also asked the planning officer if the proposed porch could be required to be open and not made of a solid material. However, as that would be included in a reserved matters application, the planning officer believed that such a requirement sat outside the matters considered at outline stage. A porch could be approved through reserved matters but further changes to it would be restricted by permitted development rights which would be secured through condition.

Some members remained concerned about the potential impact the dwelling would have on the neighbours due to the position of the property in relation to the bay windows of No. 45. However, the majority

of the committee believed that the design was policy compliant and as the scale and massing of the dwelling was similar to the previously approved application in 2018, it was considered acceptable.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was not carried on being put to the vote.

Overall, as the committee considered that there was a small change between this application and what was previously approved, and that there were not sufficient grounds to refuse the application, it be approved subject to conditions, including specific reference to the restricting of permitted development rights for porch enlargement.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/V2285/O, subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Work to commence within 3 years, and only once reserved matters have been submitted and approved in accordance with approved plans

Pre-commencement:

2. Tree protection (detailed)
3. Surface water drainage scheme
4. Construction method statement

Pre-occupation:

5. Implementation of parking and turning areas

Compliance:

6. Permitted development restriction – garage retained for parking
7. Permitted development restriction – no roof alterations, extensions or outbuildings

**115 P22/V2825/S73 - 42 Hutchcomb Road, Oxford, OX2 9HL**

The committee considered planning application P22/V2825/S73 for the section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) on application P22/V0480/HH - alteration to proposed upper ridge height; change to roof finish for single storey rear extension; alteration to rooflight configuration over single storey extension and addition of solar photovoltaic panels to front and rear roof slopes. (Demolition of existing conservatory and raised terrace, proposed single storey rear extension,

raised terrace, loft conversion and dormer window), on land at 42 Hutchcomb 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.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to the committee as the applicant was a member of the council, Councillor Emily Smith.

The planning officer informed the committee that permission was approved in June 2022 for a single storey rear extension and loft conversion and that the proposal was a resubmission with minor changes. The key changes were a raising of the roof by 20cm, a change from zinc to tile finish on the rear extension roof, alterations to roof light configuration, and the addition of front and rear solar panels. The planning officer was satisfied that these alterations would not create any harm to the neighbours or significantly change the appearance of the previously approved scheme and therefore recommended that the application be approved.

The committee asked the planning officer if he believed that this application would come to the committee if the applicant was not a member of the council and he confirmed that he did not believe that it would have. Overall, as members were satisfied with the officer's report they agreed that the application 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/V2825/S73, subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions:

1. Commencement within three years
2. Approved plans list

Compliance Conditions:

3. Parking spaces to be implemented in accordance with plans
4. Materials in accordance with application details

The meeting closed at 9.27 pm