

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 2 December 2020 at  
6.00 pm



### A virtual meeting

#### Present:

Members: Councillors Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Jerry Avery, Eric Batts (substituting for Councillor Janet Shelley) Ron Batstone, Jenny Hannaby, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison and Mike Pighills

Officers: Paul Bateman, Adrian Butler, Martin Deans, Andy Heron, Josh Sharp and Stuart Walker

Also present: Councillors Hayleigh Gascoigne, Debby Hallett, Bob Johnston and Judy Roberts

#### **PI.183 Chair's announcements**

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

#### **PI.184 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Janet Shelley. Councillor Eric Batts was substitute for Councillor Shelley.

#### **PI.185 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Jerry Avery declared an interest in application P20/V2385/FUL, 17, Bow Bank, Longworth, Abingdon, as he knew the applicant. In addition, as local ward councillor he would stand down from the meeting for the consideration of this application.

#### **PI.186 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

#### **PI.187 Public participation**

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

### **PI.188 P20/V0200/FUL - Kingston Bagpuize Business Park, Kingston Bagpuize, Abingdon, OX13 5AS**

Councillor Eric Batts, the local ward councillor, stood down from the committee for consideration of this application.

The committee considered application P20/V0200/FUL for the demolition of existing buildings, erection of buildings for flexible employment uses (Use Classes E(g)(iii) and/or B2 and/or B8), associated landscaping, access and facilities at Kingston Bagpuize Business Park, Kingston Bagpuize, 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 the proposed re-development of the site is predicted to result in a reduction in traffic movements. Proposed car parking meets council standards and there were no objections from the landscape officer. The new units would be taller than the existing ones at up to 10.6m tall although some proposed buildings had been reduced in height to 8.91m. The locations of listed buildings were shown on the plans presented. Were planning permission to be granted, it would be subject to an agreement between the applicant and Oxfordshire County Council being secured for a financial contribution towards travel plan monitoring. The less than substantial harm to heritage assets was considered limited and short term reducing to negligible harm in the long term once proposed landscaping becomes established. Whilst giving great weight to the desirability of protecting, preserving or enhancing heritage assets, officers considered the public benefits outweigh the limited harm.

Councillor Virginia Grant a representative of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement of objection from the parish council had been circulated to the committee by the democratic services officer some days before the meeting.

Councillor David Warr, a representative of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Ms. Emma Lancaster, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Eric Batts, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Responding to a question regarding the twenty-four operation of the proposal, the planning officer reported that this situation already existed on the business park and confirmed that traffic movements are predicted to be reduced with the new development. The projected reduction resulted from a calculation of the use of the new buildings based on worse case scenarios compared to the existing uses which include buildings and open yard areas. The committee was reminded that Oxfordshire County Council, the local highways authority, had no objection to the application and that the council's economic development officer supported the proposal as being beneficial to local employment.

The committee was concerned about potential problems emanating from the construction period and sought appropriate measures in the proposed conditions. The committee was reassured by recommended condition 4, containing a requirement for a traffic management plan and asked that a requirement for wheel washing facilities be included during the construction period. The committee also noted, and supported, recommended condition 17, restricting the hours of work during construction.

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/V0200/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

1. An agreement between the applicant and Oxfordshire County Council being secured for a financial contribution towards travel plan monitoring; and

2. Conditions:

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Approved plans

Pre-Commencement Conditions

3. Surface water drainage scheme
4. Construction traffic management plan
5. Phased risk assessment for potential contamination

Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

6. Foul water drainage scheme
7. Implementation of any contamination remediation
8. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy
9. Noise, dust, emissions, odour mitigation prior to commencement of any Class B2 use
10. Travel Plan
11. Car parking provision in accordance with approved plans
12. Electric charging points – scheme to be approved
13. Cycle parking provision in accordance with approved plans
14. Footway and lighting provision to A415 bus stops before first occupation
15. Community Employment Plan to be agreed

Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions

16. Landscaping implementation in accordance with the approved plans
17. Construction hours – 8.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday 8.00 to 13.00 Saturday no works on Sunday or bank holidays
18. Permitted development rights removal – extensions to industrial and warehouses, industrial processes and hard standings (Classes H, I and J of Part 7, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015
19. Use restriction to E(g)(iii) (industrial processes), B2 (general industry) and B8 (distribution and warehousing)

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 2 December 2020

**PI.3**

Informative

1. Thames Water will aim to provide a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water pipes. This should be taken into account by the developer in the design of the development

## **PI.189 P20/V0921/FUL - Botley Centre, West Way, Botley, Oxford, OX2 9LP**

The committee considered application P20/V0921/FUL for the demolition and redevelopment of existing buildings for new commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1-A5 and B1a) at ground floor level, with development above comprising 150 residential dwellings (C3). Associated car parking and landscaping are also proposed (amended LVIA received 6 July 2020, viability addendum and supporting viability documents received September 2020, and amended landscape plans for area between West Way and Block A received 20 October 2020), at Botley Centre, West Way, Botley, 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 reported that the application represented phase two of a wider development which had been granted planning permission in 2016. The application had been called in by one of the local ward councillors, Councillor Debby Hallett, with concerns regarding the proposed increase in height of block A, and lack of vehicle parking and affordable housing delivery.

The proposal sought to increase the number of dwellings in block A by 30. The committee noted that the application contained a proposal for a 9-storey building in place of the previously approved 8 storey building. A deed of variation to the s106 agreement would also be required as part of any permission to adjust financial contributions.

The planning officer also reported that in the view of officers, the application would provide an economic and social role through construction, employment, and increased investment in the local economy. This represented an opportunity to provide 30 additional dwellings in the district's main service centre. This was a highly sustainable area within close proximity to Oxford and Abingdon.

The committee noted paragraph 5.20 of the report, relating to affordable housing; Policy CP24 of the local plan, part one, required 35% of housing on major sites to be affordable housing. The development, with an uplift of 30 residential units equated to a total of 150 residential dwellings within the block. The planning officer advised the committee of a total of £2m. contributions for off-site housing (£1m. of which had already been paid).

Mary Gill and James Hyndman, representatives of West Way Community Concern (WWCC) spoke objecting to the application. WWCC's statement of objection had been circulated to the committee by the democratic services officer before the meeting.

Neil Rowley, the agent, spoke in support of the application. Mr. Rowley's statement of support had been circulated to the committee by the democratic services officer before the meeting.

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

The committee had concerns regarding the height of the proposed development, which it considered represented an overbearing development by virtue of the buildings mass and scale and was out of character of the local area. The level of affordable housing was not acceptable and the parking arrangements were considered to be inadequate. The committee also considered that the lack of car parking would adversely impact the local roads network and compromise highway safety.

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/V0921/FUL, for the following reasons;

1. The proposed development would result in a visually harmful and overbearing development, which is not compatible with or sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area by reason of the height, mass, and scale of the proposed building. As such the proposal is contrary to policies CP37 and CP44 of the Local Plan 2031, Part 1, policy GS3 of the emerging North Hinksey Neighbourhood Plan, and to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would be harmful to highway safety and operation due to inadequate on site parking. There would be a lack of on-site car parking and cycle storage which would lead to on-street parking and traffic congestion on the local highway network which would create highway safety implications. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies CP33 and CP35 of the Local Plan 2031, Part 1, policy DP16 of the Local Plan 2031, Part 2, and to paragraphs 108 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The application fails to provide 35% of the proposed dwellings as affordable housing which is contrary to policy CP24 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and to paragraphs 61-63 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. In the absence of a S106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing, and financial contributions towards education and public art 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 policies CP7 and CP24 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1, and policy DP20 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2.

**PI.190      P20/V2219/FUL - Orchard Way, Harwell, OX11 0LH**

Councillor Jenny Hannaby encountered technical communication problems during the presentation of this item. The councillor was unable to participate in or hear the whole debate and did not vote on this application.

The committee considered application P20/V2219/FUL for the removal of Condition 9 (two car parking spaces to be provided within the site for sole use by the owner/occupier of 33 Orchard Way) of the Outline planning permission P17/V1998/0, variations to the approved drawings specified in the Reserved Matters conditions 2 (approved plans), 4 (hedge protection), 6 (internal and external boundaries), 7 (landscaping scheme), 8 (access, parking area/spaces and turning space), 9 (cycle parking facilities) and 10 (biodiversity

enhancements)of P19/V1672/RM and the removal of conditions 6 (Archaeological WSI) and 7 (Archaeology) of the Outline planning permission that were discharged under P19/1253/DIS and P20/V1292/DIS, the variation of conditions 4 (sustainable drainage scheme) and 5 (construction traffic management) of the Outline planning permission that were discharged under P19/V2174/DIS, and the removal of condition 3 (Biodiversity Offsetting) of the Reserved Matters was discharged under P20/V1290/DIS, at Orchard Way, Harwell.

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 site had a history of planning applications and this present application sought to remove the requirement to provide two parking spaces on the housing site. The reason for this was that planning permission now existed for no.33 in respect of the provision of two parking spaces within the front garden area of the house in connection with an approved two storey side extension. It was also reported that that the county highways officer had no objection to the removal of condition 9 on the basis that the on-plot parking spaces were due to be provided in connection with the extension under construction. The on-plot parking was considered to be safe within the local environment of low traffic numbers and slow speeds.

Gloria Hawthorne a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Paul Butt, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

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/V2219/FUL, subject to the following conditions; Planning Permission subject to the following conditions:

Standard:

1. Time Limit - Variation of Condition
2. Approved plans (varied)

Compliance:

3. Materials in Accordance with Application.
4. Hedge protection as per plan
5. Boundary treatments as per plan
6. Landscaping scheme as per plan
7. Access, Parking, cycle parking and turning as per plan
8. Biodiversity enhancements as agreed
9. Archaeology Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) as agreed
10. Archaeology as agreed
11. Sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) implemented as agreed
12. Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMP) as agreed
13. Biodiversity offsetting as agreed
14. Windows Obscure glazed
15. Removal of Permitted Development (PD) Rights Class A
16. Removal of PD Rights Class E
17. Removal of PD Right Class B

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 2 December 2020

## **PI.191 P20/V1019/FUL - 30 Pinnocks Way, Oxford, OX2 9DG**

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

The committee considered application P20/V1019/FUL for the conversion of existing house to 2 flats (1 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed) and relaxation of condition 5 of planning permission P17/V2683/FUL to enable existing annex to be used as a separate flat.(as amended by Application Form & plans received 22 September 2020) at 30 Pinnocks Way, 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 reported that a rear garden 1-bedroom annex was permitted on this site in 2018, to be used as part of the household. The current proposal was to retain the annex as a separate unit, and to convert the house to two flats, one 2-bedroom flat on the ground floor and one 1-bedroom flat on the first floor. Up to four parking spaces would be provided on the existing hardstanding at the front of the property, together with bin storage for the three units.

In response to questions from the committee, the planning officer confirmed that the recommended conditions contained requirements in respect of bin stores and cycle storage (the latter contained in the condition relating to car parking).

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/V1019/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

Standard:

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans

Prior to Use:

3. HY7 - Car Parking (Full)
4. RE29 - Refuse Storage (Full)
5. Arrangements for use of garden space

## **PI.192 P20/V1492/HH - 1 Gooseacre, Radley, Abingdon, OX14 3BL**

This application was deferred due to the meeting guillotine having been reached prior to its consideration. It would be considered at a later date, to be confirmed.

## **PI.193 P20/V2385/FUL - 17 Bow Bank, Longworth, Abingdon, OX13 5ER**

This application was deferred due to the meeting guillotine having been reached prior to its consideration. It would be considered at a later date, to be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm

**PI.1**