

# **Minutes**

of a meeting of the

## **Planning Committee**



held on Wednesday, 7 July 2021 at 6.00 pm  
in First Floor, 135 Eastern Avenue, Milton  
Park, Milton, 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 Janet Shelley

Officers: Paul Bateman and Emily Hamerton

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Hayleigh Gascoigne

Officers: Katherine Canavan and Susie Royse

### **PI. 35 Chair's announcements**

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

### **PI.36 Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **PI.37 Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on Wednesday 21 April 2021, were agreed to be a correct record of the meetings. It was agreed that the chair sign them as such.

### **PI.38 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **PI.39 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

### **PI.40 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.41 P21/V0430/FUL - Avon Road Car Park, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Harwell Campus**

The committee considered application P21/V0430/FUL for a Solar Photovoltaic Carport System (as amplified by plans received 20 April 2021, and additional supporting information (arboricultural impact, landscape and visual impact, glint/glare report, lighting scheme, car port visualisations) received 20 April 2021, and as amended by plans showing updated layout and landscaping, and additional supporting information (updated glint/glare report, lighting scheme, landscape and visual impact report) received 17 June 2021 at the Avon Road Car Park, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Harwell Campus.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and appendices, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer reported that the proposal entailed 502 covered car park spaces, generating 1.6 megawatts per annum (the equivalent of power for 467 households). The proposals involved the installation of metal framed structures over existing car parking bays, onto which solar photovoltaic panels would be attached. The development was designed to generate electricity for use by the campus, with any additional generation being exported to the national grid. The latest situation was that the solar car park to the west of the site had been set further back. The objection from the landscape officer had been withdrawn and there were no technical objections to this application.

With respect to glint and glare issues, the planning officer reported that the Glint and Glare Study had been completed, using approved methodology. Existing fencing and planting had already reduced glare, amounting to less than 60 minutes of glare for less than 3 months of the year, in respect of 32 properties on Severn Road, Potteries Lane, Baths Road and Chilton Field Way. The amended scheme had removed the proposed lighting columns and that the lights would be below the roof line. Glint and glare would have a minimal impact on amenity and was not sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission. The planning officer, referring to the recommended conditions contained in the report, reported that conditions 3 and 4, relating to landscaping and tree planting, would be combined into a single 'landscaping' condition.

Mr. David White, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Chris Broad, a representative of Chilton Parish Council, spoke to the application.

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

A statement by Mr. Andrew Softley, a local resident, had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting by the democratic services officer.

In response to a question from the committee regarding detailed aspects of glint and glare mitigation, the planning officer reported that these issues were identified early in the planning application process and further information had been requested from the applicants, who had responded fully. Additional landscaping could not be required from the developer, as strictly there was no amenity issue. The planting of mature trees specifically could not be mandated by officers. However, the developer's goodwill had ensured additional landscaping. Also in response to a question regarding glint and glare and the possible the effect upon local residential properties, the planning officer reported that the calculation related to 'habitable rooms' on ground floors and that first floors were not deemed to be affected over and above normally experienced direct sunlight. On being asked about measures contained within the glint and glare report, the planning officer reported that fencing and planting was already in place. Landscaping and the site plan had evolved over time and the council's planning officers considered the detail to be satisfactory.

The committee requested details about the effect of the development upon the local highways network and the need for a traffic management plan. The planning officer reported that these measures were not considered to be necessary, as the development was well within the site, and the delivery of any equipment in connection with the development would not impact upon the highway

The senior planning officer advised the committee that if it wished, a condition could be added relating to the revised scheme, which could include mature planting, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

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

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P21/V0430/FUL for the following reasons;

1. Work to commence within three years.
2. In accordance with approved plans.
3. Implementation of landscaping scheme.
4. Tree and planting replacement, in the event of any landscaping is lost within five years of planting.
5. Restriction on hours of lighting.
6. Lighting columns to be removed prior to first use of the solar car ports.

## **PI.42 P21/V0140/FUL - Workshop and Premises, 2A 2-6 High Street, Steventon**

The committee considered application P21/V0140/FUL for the redevelopment of previously developed land involving change of use from Class E to Class C3, demolition of light industrial buildings (No 2A) and erection of replacement apartment building providing 7 no. apartments with undercroft parking and cycle storage, part-demolition of buildings (Nos 6 and 6A) fronting High Street, to facilitate provision of parking and bin and cycle storage, with retained floor area consolidated for commercial use Class E (as amended by updated contamination report received 1 March 2021, and as amended by plans omitting balcony

to flat 4 and reconfiguring parking received 6 April 2021, and as amplified by noise assessment received 13 April 2021 and sun diagrams received 20 April 2021) at workshop and premises, 2A and 2-6 High Street, Steventon.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report and appendices, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer reported that the application site was classed as brownfield land and was located centrally within Steventon. The site was within the Steventon Conservation Area and there were listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. The courtyard was within Flood Zone 1, and both access points fell within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The adjoining High Street and The Causeway were in Zone 3. The courtyard was to the rear of commercial buildings and the Co-Op on the High Street, and behind dwellings on The Causeway. Two accesses linked the site to these two main roads. The site comprised two vacant industrial buildings set back within the site, and a restaurant and café fronting onto the High Street, which were also vacant. A barn and 2-storey printworks were also located within the courtyard, but were outside the application area. The Co-Op car park and delivery yard adjoined the southern edge of the site. The western edge of the site faced onto open land and private gardens. The planning officer also reported that Causeway site was now boarded up and that the flats would be set back into the courtyard. The warehouse overlooking the Co-Op car park would be demolished. The roof heights in the proposed development were in line with existing properties.

The planning officer also reported that with respect to flood risks, the council's drainage engineer had approved the drainage scheme. The Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), as highways authority, had no concerns regarding access and egress issues at the site. OCC had examined the accessibility of parking spaces, and its analysis had demonstrated that use of the spaces would be safe. In response to an element of Steventon Parish Council's objection, that the proposal would result in the reduction in size of commercial units and associated employment, the planning officer also reported that there was a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the existing built area of market towns, local service centres and larger villages in accordance with Core Policy 1. The proposal also contributed positively to the housing needs of the district and local area; the partial redevelopment of the site would bring back into use land occupied by vacant buildings, and the delivery of 7 apartments, in a sustainable location, which would contribute to the district's housing needs.

Councillor John Rice, a representative of Steventon Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

A statement from Councillor Robert Green, on behalf of Steventon Parish Council, had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting by the democratic services officer.

Mr. Andre Botha, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

In response to a question from the committee regarding the final size of the plot where a restaurant was presently situated, the planning officer reported that the rear of the property

had been reduced to accommodate car parking, and in the scheme the reduced floorspace plot would become available for a commercial Class E use for a single unit.

In response to a further question from the committee regarding the bin collection service, the planning officer reported that the arrangements were satisfactory; any bin lorry would remain outside the site. OCC were satisfied with the arrangements. The planning officer also reported in response to another query regarding deliveries; it was confirmed that deliveries to the Co-Op would not use the access to the flats but would use the Co-Op car park alongside.

The committee expressed a wish to safeguard the local community from excessive workers' vehicle movements during the development. The planning officer advised the committee that two proposed conditions, 3., "Demolition statement" and 4., "Construction Traffic Management Plan", would deal with these issues. There would be traffic management, a defined construction area, a compound area and a stipulation regarding hours of working.

The committee considered that having heard the arguments for and against the proposal and having been advised of the detailed proposals, they should visit this complex site, and view its various elements and envisage the buildings and access arrangements fully in context.

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

**RESOLVED:** to defer consideration of the grant of planning permission for application P21/V0140/FUL, to facilitate a site visit.

### **PI.43 P21/V1075/LB - Dunraven House, 32 London Street, Faringdon P21/V1075/LB - Dunraven House, 32 London Street, Faringdon**

The committee considered application P21/V1075/LB for the replacement of the existing impermeable pointing, plaster and rendering with breathable lime mortar 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 and appendices, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

It was noted that this application had been referred to committee as the applicant was a ward member. The senior planning officer reported that the application sought listed building consent for internal and external works to replace existing inappropriate materials, implemented by previous owners, with more appropriate replacements, better suited to the historic fabric of the listed building.

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

**RESOLVED:** to grant listed building consent for application P21/V1075/LB subject to the following reasons;

Standard Conditions:

1. Commencement within three years

2. Development completed in accordance with the approved plans

Compliance Conditions

3. Details and materials in accordance with the application

The meeting closed at 7.30 pm