

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Tuesday, 13 February 2024 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, Jenny Hannaby, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills, Jill Rayner and Scott Houghton  
Officers: Holly Bates (Planning Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager) and Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer)  
Guests: Councillor Sally Povolotsky

### **75 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Val Shaw.

### **76 Chair's announcements**

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

### **77 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 24 January 2024 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

### **78 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **79 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

### **80 Public participation**

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

## **81 P23/V2120/HH and P23/V2121/LB - 57 The Causeway, Steventon, OX13 6SE**

The committee considered planning application P23/V2120/HH and listed building consent application P23/V2121/LB for internal and external alterations to ancillary garage (originally approved under P21/V2326/HH). Installation of new widened entrance gate piers. Installation of a new septic tank. Replacement of existing driveway and front path with permeable cobbled paving - PART RETROSPECTIVE (amended plans and additional information received 19 and 26 October 2023 and 01, 12 and 30 January 2024) on land at 57 The Causeway, Steventon, OX13 6SE.

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 this meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and informed the committee that the applications were part retrospective in nature. She went on to illustrate the works which had commenced and those which were proposed.

The site was a Grade II listed property accessed from the north via The Causeway and the northern half of the site was located within a conservation area. Permission for the erection of the garage had been granted in 2021 and the application before the committee proposed no enlargement to the existing garage but the reconfiguration of the doors and windows in the garage as well as a widening of the gate.

The planning officer clarified that no roof lights had been constructed or were proposed above the constructed mezzanine. She went on to inform the committee that, on balance, the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions. The planning officer noted that conditions 5, 6 and 7 had not been included in the officer report due to an administrative error but displayed these for the committee to read.

Liz Rice and Robert Green spoke, objecting to the application.

Councillor Sally Povolotsky, a local ward councillor, spoke on the application.

Due to technical issues, Duncan Wolage, the agent representing the applicant, spoke last in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer to comment on the concerns raised about the site being used for commercial purposes. The planning officer advised that the site had been subject to an enforcement investigation and that both an enforcement and planning officer had visited the site. Documents detailing the business location had been shown to the officers and based on all the evidence available to them officers were satisfied that the premises was not being used for commercial purposes. As such the proposed condition on the ancillary and not business use of the garage was deemed to be sufficient.

The committee asked the planning officer if there were any steps which could be taken to address the safeguarding concerns which had been raised. The planning officer advised the committee that whilst the neighbour concerns had been acknowledged there was no harmful overlooking as a result of the proposed window. She informed the committee that the window to window distance was 66 metres with a window to boundary distance of 45 metres, both well in excess of the required 21 metres. The planning officer went on to advise the committee that as the window was at ground floor level, were the main dwelling not listed the window could have been installed without planning permission. The committee

enquired as to whether it would be possible to condition that the window was obscure glazed. The planning officer advised that there was no planning reason to do so but that officers would be able to add this should the committee desire.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm what the current restrictions were on the site. The planning officer confirmed that the garage was restricted to use for ancillary purposes to the main dwelling only. She advised that the 2021 permission did not have a restrictive condition on it and therefore the proposed condition restricting the use of the garage would be stronger but that this simply clarified the existing situation. Any proposal to change the garage to a separate dwelling or for it to be used for commercial purposes would be the subject of a new application for planning permission and, where necessary, listed building consent.

The committee went on to ask the planning officer to comment on the 'small' septic tank. The planning officer advised the committee that the drainage officer had raised no objections to the application as submitted. She reiterated that any proposal to change the garage to a separate dwelling would require planning permission.

Motions, moved and seconded, to approve the planning application and listed building consent application were carried on being put to the vote.

The committee reflected that it was required to take the application at face value and accept the use as proposed. The committee commented that they were sceptical about the use of the site and requested it was noted that they encouraged enforcement to investigate this. The committee was satisfied that all which could be done to prevent scope creep of the development had been done with the proposed conditions.

Members had concerns around the safeguarding issues raised and through the course of debate it was requested that an additional condition for obscured glazing in the proposed window was added. The proposer and seconded of the motion agreed to this addition.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/V2120/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – Full Application (Full)
2. Approved plans
3. Approved supporting documents
4. Materials in accordance with application (Full)
5. Tree protection measures (implementation as approved)
6. Use restriction – ancillary garage use only
7. Obscured glazing (non-opening) garage window
8. PD restriction – new new/replacement hardstanding

**RESOLVED:** to approve listed building consent application P23/V2121/LB, subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit – LB/CA Consent (Full)
2. Approved plans (listed building)
3. Approved supporting documents (listed building)
4. Materials in accordance with application
5. Obscured glazing (non-opening) garage window

The meeting closed at 7.58 pm