

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday 8 May 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, Jenny Hannaby, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills, Sarah James, Jill Rayner and Scott Houghton  
Officers: Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Nathaniel Bamsey (Planning Officer), Sarah Green (Planning Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Roseanne Lillywhite (Planning Officer) and Amanda Rendell (Planning Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer)

### **107 Chair's announcements**

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

### **108 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Val Shaw and Cheryl Briggs who was substituted for Councillor Sarah James.

### **109 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 17 April 2024 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

### **110 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Scott Houghton declared that he was ward member for item 8 on the agenda, P24/V0325/FUL. Councillor Houghton confirmed that he would stand down from the committee and not participate in the debate or vote for this item.

### **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 P23/V2576/O - Entree Global Services, Appleford Road, Sutton Courtenay**

The committee considered planning application P23/V2576/O for outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access for the redevelopment of 2morrow Court for residential purposes on land at Entree Global Services, Appleford Road, Sutton Courtenay.

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 sought to establish the principle of development for up to 17 dwellings and associated access, with all other matters indicative at this stage. She advised the committee that the application was before them due to the objection of the parish council. The planning officer informed the committee that the main areas for objection related to overdevelopment of the site, connectivity of the site with the surrounding area and a need to wait for the outcome of the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF1) inquiry. She confirmed that responses to these concerns were set out in full in the officer's report.

The planning officer informed the committee that the main issue with the application was the proposed loss of employment space in line with policy CP29 of the adopted Local Plan 2031. She advised a viability assessment had been submitted with the application which demonstrated that via direct marketing of the site only four enquiries had come forward. The site was deemed unsuitable for business use as a better property was available within the area. The officer informed the committee that no technical objections had been raised on the basis of loss of employment space.

The planning officer went on to inform the committee that no objections had been received from the local highway's authority. The proposal made use of the existing site access and the change in movements would not be a significant change from the existing use. The planning officer went on to advise that some development could be permitted prior to HIF1, advising that guidance now allowed for tier 3 developments of 10 or more houses are no longer to be objected to on highways grounds as HIF1 funding had been secured. Applications of this type should therefore be assessed based on their merits.

The planning officer informed the committee that all dwellings in the proposal fell within flood zone 1 but that a proposed area of open space fell within flood zone 2 as confirmed by the flood risk assessment submitted with the application. She confirmed that the Environment Agency had no objection subject to proposed conditions.

The planning officer then advised the committee that since the submission of the application the Sutton Courtenay Neighbourhood Plan had been approved via referendum. She confirmed that full weight had been given to the Sutton Courtenay Neighbourhood Plan since its approval at referendum even though it had not yet been adopted by Council.

Hugo Raworth spoke on behalf of Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Ellie Neil, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm if the application site was a brownfield site. The planning officer confirmed that it was.

The committee asked the planning officer to comment on any noise implications the development may have. The planning officer confirmed that the Environmental Health team had been consulted and the application had been accompanied with a noise impact assessment. She confirmed that a Construction Management Plan would be required and that noise mitigation measures would form part of a reserved matters application should the application be approved.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm that there were no objections from statutory consultees. She confirmed this to be the case.

The committee went on to ask the planning officer to clarify why the Hobbyhorse Lane development had been restricted in advance of HIF1 but it was deemed this application for 17 dwellings did not need to be. The planning officer advised that 17 dwellings was relatively modest. She also advised that the local highways authority had suggested obligations to mitigate the impact of the development. The planning manager advised the committee that the two sites differed as Hobbyhorse Lane was a greenfield site whereas the application before the committee was brownfield and the traffic trip rate information generated from the current employment indicated a net loss when changing from employment to residential.

The committee asked the planning officer what it was able to do to ensure that the footpath connection identified by residents came forward. The planning officer advised that it would have ideally been considered as part of the wider masterplan for the area. She confirmed that the indicative layout submitted showed a path there and it was understood there was a path on the other side of this, but that they had no control over adjacent sites. She advised it was to be explored under the relevant condition.

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

The committee commented that the site was currently classified as a brownfield site and that the applicant had demonstrated alternative uses had been considered. The committee also noted the local and national need for homes and this site presented an opportunity to deliver homes.

The committee noted that Sutton Courtenay was arguably overloaded with traffic and over developed for the infrastructure which was in place and questioned if it would be sensible to wait for the result of the HIF1 inquiry. Other members noted that the application was before them now and that there is traffic throughout the entire district, not just in Sutton Courtenay.

The committee reflected that it would be better for the site to be used for housing which included affordable housing than as an employment site. Whilst questions had been raised about the robustness of the marketing report the committee concluded it was not their place to second guess the opinion of the economic development officer.

The committee also noted that the S106 agreement would secure funding for transport improvement including to bus services.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/V2576/O, subject to completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure Affordable Housing, Public open space, Local Area of Play, Public Art, and Financial contributions for education, transport, street naming and waste, and the following conditions:

1. Commencement outline permission
2. Approved plans
3. Reserved Matters to be approved
4. Access and Vision Splays
5. Construction Traffic Management Plan
6. Construction Management Plan
7. Green Travel Plans
8. Maximum number of dwellings
9. Housing Mix
10. Space Standard
11. Ridge Heights (Two storey)
12. Landscaping (incl. hard surfacing and boundary treatment)
13. Landscape Management Plan
14. Tree Protection (General)
15. Tree Species and Tree Pits
16. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
17. Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy (Outline)
18. Construction Enhancement Management Plan
19. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)
20. Public Open Space and Play Areas
21. Lighting Scheme
22. Noise Assessment and Mitigation
23. Contamination Remediation Strategy
24. Verification Report
25. Previously unidentified contamination
26. Infiltration
27. Boreholes
28. SWD scheme in accordance with Calibro report
29. Detailed sustainable drainage scheme
30. SUDS Compliance Report
31. Foul Water Drainage
32. Gas Fired Boilers

Informative

33. Informative - CIL Vale
34. Informative - Highways details
35. Informative - Legal Agreement (S106)
36. Informative - Secure by Design and Crime Prevention
37. Informative - Contaminated Land
38. Informative - Thames Water pressure
39. Informative - Trees and Streetlights
40. Informative - Informative - Key Neighbourhood Plan Policies

**114 P23/V2385/RM - 25 Orchard Way, Harwell, Didcot, OX11 0LQ**

The committee considered planning application P23/V2385/RM for reserved matters application for the details of appearance, landscaping, scale, and layout following Outline

Approval P21/V0679/O (Outline application for access for residential development of up to 5 dwellings). (Amended plans and information received 21 March 2024 as set out in accompanying agent cover letter) on land at 25 Orchard Way, Harwell, Didcot.

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 followed approval of an outline application in 2021. The application sought permission for 5 dwellings and concerned the reserved matters of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping. The planning officer informed the committee the application was before them as it had been called in by the local ward member. In response to comments made by a neighbour, the planning officer went on to confirm that she had carried out a site visit on the 5 December 2023.

The site itself was located on the western side of the village with the recreation ground to the south. The proposal was for a single storey dwelling at the front of the site with four two storey dwellings behind. The planning officer informed the committee that the boundary treatments would comprise hedges to the external site and closed board fencing to the neighbouring property.

The planning officer described the built form in the area and advised the committee that the views from the recreation ground would be taken in the context of the existing built form. She reminded the committee that the principle of development had been approved and therefore was not for reconsideration. The planning officer was of the view that, on balance, the proposed landscaping, scale and design were acceptable, there was sufficient parking being provided to meet current standards and that the proposal accorded with the adopted local plan. For these reasons, the application was recommended for approval.

Paul Luper spoke on behalf of Harwell Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Jez Hawthorne spoke objecting to the application.

Sean Bates, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. During his allocated speaking slot Mr Bates experienced technical difficulties and therefore the time was stopped to allow him to reconnect. The remainder of his speaking slot was given following the local ward member.

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

The committee asked if officers were satisfied with the reduction in building heights which had been secured since the original submission of the application. The planning officer confirmed they were happy with the changes to the heights detailing that plots 1-3 and 5 had been reduced from 8.6 metres to 7.46 metres and plot 4 had been reduced from 8.25 metres to 7.74 metres. She went on to advise that this should be considered in line with the levels details which showed the ridge heights in context of the surrounding properties. The planning officer advised that she was satisfied the bungalow was a single storey building and advised that high pitched rooves were traditional for the area. She concluded that the proposal complied with the design guide.

The committee raised concerns about the views of the development from the recreation ground and queried why the proposal was not being compared to the older properties in the

area. The planning officer advised that Armstrong Close is part of the built up area and therefore formed part of the context.

The committee highlighted that the local highway's authority had requested secure cycle storage and EV charging points by condition. The planning officer confirmed that the requirement for secure cycle parking could be added to the relevant condition. She went on to advise that EV charging points would be covered under Building Regulations.

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

The committee reflected that outline permission for the site had already been approved. It was noted that five properties could be built on the site but that the committee were unhappy with the size proposed and felt it was important to see the area.

Some members of the committee noted that a balance had to be struck between the houses being marketable and other considerations. The developer had made compromise, but it was not possible to will houses that developers do not want to build.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer application P23/V2385/RM in order for the committee to conduct a site visit was carried on being put to the vote.

The committee noted the importance of seeing the context of the proposal in order to make an informed decision.

**RESOLVED:** to defer planning application P23/V2385/RM in order to allow for a site visit to take place.

## **115 P24/V0325/FUL - 134 Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9PH**

The committee considered planning application P24/V0325/FUL for erection of detached part single part 2 storey dwelling house with home workshop. Erection of bin and bike stores/energy hub building. Car parking provision. Improved visibility splays to existing vehicular access. Landscaping of the site at 134 Cumnor Hill, 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 had been called in by a local ward member.

The planning officer informed the committee that the proposed dwelling was located behind the existing dwelling and would be accessed from Chorley Lane to the west. He confirmed that the existing dwelling would be unaffected by the proposal. The proposed dwelling was to be set down from the existing ground level and screening was proposed on the flat roof to prevent overlooking. He advised there was also a proposed condition to prevent the use of the flat roof areas a balcony.

The planning officer advised that officers considered the main issues to be the impact on the character of the area and the impact on amenity. Whilst the proposal was back land development, officers were of the view that the specific context of the development in the site meant it was not harmful to the area. The planning officer confirmed the site was

located in a designated low density area but that the proposal would not harm the amenity of neighbours.

Chris Westcott spoke on behalf of Cumnor Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Paul Munsey spoke objecting to the application.

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

Councillor Scott Houghton, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee asked why, when the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan restricted backland development, did the planning officer feel this application was appropriate. The planning officer confirmed that policy said that backland development should be avoided where it was harmful to the character of the area but there was no blanket ban on this type of development. He also advised that all applications should be considered in context and that on balance the planning officers conclusion was that the development was not harmful. Officers were of the view that the context of the surrounding buildings meant that in this instance the proposal was a continuation of that development rather than needing to be in keeping with stronger character of dwellings to the east. The planning officer confirmed that the development did not conflict with policy as it was not harmful.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm why they were of the view that overlooking was not an issue. The planning officer advised that the orientation of the proposed dwelling was unusual with the first floor looking into the bottom corner of the plot. The planning officer advised the committee that none of the first floor windows would look directly into another dwelling and that screening was proposed to prevent any direct overlooking. They went on to confirm that the angle and distance of the windows from other dwellings prevented any significant harm.

The committee asked for clarification on why the planning officer was of the view that the design of the building was not harmful to the linear character of the area. The planning officer informed the committee that, taken in the context of the surrounding built form, his view was that the proposed dwelling was not harmful. This took account of the buildings behind the proposed dwelling and he highlighted that should these buildings not exist then the proposal would be harmful and therefore contrary to policy.

A motion was moved to approve the application but was not seconded and therefore the motion fell.

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

The committee noted that the appropriateness of this proposal in the relevant context was subjective. The committee supported the view of the parish council and those who had helped to develop the neighbourhood plan noting that a clear approach had been taking to zoning areas with the proposal falling within the zone characterised by more linear development.

The committee were of the view that backland development broke up the character of the area.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P24/V0325/FUL for the following reason:

The proposed development is backland development which harms the character of the area formed by common plot shapes, sizes, orientation and building to plot ratios, and which erodes the designated low-density nature of the area, harming visual amenity and conflicting with policies DBC1 and DBC3 of the Cumnor Neighbourhood Plan, Policy CP37 of the Local Plan and paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

## **116 P24/V0609/HH - 42 Harding Way, Marcham, Abingdon, OX13 6FJ**

The committee considered planning application P24/V0609/HH for single storey infill extension and front entrance porch. (As clarified by drawing reference 23020.11C received 24 April 2024, to correct the proposed first floor and proposed roof plans to demonstrate the proposed front porch extension) at 42 Harding Way, Marcham, Abingdon, OX13 6FJ.

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 there had been an update since the agenda was published as an additional comment had been raised regarding the accuracy of the red line plan. The agent had confirmed that the red line plan as submitted was correct and title deeds had been provided to that effect.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application came before them as the applicant was a district councillor. The application related to a link detached property in a built up area of Marcham and sought permission for a front porch extension and single storey rear in-fill extension.

The officer advised that the application was recommended for approval.

There were no registered speakers for this item.

The committee asked if the application would have come before them had the applicant not been a district councillor. The planning officer advised that it would not.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P24/V0609/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within three years
2. Approved plans list
3. Materials in accordance with application details

The meeting closed at 8.54 pm