

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee** held
via video conferencing at 2.00pm on **Monday 3 August 2020**

PRESENT

Councillors: Jeff Haine (Chairman), Geoff Saul (Vice-Chairman), Andrew Beaney, Richard Bishop, Mike Cahill, Nathalie Chapple, Nigel Colston, Julian Cooper, Derek Cotterill, Merilyn Davies, Ted Fenton (ex-officio, non-voting), David Jackson, Neil Owen and Alex Postan.

Officers: Abby Fettes (Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management), Stephanie Eldridge (Senior Planner), Keith Butler (Head of Democratic Services) and Amy Barnes (Strategic Support Officer).

11. MINUTES

Councillor Cotterill raised a query regarding Minute Number 9 relating to 19/02572/FUL 45 High Street, Burford. He felt that Condition 4 of the report should refer to a decibel level of 36dBA as he had requested. In response, the Chairman advised that officers were content that a figure of 47dBA was acceptable.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 6 July 2020, copies of which had been circulated, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

There were no apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers relating to matters to be considered at the meeting.

14. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated.

RESOLVED: That the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

(i) **20/008533/FUL – 49 Main Road, Long Hanborough**

The Senior Planning Officer, Stephanie Eldridge, introduced the application.

A public submission had been received and was read out on behalf of Andrew Dawson, acting as the agent in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented the report containing a recommendation of approval.

In response to a query from Councillor Davies, Miss Eldridge advised that the technical experts were satisfied that the view from the public right of way and the AONB was acceptable and the Highways Department had not raised an objection in relation to the parking. It was noted that cycle parking was provided.

Councillor Beaney asked if permitted development rights could be removed and queried the inclusion of Condition 9 which related to land contamination. Officers advised that permitted development rights could be removed and Condition 9 had been added by ERS officers, due to the land previously being used as a gravel pit. With regards to parking details, this was covered in Condition 4.

Councillor Chapple stated she was familiar with the site and felt that the proposal had been well thought out. She therefore proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations, subject to a condition removing permitted development rights.

This was seconded by Councillor Bishop.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Approved

Subject to an additional condition removing permitted development rights.

(ii) 20/00991/FUL – Land North of Gas Lane and Ascott Road, Shipton under Wychwood

The Planning Officer, Stephanie Eldridge, introduced the application and reminded Members that the application had been deferred at the previous meeting to allow officers to liaise with the applicant regarding the size and location of Plot 2.

Public submissions had been received and were read out on behalf of; Alan Vickers objecting and Mike Gilbert, agent in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendices B and C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of approval. She advised that the principle of development had been established previously, plot 2 had been moved a further nine metres away from the western boundary and the redesign had resulted in a more substantial landscaping belt being proposed. The footprint proposed in the revised plans was also reduced.

Councillor Haine felt that the applicant had moved plot 2 back as requested, was now in line with the plot at the front, as well as the garage being moved from the western boundary. The additional planting was also noted.

Councillor Jackson agreed and felt that the conditions were fairly detailed along with an ecological appraisal and a landscaping scheme. He therefore proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations. This was seconded by Councillor Beaney who stated that this was a far better proposal.

Councillor Postan felt that the original proposal had had some attempt at a varied style and he felt this was a retrograde step in design and form.

Councillor Chapple queried if permitted development rights could be removed and was advised that this had already been covered in the conditions.

The Officer recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Approved

(iii) 20/011161/HHD – High Ridge, 46 High Street, Milton under Wychwood

The Planning Officer, Stephanie Eldridge introduced the report and highlighted the additional information contained in the follow on report.

This advised that two additional letters of representation had been received, objecting to the proposed scheme and a summary of the objections was included.

Public submissions had been received and were read out on behalf of; Charles Hugill objecting and Tasha and Oliver Early, in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendices D and E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of approval. She advised that applicants did not need planning permission to use the house as a holiday let. Officers felt that the principle of development had been established due to the existing construction, and the proposed dwelling was considered ancillary to the house. It was not felt that there would be an impact on neighbouring amenity due to the structure already being in existence and there would be no additional impact as the proposal was not felt to be adversely overbearing.

Councillor Haine addressed Members and provided some history to the area in question which had been used as a builder's yard and for the storage of building materials. There had not been any parking associated with the properties. He advised that the property was currently rented out on 'Air B&B' with the capacity for eight people to stay. With this additional construction, the capacity would increase to ten. He stated that parking had always been difficult in the area and the proposal would cause gross overlooking of neighbouring properties. He did not feel that the site was suitable for a building of this size and the height of the roof was overpowering. In summary, he concluded that the application was contrary to Local Plan Policies OS2, OS4, T4, EH1 and EH8.

Councillor Haine therefore proposed that the application be refused contrary to officers' recommendation.

This was seconded by Councillor Beaney who queried whether Policy H6 could also be included in the refusal reasons. Councillor Haine agreed that he was happy to include H6 in the refusal reasons.

Councillor Saul advised that he had visited the site and had noted that neighbouring gardens rose up behind the site, which he felt would result in overlooking.

Councillor Postan stated that tourism was an important sector and queried if any activities that may create noise could be curtailed to cease at certain times. Councillor Haine did not feel this would be possible due to the individuals only staying for long weekend stays.

A recommendation of refusal, contrary to officer's recommendations, was then put to the vote and was carried for the reasons outlined below:

Refused

- 1) The site was not suitable for a building of this size, would cause gross overlooking of neighbouring properties due to them being located 4 to 5 feet lower down and the height of the roof would be overpowering;
- 2) The historical design of the area restricted the parking provision and an increase from 8 to 10 inhabitants would exacerbate this; and
- 3) The application was contrary to Policies EH1, EH8, H6, OS2, OS4 and T4.

15. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 3.15pm

CHAIRMAN