

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Uplands Area Planning Sub-Committee** held via video conferencing at 2.00pm on Monday 7 September 2020

PRESENT

Councillors: Jeff Haine (Chairman), Geoff Saul (Vice-Chairman), Richard Bishop, Mike Cahill, Nigel Colston, Julian Cooper, Merilyn Davies, David Jackson, Neil Owen and Alex Postan.

Officers: Abby Fettes (Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management), Joan Desmond (Principal Planner), Kelly Murray Senior Planning Officer); Keith Butler (Head of Democratic Services) and Amy Bridgewater-Carnall (Senior Strategic Support Officer).

16. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 3 August 2020, copies of which had been circulated, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nathalie Chapple, Derek Cotterill and Ted Fenton.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

19. 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:-

20/01246/FUL – 24 Park Street, Woodstock

The Principal Planner, Joan Desmond, introduced the application.

Public submissions had been received and were read out on behalf of Mr John Webley, objecting; Councillor Matthew Parkinson, on behalf of Woodstock Town Council, Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt, District Councillor, Councillor Ian Hudspeth, County Councillor all objecting; and Ms Caroline Beaumont the applicant. A summary of the submissions are attached as Appendices A to E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented the report which contained a recommendation of approval. Mrs Desmond highlighted that there had not been an Additional Representations report required for the meeting, however, it had been brought to officer's attention that a letter had been submitted by Sharone Parkes of Woodstock Town Council, although there

was no record of this being received. It was noted that the concerns detailed in that letter were similar to those points already raised by the Town Council.

Councillor Cooper addressed Members and stated that he did not always support the views of the Town Council or the County Council. He declared that he was keen to support development when it was in an appropriate location, however, he did not feel that this was the case in this instance. He listed the Local Plan policies which he felt the application was contrary to; OS22, OS4.2, EH9, EH10, EH11, EH13 and T4. Councillor Cooper reminded the Committee that this was a historical location and had been where the writer, Geoffrey Chaucer had lived.

Councillor Cooper also reminded the Committee of the parking issues that Woodstock already suffered from and he felt that this development would create congestion, especially during construction, due to the narrowness of the lanes. He highlighted the refusal reasons given to nearby application 15/00836/FUL, which he and Woodstock Town Council, felt were still relevant in this instance.

Councillor Cooper therefore proposed that the application be refused contrary to officers' recommendation for the reasons he had outlined above.

This was seconded by Councillor Bishop who agreed that the Town Council had put forward a strong case and he supported the comments made by Councillor Cooper.

Councillor Cooper reminded the Committee of the weight that should be given to the Conservation Officer's comments, which he felt should be respected.

Councillor Jackson advised that he had undertaken his own site visit and had noted the size of the wall adjacent to the site. In response to a number of queries raised by Councillor Jackson, officers confirmed that the neighbours had been consulted on the plans and the amenity and overlooking issues had been addressed in the report.

Councillor Saul indicated that he agreed with Councillor Postan and he felt the applicant had applied the planning rules correctly. He had also walked around the site and was not sure that the amenity of neighbours would be affected.

Councillor Davies concurred with the views put forward by Councillor Postan and felt that the Conservation Officer's comments should be respected. She also noted that there was no objection from the Highways Department and felt that the design was very favourable.

Due to the contrasting views from Members of the Committee, the Chairman stated that the proposal would be put to a named vote.

The proposal to refuse the application was put to the vote and was carried on the Chairman's casting vote, for the reasons outlined below.

Refused

The development is contrary to Local Plan Policies OS2, OS4, EH9, EH10, EH11, EH13 and T4. Members noted that the refusal reasons relating to the nearby application 15/00836/FUL remained relevant in this instance and the proposal would lead to further congestion along already narrow lanes.

20/01511/FUL – 1 Farley Lane, Stonesfield

The Interim Locality Lead Officer Development Management, Abby Fettes, introduced the application.

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

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of approval, subject to conditions and a legal agreement. She advised that the extant consent which permitted redevelopment of the site for residential housing, meant that the loss of the employment space had already been accepted in principle. Mrs Fettes highlighted the inclusion of condition 7, relating to the installation of an acoustic barrier, which would protect future residents from noise disturbance.

Mrs Fettes concluded that the access arrangements remained the same, with no objection from the Highways Department and the concerns regarding drainage had been addressed.

Councillor Bishop complemented officers on the report and felt that the proposal was acceptable. He referred to paragraphs 5.6 and 5.8 of the report which confirmed that the proposal was Policy compliant and noted that the development was already connected to the main drainage system. He hoped that the development would benefit younger residents and improve the street scene.

Councillor Bishop therefore proposed that the application be granted as per officers' recommendations and this was seconded by Councillor Postan who supported the recycling of an existing building into truly affordable housing.

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

Approved

20. PROGRESS ON ENFORCEMENT CASES

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planner (Enforcement) Mrs Kelly Murray, which informed Members of the current position and progress in respect of a number of enforcement investigations.

Section A of Annex A listed the cases where a notice had been served but the requirements had not been met within the compliance period, or there had been an unauthorised display of advertisements. This meant that an offence could have been committed and the Council needed to consider the next steps in order to secure compliance. In some cases this would entail the initiation of legal proceedings to bring about a prosecution.

Section B of Annex A provided an update on cases where a notice had been served but the compliance date had not yet passed.

Section C of Annex A outlined the progress on other enforcement investigations which had been identified as being high priority.

The report also reminded Members that the cases detailed in Annex A were only a small number of the overall enforcement caseload across the District. At the time of writing the

report, there were 256 live cases and the high priority cases for both Uplands and Lowlands constituted approximately 20% of the total caseload.

Mrs Murray introduced the report and advised Members on the progress of each of the cases listed.

In response to a query from Councillor Cooper, officers advised that an email had been circulated earlier that day in relation to the Unicorn public house, and a further update would be provided to Members once officers had had time to consider the information.

Councillor Cooper specifically asked if the update could include a timeline to resolve the situation, as the case had been ongoing for 30 years. Officers noted his request and shared his concerns that this case had taken up a lot of officer time.

Councillor Postan noted the report and requested that his thanks be passed to one enforcement officer in particular, James Nelson, who had been assisting with an enforcement case in his area.

Having considered the report and having clarified a number of queries relating to particular cases, the Committee

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

21. MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE IN JANUARY 2021

The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services, which recommended a change in the date of its meeting due to take place in January 2021.

RESOLVED: That the date of the meeting of the Sub-Committee scheduled for January 2021 be changed from Monday 4 to Tuesday 5 January 2021.

22. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS, APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN, AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of (i) applications determined under delegated powers or withdrawn; and (ii) appeal decisions, was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 3:47 pm

CHAIRMAN