

WEST AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday 7 January 2014

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Van Nooijen (Chair), Benjamin, Canning, Cook, Coulter, Goddard, Jones, Price and Tanner.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Lois Stock (Democratic and Electoral Services Officer), Michael Morgan (Law and Governance), Sarah Billam (Conservation Officer), David Edwards (Executive Director City Regeneration and Housing), Clare Golden (City Development) and Matthew Parry (City Development)

78. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

The following apologies were received:-

Councillor Gotch – Councillor Goddard substituted;
Councillor Clack – Councillor Coulter substituted.

79. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None made

80. ROGER DUDMAN WAY REVIEW: INDEPENDENT REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive Director of City Regeneration and Housing submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) concerning the final report and recommendations from the Roger Dudman Way independent review.

David Edwards (Executive Director of City Regeneration and Housing) presented the report to the Committee and provided some background and context. He emphasised that the review carried out had been independent, and that the conclusion it reached was that the Council had met its statutory duties when considering the Roger Dudman way application. However, the review report also made a number of recommendations that would assist the Council to embed best practice in its procedures in future. These recommendations were a package, which the Committee was invited to consider and encouraged to adopt.

Nicky Moeran (on behalf of the Save Port Meadow Campaign Group) said that the group was unable to endorse the review report as it stood, for the reason that it did not address a number of key questions. These questions had been deemed to be beyond the remit of the review. The Save Port Meadow Campaign Group would remain active and vigilant in holding the Council to account.

Councillor John Goddard was the Chair of the Working Group that was established in order to consider the planning processes associated with the Roger Dudman Way application. He observed that it had been a worthwhile exercise, that the history of the site had been explored, but that it was now time

to grasp the opportunity to move on and make changes and improvements to meet best practice standards.

Members of the Committee then made the following observations:-

- The recommendations made in the review report are extensive and will have a significant impact;
- The action plan is far from trivial, it has budgetary implications, and it is to be hoped that the Council can progress this quickly;
- Clarity on the interpretation of “design and context related to the surrounding area” was much needed, and should be included in the review report;
- It was noted that many items in the proposed Action Plan were already in hand, and that a design panel already existed;
- It was hoped that the suggested group of experts could be established quickly;
- It was acknowledged that some aspects to the proposed Action Plan would require finance – but the Council did need to know exactly what was required first;
- Members of the Working Party would very much welcome being kept up to date with the progress of establishing the Experts’ Group as well as the progress of the Action Plan;
- Would it be possible to establish a “standing panel” of officers, Councillors and various specialists with local and planning knowledge to look at any application that would have a major impact upon the City?
- It would be helpful for pre-application discussions related to major applications to be recorded in some way;
- Pre-application discussions were the best time to influence the outcome and a good time to involve people who might be affected;
- There should be better use of IT;
- Consultation should first consider who might be affected by a proposal, and then real efforts should be made to reach out to them;
- There should be real and consistent engagement between the Universities, major employers and the City Council, as their future and that of the City was symbiotic;

The Chair clarified, in response to comments from the Save Port Meadow Campaign Group, that the independent reviewer, Mr Goodstadt, had added some issues that they raised; and where he had not done so, it was because he felt them to be beyond the scope of the review or based upon a false premise.

He further suggested that the review report should be circulated to all members of Council as quickly as possible. A statement would be made at the next meeting of Council, and Council would be asked to ensure that provision was made in the Budget for the cost of establishing and running the suggested design review panel.

The Executive Director of City Regeneration and Housing indicated that he had prepared an informative note concerning the amount of student accommodation provided on this site. The members of the Committee had not been misled on this point. Mr Goodstadt would add this to the review report.

Resolved to:

- (1) Receive the final report of the independent review overseen by the Working Group, and note the findings and recommendations;
- (2) Endorse the proposals to address the recommendations with an Action Plan and embed best practice, and direct officers to carry out the actions stated, reporting to City Executive Board as required; the review report to be circulated to all members of Council as soon as possible and Council encouraged to make a budget allowance for the establishment and operation of the design review panel;
- (3) Thank Mr Vincent Goodstadt, the independent reviewer, and Dr Lucy Natarajan for their work, and the members of the Working Group for their contributions.

81. 23 AND BASEMENT FLAT 23 WALTON CRESCENT: 13/03031/FUL

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) that detailed a planning application to demolish the existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a conservatory to the rear; the erection of a part single storey, part 2 storey side extension, including conservatory and roof terrace, plus insertion of double doors to the front of the property at basement level.

Matthew Parry (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, the Committee Caroline Brown spoke against the application and Frank Reif spoke in favour of it.

After taking all submissions into account, both written and oral, the Committee resolved to REFUSE the planning application for the following reasons:-

- (1) The proposed side extension would result in the near total enclosure of the rear garden of 24 Richmond Road. This would significantly reduce the quality of the outlook from the rear garden as well as significantly reduce the levels of daylight and sunlight it receives. Consequently the proposals fail to accord with the requirements of policies CP1 and CP10 of the Oxford Local plan 2001-2016, as well as policy HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026;
- (2) The introduction of a raised outdoor terrace within an enclosed residential environment will give rise to a significant reduction in actual and perceived privacy for occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular no 24 Richmond Road. Consequently the proposals fail to adequately safeguard neighbouring residential amenity, contrary to the requirements of policies CP1 and CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 as well as policy HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026.

82. 102 SOUTHMOOR ROAD: 13/03091/FUL

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) that detailed a planning application to erect a first floor rear extension and the formation of a dormer to the rear. (This application was made by an employee of the Council, hence its presentation to the Committee.)

The Committee took all submissions into account and resolved to APPROVE the application with the conditions below, and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

Conditions

- (1) Development begun within time limit;
- (2) Matching materials;
- (3) Develop in accordance with approved plans.

83. TOWN HALL, ST ALDATE'S STREET: 13/02687/CT3

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) that detailed a planning application for Listed Building Consent for internal alterations to upgrade and refurbish existing toilets, involving removal of walls and partitions, and the formation of a lobby and door.

Sarah Billam (Conservation Officer) presented the application to the Committee.

Following some discussion concerning the future display of heritage items in the corridor outside the proposed toilets, the Committee resolved to DEFER the planning application to the following meeting.

84. CUTTESLOWE COMMUNITY CENTRE: 13/02922/CT3

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) that detailed a planning application to insert new doors and windows to east, south and west elevations.

Clare Golden (Planning Officer) confirmed that there were no further updates to this application.

Having taken all submissions into account, both written and oral, the Committee resolved to APPROVE the planning application subject to conditions outlined below, and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

Conditions:

- (1) Development to begin within time limit;
- (2) Development in accordance with approved plans;
- (3) Materials as specified.

85. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee resolved to note the report on planning appeals received and determined during November 2013

86. MINUTES

Resolved to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 10th December 2013.

87. FORTHCOMING APPLICATIONS

Resolved to note the list of forthcoming applications.

88. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved to note the following dates:-

Tuesday 11th February 2014 (and Thursday 13th February if necessary);
Tuesday 11th March 2014 (and Thursday 13th March if necessary)

The meeting started at 6.30 pm and ended at 8.00 pm