

Remote meeting

Minutes of a meeting of the East Area Planning Committee on Wednesday 3 June 2020

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members present:

Councillor Taylor

Councillor Tanner

Councillor Altaf-Khan

Councillor Aziz

Councillor Chapman

Councillor Clarkson

Councillor Lloyd-Shogbesan

Councillor Simm

Councillor Roz Smith

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Adrian Arnold, Head of Planning Services

Sally Fleming, Planning Lawyer

Hayley Jeffery, Development Management Team Leader

Andrew Murdoch, Development Management Service Manager

Sarah Orchard, Senior Planner

Jennifer Thompson, Committee and Members Services Officer

Alice Watkins, Planning Officer

Apologies:

No apologies

1. Election of Chair for the Council Year 2020-21

The Committee elected Councillor Taylor to be the Chair for the Council Year 2020/21.

Cllr Taylor took the Chair.

2. Election of Vice-Chair for the Council Year 2020-21

The Committee elected Councillor Tanner to be the Vice-Chair for the Council Year 2020/21.

3. Declarations of interest

19/03223/FUL

Cllr Chapman, local ward councillor, declared that he did not have a predetermined opinion on this, had made no statements, and had not had contact with the developer or with the applicants prior to this meeting.

4. 19/03223/FUL: 1 Pullens Lane, Oxford OX3 0BX

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and garage/annex; erection of 3 x 5-bed dwellinghouses (Use Class C3); creation of new access, modification of existing access, landscaping works and provision of bin and cycle storage (Amended plans) at 1 Pullens Lane, Oxford, OX3 0BX.

The Planning Officer introduced the report and reported updates: a further 4 letters of support received since the report was written; additional ecology information from the applicant reviewed by the Council's ecology officer who maintained objections; and a letter from the applicant to the committee, circulated on 2 June, which officers had not assessed.

He recommended, and the Committee agreed, amending refusal reason 3 to reflect the updated ecology information:

~~*“The proposed development, by reason of the lack of up-to-date information and assessment, fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in harm to known protected species on site and any appropriate mitigation necessary. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the scheme would not result in harm to known protected species on site, due to the loss of functional wildlife habitat, most notably for badgers. The development would result in the net loss of a significant amount of trees, vegetation and ecological habitat that makes a meaningful contribution to local biodiversity that cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated by the proposal. A measurable net gain in biodiversity has not been demonstrated within the proposed development. As such, the development fails to accord with the requirements of policies NE15 and NE22 of the Oxford Local Plan 2016, policy CS12 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, policy GSP3 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan, policies G2 and SP54 of the emerging Local Plan 2036 and the NPPF.”*~~

Alex Creswell (the agent) and David Gye (from Pullens Lane Association) spoke in support of the application, and they and Neil Perry (architect) were available to answer questions.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. On being debated, proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to

REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its siting, massing, form, layout and external appearance, would cumulatively dominate and overwhelm this greenfield site such that it would result in an incongruous and inappropriate form of development, that would fail to preserve, and would erode, the quiet, verdant and rural character of Pullens Lane and the Headington Hill Conservation Area. Further, the loss of trees and important soft landscape features along with inadequate landscape mitigation proposed would cause harm to the visual amenity of Pullens Lane. This, coupled with the scale, form and layout, would cause harm to the wooded hillside that forms the green backdrop to Oxford and would be harmful to views out of the city, and to the special character and

appearance of the Central Conservation Area. The proposed development would result in a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building Headington Hill Hall and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of that area or its setting. Overall, the development would result in a high level of less than substantial harm that would not be outweighed by any public benefit derived from the development contrary to the requirements of policies CP1, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP11, HE3, HE7 and HE10 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, policies CS2 and CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026 as well as policies HP9 and HP10 of the Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026; policies CIP2, CIP3, CIP4 and GPS4 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and emerging policies DH1, DH2, DH3, G6 and SP54 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036. The development would also fail to meet the duties set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in sections 66 and 72 of that Act.

2. The proposed development has failed to demonstrate that the proposal makes the best use of the site's capacity through exploring all available opportunities in a manner compatible with both the site itself and the surrounding area. The development therefore results in an inefficient use of the land contrary to the aims and objectives of policies CP1 and CP6 of the Oxford Local Plan and emerging policy RE2 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.
3. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that the scheme would not result in harm to known protected species on site, due to the loss of functional wildlife habitat, most notably for badgers. The development would result in the net loss of a significant amount of trees, vegetation and ecological habitat that makes a meaningful contribution to local biodiversity that cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated by the proposal. A measurable net gain in biodiversity has not been demonstrated within the proposed development. As such, the development fails to accord with the requirements of policies NE15 and NE22 of the Oxford Local Plan 2016, policy CS12 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, policy GSP3 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan, policies G2 and SP54 of the emerging Local Plan 2036 and the NPPF.

5. 19/03303/FUL: Land To The Rear Of 4 Lime Walk, Oxford, OX3 7AE

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the demolition of former MOT facility (Use Class B2); erection of part four part three storey building to create 4 x 1-bed flats and 3 x 2-bed flats (Use Class C3); erection of a single storey building to create 1 x 2-bed flat (Use Class C3); provision of private amenity space, bin and cycle storage, alterations to landscaping and formation of 1 disabled parking space on Land to the Rear of 4 Lime Walk, Oxford, Oxfordshire, OX3 7AE.

Jeremy Biggin (the applicant) spoke in support of the application.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to

a) REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

1. Due to the scale and massing of the proposed flats, the proposal fails to form an appropriate visual relationship between the student accommodation blocks at Dorset house, two storey buildings in Lime Walk and office building to the

north of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and visual amenity, contrary to policies CP1 and CP8 of the Oxford Local Plan, CS18 of the Core Strategy, HP9 of the Sites and Housing Plan and CIP1 and GSP4 of the Headington Neighbourhood Plan.

2. No formal assessment has been carried out on the impact on light to the office building to the north of the site. Given the height and proximity of the proposed development to this neighbouring property and the location of light sources in the office building, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not be harm to the amenity of the office building at Lime Tree Mews contrary to policy CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan.
 3. The proposal due to its height and scale in a backland location in close proximity to rear gardens of Lime Walk would result in a perceived loss of privacy to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers contrary to policies CP10 of the Oxford Local Plan and HP14 of the Sites and Housing Plan.
 4. The proposal fails to provide an adequate level of shared outdoor amenity space to serve the proposed units, especially those without direct access to a balcony or terrace in accordance with the requirements of policy HP13 of the Sites and Housing Plan.
- b) delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the refusal reasons as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

6. 20/00073/FUL: 385 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 2BS

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the demolition of existing car repair garage; construction of new building containing 1 office unit (Use Class B1); erection of 5 x 2 bed flats (Use Class C3); and provision of 6 off street car parking spaces, bin and cycle storage at 385 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 2BS.

The Planning Officer corrected a typographical error in paragraph 11.2 of the report: *Officers would advise members that having considered the application carefully that the proposal is considered to be un-acceptable in terms of the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.....*

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. They noted that as no controlled parking zone was in place, no conditions relating to this could be applied, but controls and exclusions could be put in place by the Highways Authority should one be introduced.

On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to:

1. approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the 9 required planning conditions and 2 informatives set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission; and
2. delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

7. 19/03050/FUL: Karam House 84A Crescent Road Oxford OX4 2PD

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the change of use of dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4); and provision of car parking, bin and bicycle storage at Karam House, 84A Crescent Road, Oxford.

Huw Mellor (the agent) spoke in support of the application and Israr Hussain (the applicant) was available to answer questions.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to:

1. approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the 3 required planning conditions and 2 informatives set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission; and
2. delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

8. 19/03051/FUL: Fatima House 84B Crescent Road Oxford OX4 2PD

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the change of use of dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4); and provision of car parking, bin and bicycle storage at Fatima House, 84B Crescent Road, Oxford.

Huw Mellor (the agent) spoke in support of the application and Israr Hussain (the applicant) was available to answer questions.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to:

1. approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the 3 required planning conditions and 2 informatives set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission; and
2. delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

9. 20/00162/FUL: 84 Church Way, Iffley

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the change of use of the dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4) at 84 Church Way, Oxford, OX4 4EF.

On behalf of Ms Gregory (the applicant) the clerk read her statement outlining the reasons for making the application. Ms Gregory attended to answer questions.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. They noted, given the layout of the external space and the house's location, the particular difficulties in complying with the policy requirements for C4 use.

In reaching its decision, the Committee considered all the information put before it.

After debate and on being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse the application, and to request that planning officers contact the applicant and explore the options available to her.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to

a) REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development fails to provide adequate off-street parking in accordance with the maximum parking standards and fails to demonstrate that there is sufficient on-street car parking capacity to mitigate for any increase in parking pressure resulting from the change of use in an area which is not subject to a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy HP16 of Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026 and the NPPF.
2. The proposal fails to make provision for covered and secure cycle storage and bin storage in accordance with HP13 and HP15 of the Sites and Housing Plan and the NPPF.

b) delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the refusal reasons as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

10. 19/03392/FUL: 25A Mayfair Road, Oxford, OX4 3SR

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alteration to one window to side elevation (Amended Plan) at 25A Mayfair Road, Oxford, OX4 3SR.

The applicant spoke in support of the proposal.

The Committee asked questions of the officers and considered all the information before them. On being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

The East Area Planning Committee resolved to:

1. approve the application for the reasons given in the report and subject to the 3 required planning conditions and 1 informative set out in section 12 of the report and grant planning permission; and
2. delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to finalise the recommended conditions as set out in the report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary.

11. Minutes

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2020 as a true and accurate record.

12. Forthcoming applications

The Committee noted the list and that application 19/03361/FUL 139 London Road had been refused as a delegated decision.

13. Dates of future meetings

The Committee noted the dates and that meetings would start at 3.00pm while the committee is meeting remotely.

The meeting started at 3.00 pm and ended at 6.05 pm

Chair
2020

Date: Wednesday 1 July

When decisions take effect:

Planning Committees: after the call-in and review period has expired and the formal decision notice is issued.

Details are in the Council's Constitution.