

# Minutes of a meeting of the Planning - Oxford City Planning Committee on Tuesday 24 May 2022

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Committee members present:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Councillor Chapman                                | Councillor Corais (for Councillor Aziz)              |
| Councillor Diggins (for Councillor Hollingsworth) | Councillor Fry (for Councillor Clarkson)             |
| Councillor Hunt                                   | Councillor Landell-Mills (for Councillor Altaf-Khan) |
| Councillor Pegg                                   | Councillor Rehman                                    |
| Councillor Roz Smith (for Councillor Fouweather)  | Councillor Upton (Vice-Chair, in the Chair)          |

## Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Adrian Arnold, Head of Planning Services  
Gill Butter, Principal Heritage Officer  
Sally Fleming, Planning Lawyer  
Robert Fowler, Development Management Team Leader (West)  
Emma Lund, Committee and Member Services Officer  
Andrew Murdoch, Development Management Service Manager  
Sarah Orchard, Principal Planning Officer  
James Paterson, Senior Planner

## Apologies:

Councillors Aziz, Altaf-Khan, Clarkson, Fouweather, Hollingsworth and Malik sent apologies.

Substitutes are shown above.

### 1. Election of Chair for the Council Year 2022-23

Councillor Mary Clarkson was elected Chair for the Council year 2022-23.

### 2. Election of Vice-Chair for the Council Year 2022-23

Councillor Louise Upton was elected Vice-Chair for the Council year 2022-23.

### 3. Declarations of interest

#### General

**Councillor Upton** stated that as a member and trustee of the Oxford Preservation Trust, she had taken no part in that organisation's discussions regarding the

applications before the Committee. Councillor Upton said that she was approaching the applications with an open mind, would listen to all the arguments and weigh up all the relevant facts before coming to a decision.

**Councillor Roz Smith** stated that as a member and trustee of the Oxford Preservation Trust, she had taken no part in that organisation's discussions regarding the applications before the Committee. Councillor Smith said that she was approaching the applications with an open mind, would listen to all the arguments and weigh up all the relevant facts before coming to a decision.

#### **21/02581/FUL**

**Councillor Fry** stated that he had been a signatory to the call-in but was approaching the application with an open mind, would listen to all the arguments and weigh up all the relevant facts before coming to a decision.

**Councillor Corais** stated that he had been a signatory to the call-in but was approaching the application with an open mind, would listen to all the arguments and weigh up all the relevant facts before coming to a decision.

#### **4. 21/02776/RES: Land At Barton, Northern By-pass Road, Oxford, OX3 9SD**

The Committee considered an application (21/02776/RES) for the approval of reserved matters in relation to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for 434 residential units and a commercial centre following the grant of outline planning permission for Barton Park in 2013.

The Planning Officer presented the report and visualisations of the development, and provided the following updates:

- Many matters had been agreed at outline stage in 2013, including parking and energy standards; the energy standards set in 2013 had been exceeded;
- The size of the commercial centre had been reduced in scale since the approval of the indicative proposal;
- The distribution of the affordable units had been split in order that they would be distributed more evenly throughout the development;
- Since publication of the agenda, an objection had been received from Headington Heritage. This had raised concerns that the officer's report referred only to the official parking spaces which were proposed. There was a concern that parking may take place in areas which were not designated for parking, thereby exceeding the maximum standards. The officer's response was that a condition could be added to require that no additional hardstanding was to be put down, and to remove permitted development rights to that effect in order to prevent additional parking spaces being created.
- A request had been made that a legal agreement should be put in place to require that all sporting facilities should be available at all times. The Planning Officer responded that the development referred to had been subject to a separate reserved matters application. It would therefore not be appropriate to impose new

restrictions on matters which were the subject of the application before the Committee.

- A request had also been made that artificial sports pitches should be replaced with grass in order to increase run-off. The Planning Officer reported that that had also been subject to a separate reserved matters application which was not before the Committee. Having checked the drainage report, the Planning Officer advised that the synthetic pitch was of a porous construction, with attenuation tanks underneath serving the whole of Barton Park.
- In relation to paragraph 10.53 of the report, the Planning Officer clarified that the Construction Environmental Management Plan for the whole of Barton Park had already been approved by condition.
- In relation to paragraph 10.59 of the report, the Planning Officer clarified that a tree protection plan had been submitted and approved under the outline application. No condition requiring a tree protection plan had therefore been included in the reserved matters application.
- The original officer recommendation in the report had been to grant approval subject to the finalisation of landscape proposals, plans, and a planting schedule and to give officers delegated powers to finalise these prior to issuing the decision notice. The Planning Officer clarified that revised landscaping plans had now been received and reviewed by officers. Officers were of the view that they went a significant way towards addressing the lack of native species' identified outside the greenways and pocket parks, and the further native species which had been included would provide additional biodiversity benefit. Therefore, officers now recommended that the application should be approved in accordance with those plans, with no further requirement for delegated powers in that respect.

Mark Patt, representing Headington Heritage, spoke against the proposal.

Andy Barron, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the proposal.

The Committee asked questions of the officers about the details of the application.

In discussion the Committee considered various issues, which included the following:

- The site was exempt from the 'First Homes' requirements due to the outline permission having been granted in 2013;
- A footpath diversion may be required in order to allow the construction of some of the dwellings, subject to checking the exact route of the right of way. Any diversion would need to be subject to a separate Footpath Diversion Order which would require public consultation;
- The outline permission had included a larger retail area and the proposal no longer included a large supermarket. As no minimum size threshold had been set at the time of approval of the outline application it was not possible to insist that the commercial centre should be of the larger size previously indicated. The

reduction in size of the commercial area did offer the potential for a larger number of homes to be delivered within the overall scheme.

- The 40% affordable housing within the scheme would all be at social rent, with nomination rights to be given to the Council.
- The parking standard had been reduced through pre-application discussions from 1.9 spaces per unit at the outline stage to 1.44 spaces per unit. There was also a condition requiring details of the implementation of a controlled parking zone. There was no scope to completely remove provision for car parking from the proposal due to the outline permission which had been granted in 2013.

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

After debate and being proposed, seconded and put to the vote, the Committee agreed with the officer's recommendation to approve the application subject to (i) the addition of a condition to remove permitted development rights for additional hardstanding; and (ii) approval of the application to be in accordance with the submitted revised landscaping plans.

#### **The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:**

1. **approve the application** with the submitted revised landscaping plans for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of the report and the addition of a condition to remove permitted development rights for additional hardstanding and grant approval to the reserved matters; 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; and
  - Authorise the Head of Planning Services to agree the change in the affordable housing mix set out in the S106 agreement associated with application 13/01383/OUT in writing, to be issued with the decision notice, and issue the decision notice.

#### **5. 21/02581/FUL: 1 North Street, Oxford, OX2 0AY**

The Committee considered an application (21/02581/FUL) for the erection of a three storey building to create 6 no. 2 bedroomed flats (use class C3); demolition of existing single storey extension to clubhouse; erection of part single, part two storey rear extension to the existing clubhouse; alterations to the fenestration throughout; extension and alterations to the existing roof including the formation of 4 no. dormers, addition of external stair access and insertion of rooflights; alterations to the extended clubhouse to create 2 no. 2 bedroomed flats and 1 no. 1 bedroomed flat (use class C3); alterations to boundary treatments; provision of private amenity space, car parking, bin and cycle stores at 1 North Street, Oxford OX2 0AY.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation and advised that the application was considered to be acceptable in planning terms and in accordance with planning policies, and was therefore recommended for approval for the reasons set out in the report.

Tara Howard and Alan Goodwin, local residents, spoke against the application.

Adrian James, agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee's discussions included the following points:

- Amenity space would be provided in the form of balconies, with a communal garden. The amenity space provision was considered by officers to be acceptable, and was in accordance with the national minimum space requirements;
- All of the dwellings on the site would be subject to noise conditions;
- The proposal would enable the preservation of the Democrat Clubhouse, which was considered to be a community facility;
- The proposal was considered to be of good design, with secure and adequate cycle parking and would increase housing provision.

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

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

#### **The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:**

1. **approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions 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.

#### **6. 22/00393/FUL: 39 South Parade, Oxford OX2 7JL**

The Committee considered an application (22/00393/FUL) for partial demolition of the existing building; erection of a three storey building to create 6 no. 1 bedroomed flats (use class C3); alterations to the existing building to form 3 no. 1 bedroomed flats (use class C3); alterations to fenestration on the west elevation; provision of bin and cycle stores; and alterations to landscaping and other ancillary works at 39 South Parade, Oxford.

The Planning Officer presented the report and informed the Committee that:

- The application site comprised a large Victorian building which had originally been used as a greengrocers at ground floor level with accommodation above, but which had since been converted to being wholly residential in nature. The building had also been extended rearwards;

- The site lay within the Summertown district centre; the Summertown area of change; and the Southern Terraces character area of the Summertown and St Margaret's neighbourhood plan;
- The proposal included no car parking, but did include landscaping to the front and rear and also an external rear stairway to provide access to the upper floors;
- The application was considered to be acceptable in planning terms, and to accord with planning policies for the reasons set out in the report.

Rosalind Philps, Jane Binyon and Nick Georgiou, local residents, spoke against the application.

Nik Lyzba, agent and Bruce Coburn, architect, spoke in favour of the application.

The Committee asked questions of officers about the details of the application.

In discussion the Committee considered various issues of concern, including (but not limited to):

- The implications on privacy, daylight and sunlight for the residents of nearby properties at 42, 43 and 44 South Parade, and the potential for overbearing impact on the property at 60 Stratfield Road;
- The visual impact of the development on Stratfield Road, given that the majority of the development would face onto Stratfield Road rather than South Parade. Although the development site is land belonging to and associated with 39 South Parade, the development would sit at the rear of 39 South Parade, fronting onto Stratfield Road.
- The insertion of a tall, flat-roofed contemporary building amidst existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings. The application site represented a transition between different patterns of development on South Parade and Stratfield Road;
- There were examples of successful juxtapositions between old and modern buildings elsewhere in the City; however, in such cases there was a need for careful consideration of building design in order to ensure an appropriate transition;
- Objections to the design had been expressed by local residents;
- The proposal was not considered to be in accordance with the design policies of the local plan and the neighbourhood plan.

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

A proposal to approve the application was moved and seconded. On being put to the vote the motion fell.

A proposal to refuse the application for the reasons set out in 1) and 2) below and with authority being delegated to the Head of Planning Services to finalise those reasons was moved and seconded. On being put to the vote the Committee resolved to refuse the application.

- 1) The design fails to comply with policies in the Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan;
- 2) The impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity; specifically the loss of privacy to the rear of properties at 42, 43 and 44 South Parade and 60 Stratfield Road caused by overlooking by stairwells, contrary to Policy H14.

**The Oxford City Planning Committee resolved to:**

**1. Refuse the application** for the following reasons:

- 1) The design fails to comply with policies in the Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan;
- 2) The impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity; specifically the loss of privacy to the rear of properties at 42, 43 and 44 South Parade and 60 Stratfield Road caused by overlooking by stairwells, contrary to Policy H14;

and

**2. Delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services** to:

- Finalise the above reasons for refusing the application including such refinements, amendments, additions and / or deletions as the Head of Planning Services considers reasonably necessary; and
- Refuse the planning application.

**7. Minutes**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2022 as a true and accurate record.

**8. Forthcoming applications**

The Committee noted the list of forthcoming applications.

**9. Dates of future meetings**

The Committee noted the dates of future meetings.

**The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.47 pm**

**Chair .....**

**Date: Tuesday 21 June 2022**

*When decisions take effect:*

*Cabinet: after the call-in and review period has expired*

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

*All other committees: immediately.*

*Details are in the Council's Constitution.*