

## EAST AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Tuesday 8 January 2013**

**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Darke (Chair), Rundle (Vice-Chair), Altaf-Khan, Clarkson, Coulter, Curran, Hollick, Lloyd-Shogbesan and Sinclair.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Martin Armstrong (City Development), Michael Morgan (Law and Governance), Lois Stock (Democratic and Electoral Services Officer) and Murray Hancock (City Development)

### **102. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

None

### **103. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:-

Councillor Lloyd-Shogbesan declared an interest in agenda item 5 (59 Littlemore Road, minute 106 refers) on the grounds that he was a Board Member of the organisation that had made the application. He intended to withdraw from the room during consideration of this item.

### **104. UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OLD ROAD CAMPUS: 12/02072/OUT**

The Head of City Development submitted a report which detailed a planning application to demolish the existing buildings on application site. Outline planning application (fixing details of access) for the erection of 48,000sqm of class D1 research floor space and ancillary facilities on 2 to 5 storeys over 5 building plots as an extension to University of Oxford Old Road Campus. Provision of 459 car parking spaces, cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment

Murray Hancock (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee. Huw Jones and Craig Rossington (Oxfordshire County Council Highways) attended the meeting and spoke on the traffic and transport aspects of the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Nicholas Rollin and Tony Joyce spoke against the application and made the following points:-

- Not against development at this site, but wished to highlight certain aspects which were of concern;
- Expressed concern about traffic delays in the area, parking issues, height of proposed new buildings particularly those nearest to Old Road, need for good cycle routes – it is good to encourage this but please note that there are high kerbs and narrow lanes around here;
- The area has already lost facilities, some replacement would be welcomed, especially sporting facilities;

- Whilst appreciating the University's efforts to consult with local people, residents still have some concerns about the site as it is now and as it may be in future;
- Car parking at the site is an especial concern – the number of increased spaces should happen at the same rate as the increase in employment at the site.

Christopher Patterson (Agent for the Applicant) spoke in favour of the applications and made the following points:-

- Had nothing further to add to the officer's report and presentation, but would be happy to answer questions;
- Stressed that the University had tried very hard to involve the local community in its plans. There had been meetings and workshops at which people could engage with the design team;
- The submission had been prepared with input from both individuals and community groups as well as statutory consultees;
- Dialogue with groups would continue.

In discussing the application, members of the Committee made the following comments and observations which they asked to be recorded for future reference:-

- This is a very significant application and the Committee noted and welcomed the fact that the University had discussed the application with the local community and had listened to its comments;
- The Committee hoped that this communication would continue;
- There were still issues with the site, but this application gave the Council the opportunity to manage change here. Change at the site had, over time, been somewhat piecemeal;
- Conditions attached to the application should be living documents, not merely a tick list;
- The recommendations in the report were fine, but it would be advantageous to have the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee look over the wording to ensure that the right mechanism was in place;
- There was concern about the proposed extra spaces at the Thornhill Park and Ride site. When would they be provided? Would it be before or after this development was completed? There was a need to be proactive here to minimise problems;
- There was serious concern about parking provision at the site and the possible overspill of parking into the local area;
- The Committee noted that a CPZ was proposed for Lye Valley. Once that was in place, there was a worry that this would cause displacement parking in Old Marston – which was already used as an informal park and ride site. Overspill parking in this area should be avoided;
- The cost of the introduction of CPZs was a concern for many residents, some of whom did not want it, especially where it was introduced as a result of a large planning application;
- Where a CPZ is proposed and consulted upon, the County Council must listen seriously to the views of local people;
- This site has grown over many years and it has had an impact on the local community;

- A key issue for this development was that of transport to and from the site. Overflow parking in Old Marston had been mentioned, and the same situation occurred in Quarry and Risinghurst. There were already overflow problems from Thornhill Park and Ride which caused concern for residents;
- The comments made about the need for sporting facilities in the area were also noted by the Committee;
- This is not just about capacity on roads and car parks. There is also the question about community capacity too, such as pressure on schools;
- It would be helpful for the Committee to see an annual report concerning the traffic and travel plan for this site so that it could be made aware of any problems. The Committee would also like to be appraised of the progress of the development and its impact upon the local area.

Murray Hancock reminded the Committee that this was an outline application and that there would be a series of reserved matter applications at which specific details could be discussed. The Committee felt that it was important to ensure that the details were correct from the start, as this was not an “everyday” application.

The Committee considered all submissions, both written and oral, and **RESOLVED:-**

- (1) To support the proposals in principle but defer the planning application in order to draw up an accompanying legal agreement;
- (2) To delegate to officers the issuing of the Notice of Planning Permission on its completion;
- (3) That the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee would review the wording of all conditions in conjunction with officers;

#### **105. 18 SANDFIELD ROAD: 12/02653/FUL**

The Head of City Development submitted a report which detailed a planning application to demolish the existing dwelling house, and the erection of 2 x semi-detached dwelling houses (Class C3), provision of car parking and landscaping. (Additional Information)

Murray Hancock (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, James Watts and Charles Crombie spoke against the proposal, expressing concerns about overlooking, the scale, mass and bulk of the property and the overbearing nature of the development.

Nik Lyzba and Danny Wright spoke in favour of it, pointing out that the application sought to make better use than at present of the land for housing, and that the proposal met Council standards for sunlight, daylight and the outlook from windows. They would be willing to accept a condition requiring obscured glass in the side windows.

The Committee considered all submissions, both written and oral, and RESOLVED to approve the planning application with conditions laid out in the planning officer's report and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

#### **106. 59 LITTLEMORE ROAD: 12/02698/FUL**

The Head of City Development submitted a report which detailed a planning application to erect a single storey side and rear extension. Subdivision of dwelling house to form 3 self-contained flats (Class C3).

Martin Armstrong (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, James McLaughlin spoke in favour of the application. He pointed out that the charity, Response, had owned the property for over 15 years, during which time it has not been a family dwelling. It provides supported accommodation for people with mental health problems. The intention is to support people so that they can become independent and move on to other accommodation.

No-one spoke against it.

The Committee noted that the application was recommended for refusal. It also noted an offer from officers, made at the meeting, to work with the applicant on improving the proposal, and that the normal fee for pre-application advice would be waived in this instance.

The Committee considered all submissions both written and oral and RESOLVED:-

- (1) To refuse the application for reasons laid out in the planning officer's report;
- (2) To note and welcome officers' suggestion that they work with the applicant to improve the proposal, and that no charge would be made in this instance for pre-application advice.

(Having declared an interest in this item, Councillor Lloyd-Shogbesan withdrew from the meeting whilst this item was considered, and took no part in the discussions.)

#### **107. 19 CAVENDISH DRIVE: 12/02738/FUL**

The Chair informed the Committee that the call in for this item had been withdrawn by Councillor Clarkson. The item would be dealt with by planning officers under delegated powers, and was therefore withdrawn from the agenda.

#### **108. 19 RYMERS LANE: 12/02782/FUL**

The Head of City Development submitted a report concerning planning application 12/02782/FUL – erection of part single storey, part two storey rear extension at 19 Rymers Lane.

The Committee considered that this was a non-contentious application that did not need further discussion.

Resolved to approve the application with conditions laid out in the planning officer's report, and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

#### **109. 139 ROSE HILL: 12/02969/VAR**

The Head of City Development submitted a report detailing a planning application to vary conditions 3 [tree protection], 4 [landscaping], 6 [means of enclosure], 11 [means of access], 12 [bin and cycle stores] and 13 [vision splays] of planning permission 07/01984/FUL to allow post-commencement discharge of conditions. (Amended description) (Amended plans).

Martin Armstrong (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr Robert Pope spoke in favour of the application. No-one spoke against it.

Resolved to approved the application with conditions laid out in the planning officer's report, and with the addition of those conditions listed below; including an amendment to Condition 6, and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

##### Amended condition:-

- Condition 6 is amended to require the provision and retention of cycle parking for all the plots.

##### Additional conditions:-

- Condition 7 – landscaping as per the approved plan to be provided in the first planting season and retained thereafter;
- Condition 8 – refuse and recycling storage as per the approved plan to be provided prior to first occupation and retained thereafter;
- Condition 9 – Boundary fences as per the approved plan to be provided prior to first occupation and retained thereafter;
- Condition 10 – Parking areas, access, and vision splays as per the approved plan to be provided prior to first occupation and retained thereafter;

- Condition 11 – second floor dormer windows to be obscure glazed and retained;
- Condition 12 – no further windows to be installed in the flank wall of plot 7;
- Condition 13 – remove permitted development rights for all dwellings;
- Condition 14 – dwellings to be occupied and used as homes for single people and families (Use Class C3) only.

#### **110. PLANNING APPEALS FOR NOVEMBER 2012**

Resolved to note the report.

#### **111. MINUTES**

Resolved to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> December 2012.

The Chair, Councillor Darke, briefly updated the Committee on the progress of the Headington Hill Conservation Area Appraisal. Following its consideration in August by the Committee, a meeting was held (in November) that involved various individuals and groups, including Ward Councillors, residents associations and Councillor Darke; and as a result of this some minor amendments were made to the appraisal document. Councillor Darke has now endorsed the document.

#### **112. FORTHCOMING APPLICATIONS**

Resolved to note the list of forthcoming applications.

#### **113. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Resolved to note the following dates of future meetings:-

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013 (Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> March if necessary);

Tuesday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2013 (Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> March if necessary);

Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> April 2013 (Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> April if necessary).

**The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.42 pm**