

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 15 March 2023  
at 6.00 pm in Meeting Room 1, Abbey  
House, Abbey Close, Abingdon,  
OX14 3JE

**Open to the public, including the press**

### **Present in the meeting room:**

Councillors: Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair – in the chair), Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Stefan Gawrysiak, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, Ian Snowdon, and Alan Thompson  
Officers: Adrian Duffield (Head of Planning), Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Will Darlison (Planning Officer), and Sharon Crawford (Planning Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer)

## **1 Chair's announcements**

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

## **2 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ken Arlett, who was substituted for Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak, and Councillors Tim Bearder, Axel MacDonald, David Bretherton, and Elizabeth Gillespie.

## **3 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 February and 21 February 2023 as correct records and agree that the Chair signs these as such.

## **4 Declarations of interest**

Councillor Victoria Haval declared an interest in items 8 and 9 on the agenda, applications P20/S4467/FUL and P20/S4469/LB, as she had chaired the licencing panel where the licence was granted for The Snug at Bishops Court Farm. Councillor

Haval confirmed that she would stand down from the committee and not participate in the debate or vote for these items.

## **5 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **6 Proposals for site visits**

The committee discussed the proposal for a site visit for planning applications P20/S4467/FUL and P20/S4469/LB Bishops Court Farm, 91 High Street, Dorchester-on-Thames. There were concerns that due to the complexity of the site and the various constraints it would be helpful for the members to see the context. The committee agreed to hear the item and then take a decision on the need for a site visit.

## **7 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

## **8 P20/S4467/FUL and P20/S4469/LB - Bishop Court Farm, 91 High Street, Dorchester-On-Thames**

The committee considered planning applications P20/S4467/FUL and P20/S4469/LB for the conversion of farm buildings to residential use and creation of new vehicular access to site from Abingdon Road (amended by package of drawings and reports received on 27 October 2021 and 11 February 2022 and as amplified by traffic report received 15 June 2022), on land at Bishop Court Farm, 91 High Street, Dorchester-On-Thames.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting. The chair clarified that the report was the same for both applications, which would be taken together.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to the committee due to the objection of Dorchester-on-Thames Parish Council. The application site was located on north-west side of Dorchester-on-Thames and formed part of the farmyard area associated with the grade II listed Bishops Court Farmhouse. The entire site was located within the Oxford Green Belt and Dorchester-on-Thames Conservation Area.

The planning officer informed the committee that planning permission and listed building consent was sought for the change of use and conversion of the central range of barns from agricultural to residential use. The central range of barns already benefited from planning permission for conversion into a single dwelling house which remained extant to 2025.

New vehicular access from the north giving access onto Abingdon Road was required due to the new garden of unit A removing the existing access route for the northern part of the site. The highway liaison officer had confirmed the visibility splays for the

new access met the guidance. In addition, the access would have sufficient width for access of two vehicles as well as providing passing space at a point along the access track.

The planning officer informed the committee that concerns had been raised regarding the access being used for a potential future development. Any future development of the site was sensitive due to the site constraints, however, the planning officer noted that any potential future development did not form part of the current application and so should not unduly influence the applications assessment.

Overall, the planning officer believed that the application was compliant with relevant policies and that the design and appearance of the buildings would be in keeping with the area and would make a positive contribution to the site within the conservation area. Furthermore, he believed that the development would not be harmful to the setting of the adjacent listed building, the openness of the green belt, or the amenities of neighbouring properties. Therefore, he recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions, but with a suggested modification to conditions 3 and 4 in relation to materials and joinery details from pre-commencement to compliance as this level of detail had been supplied as part of the application.

Rob Ballantyne spoke on behalf of Dorchester-on-Thames Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Patrick Clayphan spoke objecting to the application.

Trevor Avery, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer why the new access road had been requested by the officer during the pre-application stage of the application. He confirmed that, due to the logistical issue caused by the conversion of the existing farm buildings, the operative farm building to the northern area of the site became essentially land locked, which had led to an objection from the highways authority. The planning officer confirmed to members that this was his primary motivation behind the request, not for other reasons such as for traffic concerns on the Oxford Road.

The committee further enquired as to the construction of the proposed access road. The planning officer confirmed that the proposed access was not a tarmacked estate road but instead a gravelled track which would be much more sympathetic to the area and less visually dominant.

Overall, as there were no concerns regarding the principle of the conversion of the buildings to residential, the committee considered the main issue to be the access. However, as they were satisfied there was a need for the new access and that the construction materials of the new access and the proposed trees meant it would be a track and therefore less invasive, they agreed that the application should be approved, subject to conditions.

Motions moved and seconded, to approve the planning application and the listed building consent application were carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P20/S4467/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as approved
4. Joinery details as approved
5. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class A, B, C and D)
6. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc
7. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 2 Class A) - no walls, fences etc
8. Landscaping implementation
9. New hedge required
10. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved) - Badgers
11. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved) - Bats
12. Surface Water Drainage Implementation
13. Foul Water Drainage Implementation
14. Archaeology (Implementation of Written Scheme of Investigation)
15. New vehicular access
16. Vision splay protection
17. Parking & Manoeuvring
18. No Garage conversion into accommodation

**RESOLVED:** to approve listed building consent application P20/S4469/LB, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Listed Building Consent
2. Approved plans (listed building)
3. All new external materials as approved
4. Joinery Details as approved

## **9 P22/S4300/FUL - Land north of No 1 Cranford Cottages, Moulsoford**

The committee considered planning application P22/S4300/FUL for the new access road (additional highways information received 10 January 2023), on land north of No 1 Cranford Cottages, Moulsoford.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to the committee due to the objection of Moulsoford Parish Council. She noted that a letter of support had been received from the headmaster of Moulsoford Preparatory School and requested to make a correction to paragraph 1.4 of the report where the first bullet point should read '2 Cranford Cottages' not '1 and 2 Cranford Cottages' as 1 Cranford Cottages already had direct vehicular access to their property from the highway.

The planning officer informed the committee that the site formed part of an existing paddock located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Moulsoford Preparatory School was located to the south-east of the site and the school's pre-school was located opposite the site. The planning officer highlighted that all land within the blue line indicated in the officer's report was owned by the

Cranford Estate. Planning permission was sought for a new access including fencing and a gate for several properties which did not currently have their own direct access from the highway and who currently shared the Moulsoford Preparatory School access.

Overall, as there were no technical objections from any specialist officers, the planning officer, recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions.

Sarah Elvy spoke on behalf of Moulsoford Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Hugh Colver, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Anne-Marie Simpson, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee enquired about whether the Old Laundry was a residential property or not and as such which properties were to be served by the new access. The planning officer confirmed from a plan submitted by the agent that the Old Laundry was a building to the rear of 2 Cranford Cottages, but that she was uncertain if the property was residential or an office used for the estate.

The committee also queried what the current use class of the land where the proposed access was and the planning officer confirmed that it was an area of paddock not deemed to be within the residential curtilage. The committee discussed how the internal arrangement of the access might work in practice, but the planning officer reminded them that how the internal arrangement was operated was for the applicant to decide. In response to members questions about the location of the site and if it came with any constraints, the planning officer clarified the test for development in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty was the duty to preserve and enhance the character of the area.

The committee also sought to clarify the arrangement of the proposed gate and proximity to the road. The planning officer confirmed that there was sufficient space for a car to be stationary off the road and for the gate to operate without blocking the highway and that this was acceptable to the highways officer.

Overall, the committee felt that, on balance, the proposed access would be harmful to the character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and it did not feel there was a need for the additional access. Members also noted that the proposed access would not significantly ease the pressure on the school access with it only redirecting one car movement per hour, and the properties had managed with the current access arrangement to date. It was also felt that the proposed steel gate would be harmful and have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The committee was conscious that the site area was paddock land and not within the residential curtilage which had a bearing on its decision.

Ultimately, as it was felt that the public benefit did not outweigh the duty to preserve and enhance the character of the area, the committee agreed that the application should be refused.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P22/S4300/FUL, for the following reason:

The proposal to locate a new access point, of the width and design proposed, at this sensitive location on the edge of the village and within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) would be harmful to the landscape setting and character of Moulsoford village and the AONB. The proposal does not meet the high test to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB required by paragraph 176 of the NPPF. In addition, the proposal is contrary to Policies DES1, DES2 and ENV1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and the advice in the Joint Design Guide.

## **10 P23/S0302/S73 - Drayton House, Farm Drayton, St. Leonard Oxfordshire, OX10 7BG**

The committee considered planning application P23/S0302/S73 for the variation of condition 2 (approved plans) on planning application P21/S4551/FUL, demolition of existing buildings, and construction of five dwellings, on land at Drayton House Farm, Drayton St. Leonard, Oxfordshire, OX10 7BG.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was brought to the committee due to the objection of Drayton St. Leonard Parish Council. Since the report was published, additional responses had been received from the crime prevention designer who had no objections to the application, and three further objections from local residents in respect of increased traffic, the increase in size of the properties putting them out of reach of low and middle income households, and the impact on the sewerage system, as already raised. The application sought to vary the approved plans which would add an additional bedroom to both plots one and two of the approved scheme. Some changes to the elevations were also sought comprising the addition of two roof lights and a door to the rear elevation and minor changes to window location on the side elevation.

The planning officer informed the committee that under a section 73 application the council could not revisit the original consent, but could only consider the original condition and the reasons for applying the condition. She confirmed there was no change to the size of the units and the increase in bedrooms was via internal changes only. Increase in bedrooms could increase parking space and garden area requirements. Oxfordshire County Council parking standards were met by the application and the garden sizes were in excess of the required private amenity spaces. The planning officer confirmed that drainage issues could not be considered as part of this application, but drainage engineers had confirmed that the foul sewage details were acceptable and that the foul water connection was the responsibility of Thames Water.

Paul Southouse, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee enquired whether the planning officer had engaged with the parish council over its concerns and the planning officer confirmed that she had not, but that

she had been in dialogue with the local ward member. The committee was clear on the motivations of the applicant for the proposed changes and reflected it had been helpful to hear from the agent.

Overall, the committee was satisfied with the officer's report and, as it could see no material planning reasons for refusal, agreed that the application should be approved subject to conditions.

The committee noted the new layout was preferable and that it was convinced by the motivation behind the sought changes.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S0302/S73, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development linked to original permission
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
3. Materials as approved under P22/S4591/DIS
4. Surface water drainage works as approved under P22/S4591/DIS
5. Foul Water Drainage as approved under P22/S4591/DIS
6. Contaminated Land – partially discharged under P22/S4591/DIS
7. No occupation until contamination has been addressed
8. Archaeological written scheme of investigation as approved under P22/S4591/DIS
9. Implementation of Programme or Archaeological Work
10. Improve means of access onto unmade road as shown on plan
11. No obstruction of vision splay
12. Provide parking & Manoeuvring Areas as approved
13. Energy Statement Verification prior to occupation
14. Provide Electric Vehicles Charging Point
15. No Garage conversion into accommodation on plot 2 garage
16. Landscaping implementation
17. Provision of bat and bird boxes

The meeting closed at 7.51 pm

---