

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 6.00 PM

FOUNTAIN CONFERENCE CENTRE, HOWBERY PARK, BENSON LANE,
CROWMARSH GIFFORD, WALLINGFORD, OX10 8BA

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)
Joan Bland, Margaret Davies, Jeannette Matelot, Lorraine Hillier (as substitute for Anthony Dearlove), Toby Newman, David Nimmo-Smith, Richard Pullen, David Turner, Margaret Turner, and Ian White

Also present:

John Cotton, Paul Harrison and Lynn Lloyd

Apologies:

Anthony Dearlove tendered apologies.

Officers:

Emma Bowerman, Sharon Crawford, Steve Culliford, Paula Fox, Kim Gould, Paul Lucas, and Tom Wyatt

72 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

David Nimmo-Smith declared that in relation to application P16/S0970/O at Thames Farm, Reading Road, Shiplake, he had chaired Henley Town Council's planning committee when it considered this application and, therefore, he would not take part in the discussion or voting on this item.

73 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meetings held on 13 and 27 July, and 10 August 2016 as correct records and agree that the Chairman signs these as such.

74 Urgent items

None



Listening Learning Leading

75 Applications deferred or withdrawn

The committee noted that application P16/S2114/RM (on land within Eyres Close, Eyres Lane, Ewelme) had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of one of the local ward members, Richard Pullen, to allow for the committee to visit the site.

76 Proposals for site visit reports

None

77 P16/S0970/O - Thames Farm, Reading Road, Shiplake

David Nimmo-Smith declared an interest in this item, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the committee's debate or voting on this application.

The committee considered application P16/S0970/O for outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings and associated public open space and landscaping, means of access and strategic landscaping not reserved, on land at Thames Farm, Reading Road, Shiplake.

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 this meeting.

Officer update:

- Since the publication of the agenda, a further 128 responses had been received objecting to the application, 28 of which were from new respondents
- the council had received allegations that some of the letters of support were fraudulent and as a result two representations have been removed from the council's website
- the officer would contact the Department for Communities and Local Government on 8 September 2016, advising of the committee's decision; the department would then consider whether to call-in the application for the Secretary of State's determination
- officers had sent the committee additional information in response to a submission by the local Member of Parliament, and further information on case law and recent appeal decisions

David Nimmo-Smith, a representative of Henley-on-Thames Town Council, spoke objecting to the application. The town council's concerns included:

- the site was within the Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan area and the plan had not included this as a housing site
- the policy objections to the proposed development of this site in 2013 were still relevant to this application, including the landscape objections
- the sight lines at the site's access were inadequate, given the amount of traffic using the Reading Road
- the Neighbourhood Plan could not be considered out of date
- this part of the district was already making a significant contribution to the district's five year housing land supply; why should this area suffer further housing?

Tudor Taylor, a representative of Shiplake Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- the five year housing land supply was one consideration but should not override the Neighbourhood Plan, which itself had over-provided for housing within its area
- a number of matters remained but had been dealt with by the officer's proposed planning conditions; these issues should be resolved before the committee considered the application
- the highways access to the site would be a safety risk
- there would be an adverse impact on the character of the area
- the proposed development was unsustainable
- residents of the new homes would have to rely on their cars and children would have to be bussed to schools outside the village
- there were neighbourhood planning, environmental, social and sustainability grounds to refuse the application
- the proposal trampled on local democracy

Kester George, a representative of Harpsden Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- the proposal was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, which planned for 500 homes in the plan area up to 2027, but had not included housing on this site
- of the possible housing sites considered for the Neighbourhood Plan, Thames Farm had been near the bottom of the priority list due to the high volume of traffic that used the Reading Road
- it was a greenfield site that would only provide a separate community, not an integrated one with the rest of the village
- to allow this application would make a mockery of the neighbourhood planning process and its role in the national planning system

David Bartholomew, the local county councillor, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- support for this application on pre-printed forms should be discounted
- the committee had rejected a similar application on this site previously
- the only change in circumstances was the council no longer had a five year housing land supply
- there were five reasons to refuse this application as follows
- the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of this rural area
- at senior level, the county council objected to this application on highways grounds, disagreeing with the highways officer's comments; urbanising measures were inappropriate in this rural area, and the application provided no additional infrastructure
- the county council objected on education grounds; there would be a need for additional primary education facilities and the application did not provide for this; residents' children would have to be bussed to a primary school
- the application was unsustainable; there would be no footpath, no cycle path, but rather an urban island where residents' only option would be to use their cars
- the application was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, which had not allocated this site for housing and had been prepared through a democratic process; the Crane v SSCLG 2015 case was relevant to this application

Les Durrant, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- the application provided for the need for more housing in the district, particularly affordable housing of which there would be the full 40 per cent
- this was a high quality development that would be delivered at the earliest opportunity
- the design of the development showed the applicant's commitment to quality

Michael Watson, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- the developer had delivered housing schemes across South East England
- it was fully committed to deliver a high quality development
- there would be 40 per cent affordable housing on the site
- the developer would work with the Shiplake community

Brett Farmery, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- installing a roundabout at the access to the site was not possible due to the position of the residential access to a property opposite the site
- the county council preferred a right-turn lane option
- footways would be installed at the front of the site

Paul Harrison, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- the committee had previously considered this site unsuitable for housing, as had the Neighbourhood Plan
- it was not the case that the lack of a five year housing land supply out-ranked the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan
- Shiplake Parish Council's independent highway safety assessment should be taken into account
- the committee should ignore suggestions that the Highlands Farm housing site would not be necessary
- support for the application by pro-forma response should be ignored
- the Crane v SSCLG 2015 case was relevant to this application
- the Neighbourhood Plan was in date and this application was contrary to it
- the application, if approved, would add to the air quality problems in Duke Street, Henley
- if the committee approved this application, more housing applications would follow

The committee considered that more weight should be given to the Neighbourhood Plan. This site was unsuitable for housing as any benefit from the development was outweighed by the significant and demonstrable harm to the safety of road users and to the character and appearance of the area. The committee also considered that the application was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, it did not provide for primary education needs, and it was unsustainable development.

Contrary to the officer's recommendation, a motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse application P16/S0970/O for the following reasons:

1. The application site lies beyond the edge of the settlement of Lower Shiplake (a smaller village) and is not a site allocated for development in the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan. The development would extend beyond the

settlement edge, into the adjacent countryside, in a manner that does not accord with the district's strategy for growth. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on a locally valued landscape and detract from the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CS1, CSS1, CSR1, CSEN1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies C4, G2 and G4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, and policies H1 and DSQ1 of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan.

2. The proposal would have a severe adverse residual cumulative effect on the safety and convenience of highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policies T1 and G2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, and the objectives of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan.
3. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure affordable housing to meet the needs of the district. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policy CSH3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, and the objectives of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan.
4. In the absence of a completed S106 legal agreement, the proposal fails to secure infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CS11 and CSG1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies C6, R2 and R6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, and the objectives of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan.

78 P15/S4227/FUL - Rear of 22 and 24 Blacklands Road, Benson

Felix Bloomfield and Richard Pullen, the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item. Toby Newman took the chair for this item.

The committee considered application P15/S4227/FUL for the demolition of 22 and 24 Blacklands Road and the erection of 17 dwellings, including 6 affordable homes, on land to the rear of 22 and 24 Blacklands Road, Benson.

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 this meeting.

Officer update: a further letter of objection had been received from a neighbour. Also, the Defence Infrastructure Organisation had made an objection that insufficient noise mitigation information had been provided with the application, and on safety grounds in the event of an emergency at RAF Benson. Also, Environmental Health had raised no objections subject to noise mitigation conditions.

Jon Fowler, a representative of Benson Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- there were already 241 homes approved for Benson, 35 per cent over the indicative figure given in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment; it was unfair that Benson had to take more housing

- the Benson Neighbourhood Plan was at an advanced state, hopefully going to referendum in January 2017; why should the neighbourhood plan be completed if this committee ignored it and continued to allocate housing on other sites?
- the site was not overgrown, it was a valuable home to wildlife, and protecting biodiversity was important
- the development was not sustainable

Stewart Fryatt, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- road safety—the road was a rat run, with many parked cars, and would worsen if this development was allowed
- this development was not part of the local plan
- there would be a loss of privacy from overlooking for local residents, spoiling the enjoyment of their gardens
- there was a variety of wildlife on the site and this should be protected

Rob Wood, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- the development was too dense, representing overdevelopment right up to the site boundaries
- this would cause overlooking and noise disturbance

Simon Sharp, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- the unadopted Neighbourhood Plan carried little weight
- there were no objections from the county highways officers
- to reduce potential overlooking, the velux windows could be obscure glazed
- there was sufficient distance to the adjacent properties
- the council did not have a five-year housing land supply
- the benefits of the proposed development outweighed the harm
- there was no landscape harm as this was a derelict site
- the development was sustainable and would support local services
- there would be affordable homes
- the density was comparable with housing nearby

Felix Bloomfield, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- the site was outside the built up area of the village
- it conflicted with policy CSR1 and was contrary to policy D1
- the development was too dense
- it had a poor layout and would have an adverse impact on the residents of Blacklands Road and Brook Street and was unneighbourly
- the harm outweighed the benefits of this proposal
- there was little landscaping in the proposal

The committee considered that the proposed development was of poor design, had a poor layout, lacked amenity space and landscaping, did not protect the biodiversity of the site, did not provide sufficient distance to adjacent property, and was overbearing. The neighbourhood plan was also close to completion and approving this application would be contrary to the aims of neighbourhood planning.

Contrary to the officer's recommendation, a motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse outline planning permission for application P15/S4227/FUL for the following reasons:

1. That the scheme represents an overdevelopment of the site;
 - (i) the layout is cramped and does not allow for adequate landscaping to provide well designed external areas at the entrance to or within the site and would detract from the character of the area contrary to Policy CSQ3 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Saved Policies G2, D1 and H4 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan;
 - (ii) the layout does not allow for the provision of open space to mitigate the loss of biodiversity contrary to Policy CSB1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Saved Policy C6 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan; and
 - (iii) the layout does not provide for adequate standards of residential amenity for the occupants of the dwellings/flats on plots 16, 17, 11 and 14 because the private amenity areas are below the Council's minimum standard contrary to Saved Policy D3 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan and advice in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide.
 - (iv) The harm identified to the character of the area, biodiversity and the amenity of occupants of the units would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing a net gain of 15 houses to the district's housing land supply and paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework should not override the development plan policies in this instance.

2. That, having regard to the location and size of the flats above garages on plots 16 and 17 in relation to 14, 16, 18 and 20 Blacklands Road, the proposal represents an unneighbourly form of development which would be oppressive and overbearing detracting from the residential amenity of the occupants of those properties. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policies D4 and H4 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan. The harm identified to neighbour amenity would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing a net gain of 15 houses to the district's housing land supply and paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework should not override the development plan policies in this instance.

79 P15/S4131/RM - Land adjoining Greenwood Avenue, Chinnor

Ian White, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P15/S4131/RM for reserved matters following outline permission P14/S0953/O for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development on land adjoining Greenwood Avenue, Chinnor.

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 this meeting.

Officer update: a further two responses had been received objecting to the application. The materials submitted for this development were considered acceptable.

Richard Searl, the representative of Chinnor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The proposed development was out of scale, overbearing, unneighbourly, and out of keeping with the local neighbourhood
- There should be car ports, not garages
- The neighbourhood planning steering group recognised that two other adjacent sites were also subject to planning applications; all three applications should be considered together to harmonise planning of the area
- Policies D4, H4, and T1 were all still relevant
- The neighbourhood planning group hoped that the plan could go to a referendum in early 2017

Roger Payne, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The dormer windows facing existing property would invade residents' privacy and cause overlooking
- This was contrary to policy D4 of the local plan

Phil Byron, of the Chinnor and Princes Risborough Railway, reported that:

- An acoustic barrier was required under the previous permission on the site

Lorna Juarez, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The local objections were to the principle of the development which had already been established
- The distance from the three-storey building to neighbouring property was in excess of the design standard
- The impact of the adjacent railway had been taken into account
- There would be parking for existing and future residents
- There were no statutory consultee objections to the application
- The section 106 agreement would bring contributions to education and highways improvements

Lynn Lloyd, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- The Chinnor neighbourhood planning team had worked hard to prepare a plan and their work should not be ignored
- There were local concerns over the orientation of the largest building on the site
- There had not been much liaison between the developer and the parish council
- There would be an increase in the volume of traffic from this and other developments in the village

Ian White, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application, his concerns included:

- The three-storey building had been located at the highest point on the site; it should be relocated to a lower part
- There were concerns about the adequacy of the local sewage system
- There was no mention of zero carbon growth in the report and this should be part of the development's design
- The application should be deferred to allow these issues to be resolved

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of the application was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P15/S4131/RM to allow further time to establish whether local concerns could be overcome, including the size of the three-storey block, the capacity of the sewage system, and an acoustic barrier to reduce noise from the railway.

80 P16/S2114/RM - Land within Eyres Close, off Eyres Lane, Ewelme

This item was withdrawn from the agenda to allow the committee to undertake a site visit.

81 P16/S2145/FUL - Cariad Court, Cleeve Road, Goring on Thames

The committee considered application P16/S2145/FUL for the erection of two dwellings over re-built garages and existing basement car park at Cariad Court, Cleeve Road, Goring-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 this meeting.

Catherine Hall, a representative of Goring-on-Thames Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The design of the proposed development was inappropriate for this location in terms of its scale, mass and form
- It would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the nearby Conservation Area
- The window design was inappropriate and the roof design was poor
- Existing privacy levels must be maintained, not worsened by the proposed development

Helen Abbott, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application, her concerns included:

- The proposed development would cause overlooking
- There was an increased likelihood of noise and light pollution
- The Silver Birch trees and hedge were to be removed; this was unnecessary and would result in a loss of landscape screening
- Was the lightweight structure necessary?
- How would the green roof be drained?

Errol Facey, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The windows had been designed to avoid overlooking but they could be recessed to obscure the view
- The original design had been withdrawn following objections
- The scheme had been re-designed following talks with the planning and landscape officers, with the resulting reduced impact on neighbours
- The town council had not objected to the principle of development on this site

Keith Halson, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The proposed development would improve and enhance the garage block

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S2145/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Landscaping scheme (replacement planting).
4. Tree protection method.
5. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
6. Cycle parking facilities to be provided.
7. Construction traffic management plan to be submitted.

82 P16/S1013/FUL - Vale Cottage, Northfield Avenue, Lower Shiplake

The committee considered application P16/S1013/FUL for the erection of a 2.5 storey five bedroom detached dwelling with a detached double garage following demolition of the existing house and detached garage at Vale Cottage, Northfield Avenue, Lower Shiplake.

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 this meeting.

Tudor Taylor, a representative of Shiplake Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The design, scale and bulk of the proposal did not reflect the local context
- The visual impact of the proposed development would stand out against the street scene
- The development was unneighbourly

Michelle Brown, the applicant, spoke in support of the application:

- Her family wished to extend their property and better insulate it but had been advised by the architect to demolish it and re-build
- The height of the new house had been reduced
- The house was not up against the boundary and overlooking of neighbouring property would be reduced by the new design
- There would be new planting to provide screening to neighbouring property

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S1013/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within three years.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Schedule of materials to be agreed prior to commencement of development.

4. Obscure glazing for north-west facing first floor window.
5. Rooflights to be at least 1.7m above cill level and no additional rooflights
6. Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions, roof extensions and outbuildings.
7. Parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained as approved.
8. No garage conversion into accommodation without planning permission.
9. Details of hard and soft landscaping to be agreed prior to commencement of development.
10. Details of tree protection measures to be agreed prior to commencement of development.

83 P16/S0972/FUL - 13 The Ridgeway, Nettlebed

David Nimmo-Smith, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S0972/FUL for the erection of a two storey two-bedroom dwelling at 13 The Ridgeway, Nettlebed.

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 this meeting.

Neil Boddington, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The design of the proposed dwelling mirrored that of the neighbouring dwelling
- The distance between the new dwelling and the neighbouring property was slightly below the design standards but the property had been angled to avoid issues

David Nimmo-Smith, one of the local ward members, spoke to the application:

- The parish council's objections to this application were noted but he had no objection as local ward member

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S0972/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within three years.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Details of levels to be agreed prior to commencement of development.
4. Schedule of materials to be agreed prior to commencement of development.
5. Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions, rooflights and outbuildings.
6. New vehicular access to be constructed to highway specifications.
7. Car parking to be retained.
8. No surface water drainage to the highway.
9. No vehicular access gates to be provided.
10. Details of hard and soft landscaping to be agreed prior to commencement of development.

84 P16/S1237/FUL - 1 Holliers Close, Sydenham

Ian White, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S1237/FUL for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the erection of two detached dwellings with new access into the site.

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 this meeting.

James Ward spoke objecting to the application on behalf of local residents, their concerns included:

- The principle of development on this site
- The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- There was a Conservation Area and Listed cottage opposite the site
- There would be a loss of privacy for neighbouring residents
- Soil would have to be removed from the site to create the development and this would present a risk
- The proposed development needed to be re-designed

Ian White, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application:

- He agreed with the arguments put forward by the objector, Mr Ward
- The proposal would have a significant impact on the Conservation Area nearby

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of the application to allow the committee to visit the site was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of planning application P16/S1237/FUL to allow the committee to visit the site.

The meeting closed at 9.05pm

Chairman

Date