

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 19 OCTOBER 2016

DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

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

Apologies:

Jeannette Matelot and Margaret Turner tendered apologies.

Officers:

Gabriella Brown, Paula Fox, Kim Gould, Simon Kitson, Marc Pullen, Amanda Rendell, Davina Sarac, Ron Schrieber, Cathie Scotting and Tom Wyatt

Also present:

Stefan Gawrysiak, Sue Lawson and Imran Lokhon

111 Appointment of Vice-Chairman

Toby Newman was nominated, seconded and appointed Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the remainder of the 2016/17 municipal year.

112 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

Councillor David Nimmo Smith declared that, in relation to application P15/S3385/FUL, he chaired the Henley Town Council planning committee when it considered this application and would therefore step down from the meeting for this item.

Councillor Lorraine Hillier declared that, in relation to application, P16/S2543/FUL, she was the owner of a business referred to in the report and would therefore step down from the meeting for this item.

113 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2016 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

114 Urgent items

None.

115 Applications deferred or withdrawn

None.

116 Proposals for site visit reports

None.

117 P15/S3385/FUL - The Workshop, Newtown Road, Henley-on-Thames

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

Joan Bland and Lorraine Hillier, two 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/S3385/FUL for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of an 80 bed care home (C2 use) with parking, landscaping, retention of existing access to Newtown Road and creation of a new access from Mill Lane at The Workshop, Newtown Road, Henley-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.

Officer update: additional information was provided on the usage of the Mill Lane car park and the demand for casual swimming and swimming lessons at Henley Leisure Centre.

Julian Brookes and David Nimmo-Smith, representatives of Henley Town Council, spoke objecting to the application. The town council's concerns included:

- The loss of leisure facilities will have a detrimental effect on Henley residents;
- The designation of the building as an asset of community value demonstrates its importance to the locality;
- The site was not designated for residential development in the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- Staff would need to travel to and from the development by car at all hours so generating additional traffic and impacting on air quality.

Deidre Wells, Michelle Thomas and Mark Binning, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included:

- There were already sufficient care homes in the area;

- The proposal was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Concerns about additional traffic, inadequate parking provision, access and pedestrian safety had not been addressed; and
- There was insufficient swimming pool provision elsewhere and some children's swimming classes at Henley Leisure Centre were already full.

Douglas Bond, the applicant's agent and Sheila Tunstall, a local resident, spoke in support of the application:

- A number of new gyms had opened in the area and there was spare capacity;
- The care home would attract significantly fewer car journeys than the former fitness centre and there had been no objections from the highways authority;
- The care home would be built to a high standard and would free up accommodation as elderly local residents moved into the home; and
- The designation of the building as an asset of community value did not place any restrictions on what the owner of the property can do if it remained in their ownership.

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

- The site was not designated for residential development in the Neighbourhood Plan;
- The site is in an area of business use so, if approved, more employment opportunities would need to be provided elsewhere;
- Mill Lane had insufficient capacity for the additional traffic that would be generated;
- There was already sufficient care home provision in the area; and
- Approving the application would result in the loss of a community asset.

Lorraine Hillier, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included:

- The designation of the building as an asset of community value should carry material weight;
- There was a shortage of alternative swimming provision; and
- There was an abundance of care home provision and applications for additional accommodation;

Joan Bland, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included:

- There was no need for additional residential accommodation for the elderly in the area;
- The site was not designated for residential development in the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- The proposal would generate additional traffic.

In response to matters raised, the planning officers reported that:

- Although demand varied, swimming lessons at Henley Leisure Centre were operating at 80% capacity and casual swimming was below capacity;
- Even if another recreational facility were to be opened on the site, there was no guarantee that this would include a swimming pool;
- The proposal was not contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan as the plan was silent on the use of the site; and

- The designation of the building as an asset of community value meant that the community would be given the opportunity to purchase the asset if it were put up for sale.

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

RESOLVED: to delegate authority to grant planning permission for application P15/S3385/FUL to the head of planning subject to:

- i) The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement with the County Council to secure contributions towards bus services and monitoring as detailed in the report.
- ii) The following conditions:
 1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
 2. Approved plans.
 3. Restriction on use - class C2.
 4. Slab and ridge levels to be agreed.
 5. All sample materials to be agreed.
 6. Sample wall panel of materials to be agreed
 7. Landscaping (access/hard standings/fencing/walls) to be agreed.
 8. Tree pits to be agreed.
 9. Vision splay to be agreed.
 10. Car parking details.
 11. Travel plan.
 12. Construction travel management plan to be agreed.
 13. Surface water drainage works to be agreed.
 14. Decontamination works to be verified by the Council.
 15. External lighting to be agreed.
 16. Air quality modelling and mitigation to be agreed.
 17. Protection of trees during development.
 18. Access details.
 19. No surface water drainage to the highway.
 20. Cycle parking details.
 21. Bins storage details.
 22. Noise controls.
 23. Foul drainage works.
 24. Ecology mitigation.
 25. Hours of construction

118 P14/S2860/O - Land to the West of Wallingford (Site B), Wallingford

The committee considered application P14/S2860/O for a residential development comprising 555 dwellings, a one form entry primary school, associated landscaping and open spaces, construction of a new access onto the A4130 Calvin Thomas Way/Bosley Way, construction of a public transport link/emergency access onto Wantage Road and other supporting infrastructure works and facilities at land to the west of Wallingford (Site B), Wallingford.

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 representation had been received from Oxfordshire County Council clarifying the requirements of the S106 agreement.

Three further letters had been received from neighbours raising the following issues and the need for mitigation:

- Noise – need for acoustic fencing
- Boundary treatments – security and landscaping
- CCTV
- Light pollution
- Detail of highway construction not shown on plans

Two further conditions would be added to the recommendation:

- Housing Mix to be as per Table 3 unless otherwise agreed in writing
- Any CCTV to be agreed in writing

The officer also provided clarification on some of the conditions as follows:

- Condition 4 – Time limit to include submission of first reserved matters within 6 months of outline permission, implementation to begin within 1 year of approval of first reserved matters
- Condition 21- to include reference to sustainable design and secure by design
- Condition 27 – to include reference to boundary treatments
- Condition 34 – details of lighting to cover street lighting and residential

Adrian Lloyd, a representative of Wallingford Town Council, spoke about the application. Whilst the town council had no objection in principle to the application, its concerns included:

- The height of the properties should be restricted to two storey;
- Further improvements to roundabouts were required;
- Drainage and sewerage arrangements may not be sufficient. Who will pay for the maintenance?; and
- The no access to Queens Avenue should be enforced by a condition and by a physical barrier.

Steve Capel-Davies, a representative of Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The height of the three storey development at the entrance to the site;
- The visual impact of the development;
- The speed limit along the by-pass should be reduced for safety reasons; and
- The increased light pollution.

John Gordon, representing Sustainable Wallingford, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The need for a sustainable drainage system management plan to reduce the risk of flooding;
- Environmental sustainability was not being given sufficient priority; and
- There should have been wider consultation on the proposals.

Angus Michie, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- There had been wide consultation with stakeholders prior to the application;
- The access arrangements had been agreed with the highways authority; and
- This was an outline application. Many of the objections related to matters of detail which could be addressed at the design stage.

Imran Lokhon, one of the local ward members, spoke about the application. He welcomed the extra conditions recommended but expressed concerns including:

- The percentage of affordable housing offered was disappointing;
- Further measures were required to reduce the risk of flooding; and
- Some of the S106 contributions should be allocated to specific purposes rather than general headings.

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

RESOLVED: to delegate authority to grant planning permission for application P14/S2860/O to the head of planning subject to:

i) the completion of a S106 agreement to include:

- a) A minimum of 26% affordable housing with a tenure to be agreed to achieve the headline figure but not less than 60% affordable rent.
- b) On site provisions and contributions as identified in the infrastructure section of the report.
- c) Matrix for extra contributions for larger dwellings if different mix agreed.
- d) School site to be 2.2ha and to be remediated, serviced – all abnormal costs to be covered by applicant.
- e) School to be ready by 90 occupations or 15 months following first occupation, whichever earlier
- f) S278 works to be secured including the public rights of way on site and highway works off site.
- g) Indexation to be added to items in Table 4.
- h) Bonds or security for school.

ii) Conditions covering the following matters:

Conditions

1. Approved plans and document list.
2. Approved land uses (as per masterplan).
3. Commencement time limit.
4. Time limit for submission of reserved matters.

Restrictions

5. Hours of construction.
6. Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing (CSH4).
7. All dwellings and facilities to provide cycle parking – details in reserved matters.

Pre commencement conditions

8. Phasing plan.
9. Construction management plan (CMP).

10. Employment and skills plan.
11. Detail of access – A4130 and Slade End roundabout.
12. Detail of works to public rights of way.
13. Written scheme of archaeological investigation to be submitted.
14. Staged programme of archaeological mitigation in accordance with written scheme of investigation.
15. Intrusive investigation for contamination to be carried out.
16. Drainage strategy and programme - whole site – surface and foul.
17. Details of existing and proposed levels across the site.
18. Studies of water supply infrastructure.
19. Biodiversity enhancement method statement and proposals.
20. Submission of a housing delivery document.
21. Design and landscaping codes – whole site.
22. Travel plan.

Details to be submitted with reserved matters

23. Details of surface and foul drainage to comply with drainage strategy.
24. Bus gate details.
25. Bus route, bus stops and shelters.
26. Design statement demonstrating compliance with design code.
27. Hard and soft landscaping scheme - comply with design code / biodiversity method statement.
28. Tree protection scheme.
29. Landscape management and maintenance plan.
30. Replacement planting if damaged/destroyed in five years.
31. Details of electric vehicle charging points.
32. Energy and sustainable design standards.
33. Noise impact assessment and mitigation measures.
34. Details of lighting.
35. Detailed specifications for allotments, playing fields and play areas.

Prior to occupation

36. No dwelling to be occupied unless links provided to existing highway / footway.
37. No dwelling to be occupied unless access, vehicle and cycle parking provided/ retained thereafter.
38. Means of enclosure implemented before occupation.

Other conditions

39. Housing mix to be as per Table 3 unless otherwise agreed in writing.
40. Any CCTV to be agreed in writing.

119 P16/S2543/FUL - Cau Restaurant, 38 Hart Street, Henley-on-Thames

Lorraine Hillier declared an interest in this item, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

Joan Bland, 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/S2543/FUL for the removal of Condition 5 (no customer access to patio) of planning permission P08/E0834 to allow limited use of the rear courtyard at Cau Restaurant, 38 Hart Street, Henley-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.

Stefan Gawrysiak, a representative of Henley Town Council, spoke objecting to the application. The town council's concerns included:

- There will be further residential developments affected by this application following other recently approved planning applications within the locality;
- The application was an attempt to overturn a previous committee decision to restrict the use of the courtyard. This condition had been imposed to protect neighbouring amenity; and
- The previous temporary permission should be extended for a further twelve months, so that the impact on neighbouring properties could be monitored.

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/S2543/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. No part of the patio and garden shall be open to and used by customers outside the times of 0900hrs and 1800hrs Monday to Friday and not at all on Saturday, Sundays or Bank Holidays.
2. No music, either live or recorded, shall be provided in the external courtyard area at any time.
3. All door and window openings on to the rear garden and patio areas shall remain closed at all times other than for access to and from the garden.

120 P16/S2212/O - Land to west of Chinnor Road, Towersey

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/S2212/O for the erection of four dwellings and the provision of a new access to the paddock land to the west of land to the west of Chinnor Road, Towersey.

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.

Mark Davis, a representative of Towersey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The proposal was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP);
- Towersey had delivered, and continued to deliver, its quota of houses as required by the SOLP;

- The proposal was unacceptable ribbon development; and
- Approval of the application would set a precedent and undermine the emerging Towersey Neighbourhood Plan.

Adrian Gould, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- No weight should be given to the emerging Towersey Neighbourhood Plan in the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing;
- The site was in a sustainable location; and
- There had been no objections from statutory consultees.

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

- The erection of four dwellings would make no significant contribution to the five-year housing supply;
- The council's preferred options document 2016, cited in the report, was irrelevant as it had not been formally approved;
- The proposal was ribbon development;
- The site was not in a sustainable location; there were virtually no services nearby and the bus service was on the verge of collapse.

The committee considered that the proposal was unsustainable and represented an undesirable extension to the village.

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/S2212/O for the following reason:

The application site lies beyond the built up edge of Towersey and the proposed development would result in an undesirable extension to the settlement to the detriment of the undeveloped rural character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. This identifiable harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the modest benefits of the proposal. As such, the proposal would not comprise sustainable development as defined by local and national legislation and the proposal is contrary to policies CSS1, CSR1, CSQ3 and CSEN1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies C4, G2, G4 and D1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and Government Guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

121 P16/S2223/FUL - Land to west of Withywindle, Abingdon Road, Burcot

The committee considered application P16/S2223/FUL for the proposed erection of a pair of semi-detached three bedroom dwellings and a detached garage building at land to the west of Withywindle, Abingdon Road, Burcot.

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.

Alan Stewart and Till Gins, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included:

- The proposal represented overdevelopment of the site;

- There was insufficient parking provision;
- Additional traffic would be generated on an unlit, single track access road; and
- There was a danger of vehicles reversing onto the A415.

Adrian Gould, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The proposed development would not be out of keeping with the area;
- The plans had been amended to reduce the width of the development; and
- Each dwelling would have two off-street parking places.

Sue Lawson, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included:

- She was not opposed to development on the site but two dwellings constituted overdevelopment;
- The proposed 3 storey building was out of keeping with the area;
- The garages were in the wrong location;
- There were insufficient passing places on the access road; and
- There was no provision for visitors' parking.

She requested the committee to defer consideration of the application pending a site visit.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application, subject to an additional condition to provide one parking space for visitors, was declared lost on being put to the vote.

Some Members considered the proposed development to be out of keeping with the established semi-rural character of the area. 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/S2223/FUL for the following reason:

That having regard to the prevailing character of the area which comprises predominantly large detached dwellings in extensive plots, the proposed pair of semi-detached dwellings would fail to respect the established pattern of development and would have a harmful effect on the established character and appearance of the area by way of its plot size, density, design and scale. As such it would be contrary to policies CSR1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and policies D1 and H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

122 P16/S2224/FUL - The Nursery School, Rectory Road, Great Haseley

The committee considered application P16/S2224/FUL for the conversion of the Old School building to dwelling and the erection of a new detached dwelling within the grounds of The Old School, Great Haseley. The proposal includes for the demolition of the single storey flat roof extensions, lean-to conservatories and a prefabricated outbuilding at The Nursery School, Rectory Road, Great Haseley.

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.

David Simcox, a representative of Great Haseley Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. The parish council's concerns included:

- The proposed development was not in keeping with the area;
- The design was poor;
- The scale of the site and the proposed materials were inappropriate; and
- The access to the site was dangerous.

John Alexander, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The design was poor;
- The proposal would damage an attractive building; and
- The proposal did not respect the value of the Old School building and the date stone would be removed.

Mike Orr, the applicant's architect and Adrian Gould, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- They had worked with the officers to ensure that the proposed design was acceptable within a conservation area;
- The building would be returned to its original character with inappropriate additions removed;
- Traditional materials would be used; and
- The date stone would be retained.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application, subject to an additional condition to retain the date stone, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S2224/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. New vehicular access.
4. Sample materials required (all).
5. Details of boundary treatments.
6. Existing vehicular access.
7. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
8. Hours of construction.
9. Hours of construction and demolition to be restricted.
10. Development to take place in accordance with bat mitigation plan submitted.
11. Retention of date stone.

123 P16/S2140/FUL - Chestnut House, Station Road, Lower Shiplake

Paul Harrison, 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/S2140/FUL for a three bedroom, 2 storey detached house within the rear garden of Chestnut House, Station Road, 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.

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

- The proposed development would have a significant impact on neighbouring properties; and
- There would be overlooking and a loss of privacy.

Mike Shelley and David Carlsson, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included:

- The proposal constituted overdevelopment;
- Neighbouring properties would be overlooked; and
- The development would compromise the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties.

Dean Bradbury, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The proposed dwelling was of an appropriate design and was of a suitable scale for the plot;
- The site was bounded by mature hedges; and
- The distance from neighbouring properties and the proposed location of windows meant that there would not be significant overlooking.

Paul Harrison, one of the local ward members, spoke and requested the committee to defer consideration of the application, pending a site visit.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of the application pending a site visit was declared lost on being put to the vote.

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/S2140/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 the commencement of development
4. Details of existing and proposed levels to be agreed prior to the commencement of development.
5. Existing vehicular access to be improved and laid out prior to occupation of the dwelling.
6. Turning area and car parking to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
7. Tree protection details to be agreed prior to occupation of the dwelling.
8. Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings.
9. Refuse and recycling storage to be implemented as approved.

124 P16/S2257/FUL - 46 Crescent Way, Cholsey

The committee considered application P16/S2257/FUL for a new three bed dwelling attached to existing and a single storey extension to rear aspect at 46 Crescent Way, Cholsey.

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.

David Hurford, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

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/S2257/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Matching materials (walls and roof).
4. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.
5. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class E) - no outbuildings etc.
6. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained

125 P16/S2535/FUL - Land off Reading Road,, Cholsey, Oxon

The committee considered application P16/S2535/FUL for proposed telecommunication installation and associated works at land off Reading Road, Cholsey, Oxon.

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.

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/S2535/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Removal of telecommunications equipment when redundant to operations.
4. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm

Chairman

Date