

# Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

## Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 4 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 6.00 PM

THIS IS A VIRTUAL MEETING

### Present:

Ian Snowdon (Chairman)

Peter Dragonetti (Vice Chair), Ken Arlett, David Bretherton, Sarah Gray, Kate Gregory, Lorraine Hillier, George Levy, Jane Murphy (substituting for Councillor Ian White), Axel Macdonald (substituting for Councillor Celia Wilson) and Jo Robb

### Apologies:

Ian White and Celia Wilson tendered apologies.

### Officers:

Paul Bateman, Paul Bowers, Sharon Crawford, Will Darlison, Paula Fox, Kim Gould, Amanda Rendell and Susie Royse

### Also present:

Councillors Sue Cooper, Maggie Filipova-Rivers, Andrea Powell, Sue Roberts and Anne-Marie Simpson

## 42 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in a virtual meeting.

The chair advised the committee that at the council meeting held on 8 October 2020, it resolved to change the constitution so that at meetings of the planning committee, a councillor might participate in decisions on applications in their ward, take part in the debate, and vote. This applied to all councillors who were committee members or appointed as substitutes. The councillors would be treated like any other committee member, even if the application was in their ward. The member could speak to an application without having to stand down from the committee, they could take part in the debate, and vote also. Other ward members would still have a public speakers' slot, to



Listening Learning Leading

allow non-committee members/substitutes to address the committee on applications within their ward. These changes had taken effect on 1 November 2020.

### **43 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **44 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

### **45 Proposals for site visits**

A proposal, moved and seconded, for a site visit in respect of application P19/S2923/O, land to the east of Manor Road, to the south of Little Croft and to the west of Elmcroft Manor, Goring, to ascertain the layout of the site, and to consider its impact upon the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to defer consideration of application P19/S2923/O, to allow members to visit the site.

### **46 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting. Statements from the public received prior to the meeting were circulated to the committee and would be published on the council's website.

### **47 P19/S0821/FUL and P19/S0822/LB - Goulds Grove Old London Road Ewelme, OX10 6PX**

The committee considered applications P19/S0821/FUL and P19/S0822/LB for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of five residential dwellings and the conversion of an existing building to provide four B1(a) office units, together with parking and landscaping. (As clarified by swept path analysis received 4 April 2019 and contaminated land preliminary assessment received on 18 April 2019. As clarified by drawing no 3358. 114, Heritage response and Highway Planning Limited letter accompanying Agent's letter dated 23 May 2019. As amended by drawing nos 3358- 101 rev B, 108 rev A, 109 rev A and 110 rev A accompanying Agent's email dated 5 July 2019 which re-orientate the dwellings on plots 3, 4 and 5 and retain more of the fabric of existing buildings in the car port for plot 5. As further amended by drawing numbers 3358. 104 rev C and 105 rev B to change plots 3 and 4 to two bed units and plot 5 to a three bed unit) at Goulds Grove, Old London Road, Ewelme.

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. Consideration of this application had been deferred by the committee at its meeting on 21 October 2020, to allow a site visit to take place.

The planning officer reported that the plan attached to the report (page 39 of the agenda) was incorrect. The reason for this was that amended plans had been submitted to re-

orientate the houses on Plots 3, 4 and 5, so that the front elevations faced onto Old London Road (vehicular access would be provided from the rear of the units). This had allowed for the retention of one of the existing buildings on the site to provide a car port structure for plot 5.

The planning officer also reported that the site was classified as 'previously developed land' and the principle of some development of this site was accepted. The buildings to be removed had a footprint/floor area of approximately 1,138sqm, with the proposed dwellings (and ancillary buildings) having a footprint of some 718sqm, and an overall floor area of 1,058sqm. Therefore, there would be a reduction in both the footprint and floor area of built development on the site.

The planning officer also reported that since the despatch of the agenda, a letter of support had been received from a neighbour, who had stated that they considered that the proposal was well-thought out and would provide positive benefits to the local area. That person had supported approval. Also, in the opinion of planning officers, the neighbouring property named Troy would be unaffected, and harm to the area was considered to be less than substantial.

The development did not strictly accord with Policy T1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, owing to the lack of an adequate visibility splay to the north. The planning officer considered that in this instance there were material planning considerations that indicated that a departure from the development plan was justified. The National Planning Policy Framework set a high standard for refusing planning permission due to highway safety reasons - "development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe".

In this case, there was no material change in traffic levels associated with the proposal, over and above the existing uses. There would be a reduction in the number of heavy goods vehicle movements, which would be an improvement, and the 'crashmap' data demonstrated that there had been no road traffic accidents in the vicinity during the last five years. The planning officer considered that these factors outweighed the conflict with policy T1.

Councillor Phil Murray, a representative of Benson Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Lorenzo Pandolfi, a representative of the occupants of neighbouring property, Troy, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer confirmed that Mr. Pandolfi's statement had been communicated to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. David Jacobs, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Sue Cooper, a local ward member, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Andrea Powell, a local ward member, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee was concerned that the application was in conflict with the Benson Neighbourhood Plan and also considered that this application represented unsustainable development, being in conflict with that plan and the Core Strategy. The committee remained concerned that the proposal had received a highways objection, owing to visibility splays not meeting standards.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P19/S0821/FUL for the following reasons;

1. Contrary to the Benson Neighbourhood Plan and the Core Strategy.
2. The residential element of the proposal did not represent sustainable development.
3. The scheme would be detrimental to the safety of users of the public highway, notably the lack of adequate vision splay to the west, evidenced by the highway objection.

The committee also considered related application P19/S0822/LB for listed building consent for the demolition of buildings and works to convert the curtilage listed barn to office accommodation in the same report. The committee supported the officers' views, expressed in paragraph 7.40, that the proposed works complied with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It was also satisfied that the proposal accorded with the heritage policies of the development plan.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant listed building consent was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant listed building consent for application P19/S0822/LB, subject to the following conditions;

#### Standard conditions

1. Commencement three years – Listed Building Consent
2. Approved plans

#### Pre-commencement conditions

3. Schedule of materials
4. Schedule or repairs and alterations to the curtilage listed building

#### Informatives

5. Benson Neighbourhood Plan policies

### **48 P19/S2923/O - Land to the east of Manor Road, to the south of Little Croft and to west of Elmcroft Manor Road Goring**

Consideration of this application had been deferred, pending a site visit.

### **49 P20/S0912/FUL - Land opposite Whitecross House, Reading Road, Wallingford, OX10 9ED**

The committee considered application P20/S0912/FUL for the erection of a single dwelling and associated works including new access onto Wallingford Road.(as amended by plan refs 3043-301 A, 3043-302 A, 3043-304 A, 3043-312 A, 3043-307 A, 3043-305 A and 3043-305 A received on 6 August 2020, on land opposite Whitecross House, Reading Road, 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.

The planning officer reported that in the light of neighbour objections regarding privacy and overlooking, and after having consulted the local ward councillors, the following revisions to the scheme had been made; removal of glazed areas on the north west and north east corner of the building at first and second floor level and replacement with solid cladding but with a reflective finish; removal of the balcony platform at first floor level on the north west and north east corner of the building, and replacement with a brise soleil to ensure the area could not be accessed, whilst providing shading to the lower floor.

Also, the planning officer reported that most significant trees on the site had been retained, with some additional planting. There was limited biodiversity on the site but provision for bat boxes had been made and the roof was designed to be a 'green roof' upon which plants would grow.

The committee noted that the highways authority, Oxfordshire County Council had not objected and that the Wallingford Town Council fully supported the application. The forestry officer, countryside officer, drainage engineer, conservation officer and waste management officer each had no objection to the proposal.

Mrs. Gemma Lewis, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Ms. Laura Hudson, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Sue Roberts, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P20/S0912/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. New vehicular access
5. Vision splay protection
6. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
7. Landscaping Scheme (trees and shrubs only)
8. Tree Protection (Detailed) (Amended NO dig Foundations)
9. Surface water drainage works (details required)
10. Foul drainage works (details required)
11. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy to be submitted
12. External Lighting - General
13. Restriction on Use of Roof as Balcony(F)

## **50 P20/S2746/FUL - The Byre, Mackney Lane, Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell, OX10 0SQ**

The committee considered application P20/S2746/FUL for a variation of condition 2 (approved drawings - change of internal layout with additional dormer window and velux

windows in the roof) on application P20/S0149/FUL. Demolition of two agricultural barns, erection of single dwelling house at The Byre, Mackney Lane, Brightwell-Cum-Sotwell.

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.

The planning officer reported that this application was being made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for the variation of condition 2, the approved plans condition, and sought planning permission for a number of changes to the approved development. These were reported in detail, namely: additional dormer window and roof light on the rear elevation; additional two roof lights on the front elevation; new door on ground floor northern side elevation (already approved under P20/S1964/NM) and the creation of a first-floor area and master bedroom and dressing room. The planning officer considered that these changes were not significantly different from the approved building.

Councillor Jason Debney, a representative of Brightwell - cum - Sotwell Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to a question from the committee, which had concerns regarding the possibility of the property being used as two separate dwellings, because of the inclusion of an additional staircase, the planning officer reported that the sub-division of one dwelling into two was a material change of use and would require planning permission. Therefore, an additional condition at this time to ensure that the dwelling was not sub-divided would not be necessary.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED;** to grant planning permission for application P20/S2746/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. Materials as approved
3. Landscaping Scheme as approved
4. Surface water drainage works as approved
5. Foul drainage works as approved
6. Withdrawal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc
7. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas as approved
8. No Garage conversion into accommodation
9. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)

## **51 P19/S4156/FUL - Downlands Kennels, Westfield Road, Cholsey, OX10 9JW**

Part way through the consideration of this application, members took a vote just before the meeting guillotine of 8:30pm to continue.

The committee considered application P19/S4156/FUL for a new kennel block (as amplified by Noise Impact Assessment received on 17 February 2020) at Downlands Kennels Westfield Road Cholsey Oxfordshire, OX10 9JW

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.

The planning officer reported that the council's environmental protection team initially had no objection to the application. The team had subsequently reviewed noise aspects of the proposal and had raised a holding objection, pending a noise impact assessment. That objection had been withdrawn on the basis of the results of the noise impact assessment and clarifying information submitted by the agent. The team's final position was that it had no objection, subject to a condition necessitating the implementation of all of the requirements for sound insulation for the new block and improvements to the outdoor runs. The planning officer concluded by stating that it was not considered that the application would harm the character of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

John Atkins, a local resident and neighbour, spoke objecting to the application.

David Barrington, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

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

Councillor Jane Murphy, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee was not minded to grant planning permission, as it was concerned that the noise assessments apparently did not take into account the increase in noise levels during holiday times, when demand for kennel services peaked, to the detriment of neighbours. It considered that neighbours had historically endured unacceptable noise levels and the proposal would represent an increase in noise.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P19/S4156/FUL for the following reasons;

1. Increase in intensity of use.
2. Adverse impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring property, Kingstanding House.
3. Inadequate noise assessments; the application did not provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the cumulative impact of noise from the additional dogs could be adequately mitigated for the occupants of the neighbouring property, Kingstanding House.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm

Chairman

Date