

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 9 JUNE 2021 AT 6.00 PM

FIRST FLOOR, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK, MILTON, OX14 4SB

Present:

David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice Chair), Stefan Gawrysiak (substituting for Councillor Arlett), Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Mocky Khan (substituting for Councillor Macdonald) George Levy, Jo Robb, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Apologies:

Ken Arlett and Axel Macdonald tendered apologies.

Officers:

Paul Bateman, Sharon Crawford, Michael Flowers, Paula Fox, Hannah Gibbons, Max Gull, Paul Lucas, Marc Pullen, and Tom Wyatt

145 Chair's announcements

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

146 Minutes of previous meetings

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the previous meetings held on Wednesday 17 March 2021 and Thursday 1 April 2021 as a correct record and agree that the chair sign these as such.

147 Declarations of interest

Councillor George Levy declared an interest as the applicant in agenda item 10, 42 Mereland Road, Didcot (P21/S1370/HH), and he would withdraw from the room for the duration of the item.

Councillor Jo Robb declared an interest as the applicant in agenda item 11, The Rosary, Shepherds Green (P21/S1385/HH), and would withdraw from the room for the duration of the item.



Listening Learning Leading

148 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

149 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

150 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 received from the public were circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

151 P20/S0740/FUL - 18 Harcourt Close, Henley-on-Thames

Councillor Peter Dragonetti experienced communication difficulties and did not hear the whole debate on this application and did not participate in the vote upon it.

The committee considered application P20/S0740/FUL for the erection of three-storey building incorporating one 1-bedroom apartment, two 2-bedroom apartments and two 3-bedroom apartments including associated parking and amenity space (removal of south-west-facing window from Flat 4, increase in height of screen wall for Flat 2 terrace adjacent to the front of No.18 and additional sections and 3D images as shown on plans received 18th June 2020 and site area increased along north-eastern boundary, retention of two sheds in garden of Flat 1, increase in height of parapet roof over Flat 1 and alterations to north-western and north-eastern boundary treatment as shown on amended plans received 21st October 2020 and changes to levels and introduction of boundary hedging to garden of Flat 1, as shown on amended plans received 17th December 2020 and Flat 5 reduced from two to one bedrooms as shown on amended plan received 5th March 2021 and ground floor north facing window to Flat 1 removed and sections updated to include first floor angles of outlook and a true view from 57 Deanfield Road as shown on amended plans received 26th April 2021) at 18 Harcourt Close, 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.

The planning officer explained that the site was supported by policy H3 of the local plan and H4 of the neighbourhood plan. The planning officer clarified that the density of more than 45 dwellings per hectare could be supported in principle, depending on the constraints of the local site. Internal space standards were below design guide minimum standards but were considered sustainable as a result of the pre-existing public open space. Whilst the development's finished appearance would be different from the present configuration, it was not considered to cause visual harm due to the positioning of the development, with the wider view of the site only being seen within the context of the surrounding dwellings. The planning officer also confirmed that the council's tree officer was satisfied that this application would not impact the surrounding important trees.

While there was some noticeable impact on the privacy, light and outlook of the neighbouring properties, the planning officer concluded that it complied with local plan policy DES6. The planning officer also advised the committee that each flat would have its own private amenity space, and whilst these would be below the design guide minimum standards, such a shortfall was considered acceptable, as the area was nearby to a local

open space. The officer also added that while Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), the local highway authority, was aware of the known traffic and road issues, it had not raised an objection to the amended proposal and thus district council officers had concluded that the highway authority was not significantly concerned with further impacts on the surrounding roads.

Councillor Ken Arlett, a representative of Henley Town Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Louise Dodd, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Andy Meader, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Stefan Gawrysiak, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee asked a question to Louise Dodd relating to the saleability of existing houses and flats in the area. Louise Dodd responded that 27 of the nearby flats had taken a considerable time to be sold on the market.

A question was also raised with the applicant regarding concerns surrounding the lack of amenity space, namely whether the sheds would be a communal area for residents. Andy Meader responded that all flats would have access to the open space, however the shed was allocated to a single flat. He also confirmed, upon additional questioning, that the parking space would not be impacted by the location of the bins and that there would be sufficient room for nine parking spaces and for vehicles to manoeuvre safely. In response to a question regarding paragraph 6.20 of the report, there was sufficient space for emergency vehicles and waste collection vehicles to access the development.

The committee asked officers questions relating to the location of the garden and trees. The planning officer explained that the amenity space would be the balconies, patio terrace and the shed space. Further questions were asked on whether there were any existing apartment blocks on the same street. The planning officer was not aware of any, however they commented that one aspect of their judgment was on whether it would impact the local character of the area from a planning permission viewpoint.

The committee was concerned at the proposal's impact upon the character and appearance of the local area and considered that it represented overdevelopment through massing and bulk. The development was considered to have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenity, through its impact upon neighbours' privacy. The quality of the living environment would also be adversely affected through the lack of amenity space and soft landscaping.

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 P20/S0740/FUL for the following reasons;

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, bulk and massing and amount of hard landscaping, would represent an over intensive overdevelopment of the site that would be out of keeping with the established character and appearance of the surrounding built form.

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the shortfall in private outdoor amenity space, the shading of internal and external living spaces and the limited areas available for soft landscaping, would provide a substandard quality of living environment for future occupiers of the proposed apartments.

152 P20/S4809/HH - Mulberry Barn, Church Lane, Rotherfield Peppard

The committee considered application P20/S4809/HH for the extension and remodelling with associated landscaping at Mulberry Barn, Church Lane, Rotherfield Peppard.

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 provided background information by explaining that the application had received a site visit by members previously. The proposed development was considered appropriate, as it would maintain the rural aesthetic of the existing site and would not represent harm to the character of the local area. The planning officer therefore considered the application to be an appropriate proposition and recommended the application be approved with the conditions contained in the report.

A statement by Paul Davies, a local resident, was sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Councillor Ray Freeman, a representative of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Sarah Flindall, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

David Colin, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Lorraine Hillier, local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

A question was raised on the lack of conditions relating to required materials for the proposed development. The officer explained that the application would require clay tiles and wooden windows, as identified in the application, however it was considered that sufficient reliable information had been received to make a condition on building materials unnecessary.

An additional question was asked on the possibility of a conversion for the extension into a fourth bedroom under permitted development. The planning officer responded that the extension could be converted. However, it would not be possible to increase the height of the development without planning permission. The planning officer also confirmed that the original application did not include permitted development.

In response to a further question, the planning officer also clarified the height of the roof, explaining that there would be an increase of thirty centimetres compared to its existing height.

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/S4809/HH, subject to the following conditions;

- 1: Commencement development within three years - Full Planning Permission
- 2: Development must be implemented in accordance with plans submitted
- 3: Development must be implemented in accordance with materials identified on application documentation
- 4: Scheme for protecting existing trees during development process, including any demolition and clearance, to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority
- 5: Details of three parking spaces and turning area to be agreed prior to development above slab level and implemented prior to occupation
- 6: A scheme showing full details of the proposed subterranean drainage and services should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development
- 7: Prior to the commencement of the development a report containing the findings of additional bat surveys should be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

153 P21/S1370/HH - 42 Mereland Road, Didcot

Councillor George Levy, having declared an interest as the applicant, withdrew from the room for duration of the item.

The committee considered application P21/S1370/HH for the conversion of garage to include office space and w.c. at 42 Mereland Road, Didcot.

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 clarified that the conversion of the garage would be to the rear of the property and that the alteration would not be visible to the public. The officer also confirmed that the high level rooflight that would be affixed 3m above floor level would not cause any overlooking and light pollution to neighbouring properties.

Councillor Mocky Khan, local ward councillor, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered that there were no parking issues in respect of the application, there were no problems relating to overlooking or privacy and that it would not result in any material harm to the area. Additionally, the proposal was in full compliance with national policies.

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 P21/S1370/HH, subject to the following conditions;

- 1: Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
- 2: Approved plans
- 3: Materials as on plan and supporting documentation

154 P21/S1385/HH - The Rosary, Shepherds Green

Councillor Jo Robb, having declared an interest as the applicant, withdrew from the room for the duration of the item.

The committee considered application P21/S1385/HH for the single storey extension and internal alterations. Bay window to breakfast room at The Rosary, Shepherds Green.

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 no objections had been received regarding the application. The planning officer described the proposal as of modest scale and design and that the building would blend into its surroundings. It was noted from the site visit that the property was near the bridle path, but that the visibility of the extension would be minimal.

Councillor Lorraine Hillier, local ward councillor, spoke in support of 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 P21/S1385/HH, subject to the following conditions;

- 1: Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
- 2: Approved plans
- 3: Materials and details as on plan and supporting documents

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm

Chairman

Date

--