

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 22 September
2021 at 6.00 pm in First Floor
Meeting Space, 135 Eastern Avenue,
Milton Park, OX14 4SB

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paul Bateman and Paula Fox

Remote attendance:

Officers: Nathaniel Bamsey, Victoria Clarke, Kim Gould, Simon Kitson, Marc Pullen, Bertie Smith and Tom Wyatt

190 Chair's announcements

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

191 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

192 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors George Levy and Jo Robb.

193 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

194 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

195 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting. Statements which had been received were sent to the committee some days prior to the meeting.

196 P21/S2624/FUL - 114 Broadway, Didcot

The committee considered planning application P21/S2624/FUL for the conversion and extension of existing building to create a residential development of 6 apartments to provide 2 x 3-bedroom apartments, 2 x 2-bedroom apartments and 2 x 1-bedroom apartments including amenity space to the rear (as amplified by Energy Statement received 7 July 2021) (as amplified by desk study regarding contamination received 10 August 2021). As amended by plans received from agent on 08 September in relation to National Space Standards, at 114 Broadway, 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 reported that this application had been referred to planning committee at the discretion of the planning manager. It was deferred at the meeting on 1 September 2021 to allow officers to consider the implications of an appeal decision for two flats in Goring, received earlier that day which was dismissed and referred to the National Space Standards. This application had no technical reasons for refusal.

The committee considered that planning permission should be granted as the application site was located in a sustainable location in close proximity to Didcot Town Centre and Didcot Railway Station.

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/S2624/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Energy Statement verification
5. Access and vision splays
6. Contaminated land
7. Contaminated land
8. Unsuspected contamination
9. Foul water details to be submitted
10. surface water details to be submitted

197 P20/S2809/HH and P20/S2812/LB - 11 Thameside, Henley-on-Thames

The committee considered applications P20/S2809/HH and P20/S2812/LB for a proposed in respect of rear of listed building, alteration of existing modern extension to widen its footprint and conversion from single to double storey (glass and metal cladding) plus addition of adjacent single storey glass extension. Internal floor plan

alterations to install a new stair, removal of c20 staircase, new partitions at first floor level and opening up of rear elevation at g/f and 1/f levels for proposed rear extensions. Removal of existing staircase, fireplace and modern internal partitions. Retrospective application for sub-division of roof space into one large room plus small storage room and internal staircase, involving removal of internal section of chimney. Provision of two rear dormer windows in the rear roof. (as amended by plans received 17 December 2020 reducing size of rear extension and providing additional supporting information) at 11 Thameside, 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 reported that a site visit had taken place and the applicant had made alterations to the application to deal with concerns from objectors. The extension is not now considered to be overly dominant or visually intrusive.

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

Mr. Adam Gibbon, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

A statement by Mr. Graham Keevil, a local resident, had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer some days prior to the meeting.

The senior planning officer advised the committee that were it minded to refuse listed building consent, contrary to planning officer advice in the report that the proposed works would preserve the building, it was required to state how the proposal would be harmful.

A motion moved and seconded, to refuse listed building consent failed on being put to the vote.

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

RESOLVED: to grant listed building consent in respect of application P20/S2812/LB subject to the following conditions;

1. Commencement of works within three years
2. Development in accordance with the approved plans
3. Sample / schedule of materials required (walls and roof)

The committee considered that planning application P20/S2809/HH represented an overbearing development and had concerns regarding its impact upon the property at 12 Thameside.

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

RESOLVED: that planning permission for planning application P20/S2809/HH be refused for the following reasons;

1. Size and bulk of the proposal.
2. Overbearing impact of extension on nearest neighbour at 12 Thameside.

198 P20/S0510/FUL - Land to rear of 16 Reading Road, Henley-on-Thames

The committee considered planning application P20/S0510/FUL for the erection of a three-storey building to provide three 1-bedroom flats (Daylight and Sunlight report received 29th May 2020; amended elevation received 23rd June 2020, clarifying external materials to be used for the stair core) on land to rear of 16 Reading 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.

The planning officer reported that this application had been deferred at the 21 October 2020 meeting to facilitate a site visit by members of the committee. With reference to objections which had been made regarding loss of light to neighbours, the planning officer reported that the applicant had commissioned a professional Daylight and Sunlight Report, which assessed the proposal against the 2011 Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines on Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. The study had found that all windows assessed at the Reading Road Flats 6a to 6d would continue to benefit from adequate daylight and sunlight as measured against the BRE criteria. It also concluded that 50 percent of the properties' amenity areas would continue to benefit from at least 2 hours sunlight at the spring equinox. Whilst objections to the content of the professional report had been received, officers did not have evidence directly contradicting the findings.

The planning officer reported that an area of the proposed curved stairwell would be directly visible from the patio and kitchen at flat 6b to the south. However, the living room of that property was also served by openings facing to the west, from which the view would be largely unaffected. Whilst there was an absence of demonstrable harm to flats 6a and 6b, in terms of daylight and sunlight, the perceived enclosure of the neighbours' amenity areas and consequent level of harm was a matter of judgement. One of the proposed conditions dealt with energy efficiency; prior to the commencement of the development, an energy statement would be completed, demonstrating how the development would achieve at least a 40% reduction in carbon emissions compared with code 2013 Building Regulations. In conclusion, the planning officer advised the committee that council officers considered that this was a sustainable development, which was suitable for three 1-bed properties.

Mr. Paul Scrivens, a local resident at 6d Reading Road, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Mr. Scrivens had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer some days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Edward Couldwell, a local resident at 6b Reading Road, spoke objecting to the application.

The issue of fire escapes and the fact that any scheme would still need to comply with building regulations irrespective of whether planning consent was granted was noted by the committee. It expressed concern at the apparently insufficient fire escape routes and inadequate access for emergency vehicles. The committee considered that the proposed development would be overbearing and adversely affect the quality of life of existing residents. Amenity space for future occupants was also considered to be unsatisfactory.

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

RESOLVED: that planning permission for planning application P20/S0510/FUL be refused for the following reasons;

1. Impact upon neighbouring residents, particularly at 6b and 6d Reading Road.
2. Visual intrusion.
3. Impact upon privacy of neighbouring residents.
4. Adverse effect upon neighbours' light levels.
5. Inadequate amenity space for future occupants.
6. Adverse effect upon quality of life of neighbouring residents.

199 P20/S1991/FUL - Land next to Oak House Cottage, track leading to Box Cottage Common Lane, Binfield Heath

The committee considered planning application P20/S1991/FUL for a new 4 bedroom residential dwelling, built within the garden of Oak house Cottage. New single storey, single car, oak frame car port (as amended by plans 14 October 2020 to reduce width of property and reduce glazing along south elevation) (as amended by plans received 2 March 2021 to move property further away from trees marginally) (as supported by Arboricultural Information received 2021-03-02) (as amplified by information received 2021-05-19), on Land next to Oak House Cottage, track leading to Box Cottage Common Lane, Binfield Heath.

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 had been deferred at the 1 September meeting, in order to facilitate a site visit by members of the committee. The proposal represented an infill application, was considered to preserve the character of the Chilterns area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) and protect and preserve landscape features. It was acknowledged that the proposed dwelling was larger and higher than Oak House Cottage and could overshadow and dominate it. Windows of the new house would face directly into Gosbrook Cottage at first floor level. The dwelling would maintain noticeable visual gaps between Gosbrook Cottage and Oak House Cottage, maintaining the spacious character of the area. There were no technical objections to the application. In conclusion, the planning officer advised the committee that the proposed development would be acceptable in principle and would not result in any adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area, the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB, the amenity of neighbours, the protection and retention of important landscape features and ecology, and would not harm the safety of the highway network.

Councillor Elisabeth Ransom, a representative of Binfield Heath Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Councillor Ransom, on behalf of Binfield Heath Parish Council had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer some days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Roger Murray-Leach, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Christopher Morgan a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Mr. Morgan had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer some days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Robert Kennedy, the agent, spoke in support of the application. A statement by Mr. Kennedy had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer some days prior to the meeting.

In response to a question regarding the status of the track leading to the site, the planning officer confirmed that this was a private road and that for the purposes of planning consent, an infill proposal did not necessarily have to be on the public highway. In response to a question regarding the size of gap possibly being too wide to constitute infill, the planning officer reported that infill was defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage, or on other sites within settlements where the site was closely surrounded by buildings. Council policy H16 did not specify the size of sites to be considered as infill, but did state that the scale of infill should be appropriate to its location.

The senior planning officer advised the committee that infill was a considered judgement taken by officers, who had concluded that this was suitable for such a spacious area. The design of the proposed development complied with the AONB design guide and the secretary of state's design guide.

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

The committee concluded that there were no planning reasons to refuse permission and that therefore consent should be given.

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/S1991/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

1. Development to commence within three years of the date of permission.
2. Development to be implemented in accordance with approved plans.
3. Schedule of all materials to be used in the external construction of the development to be agreed.
4. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas retained as shown on plan.
5. Details of landscaping (including hard surfacing and boundary treatment) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA
6. Tree Protection details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

7. Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
8. A schedule of all external lighting to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
9. Surface water drainage details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
10. Foul drainage details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
11. Energy Statement – report to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.
12. Glass coating for external glazing to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

Highway informative:

- It is an offence under Section 151 of the Highways Act 1980 for vehicles leaving the development site to carry mud onto the public highway. Facilities should therefore be provided and used on the development site for cleaning the wheels of vehicles before they leave the site.
- No vehicles associated with the building operations on the development site shall be parked on the public highway so as to cause an obstruction. Any such obstruction is an offence under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980.

200 P21/S2041/HH - 50 Hardings, Chalgrove

The considered planning application P21/S2041/HH for a retrospective planning permission for a radio amateur mast, rotator and antenna system at 50 Hardings, Chalgrove.

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 advised the committee that planning permission was recommended as the principle of the development was acceptable and there was no harm to visual amenity, neighbour amenity nor highway safety. Therefore, it was concluded that the application complied with the relevant policies of the adopted development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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/S2041/HH, subject to the following conditions;

1. Approved plans.
2. Remove and restore when no longer required.
3. Retract when not in use.
4. Chalgrove Neighbourhood Plan Policies.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm
