

# Minutes

## OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

## Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 APRIL 2022 AT 6.00 PM  
FIRST FLOOR MEETING SPACE, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK,  
OX14 4SB

### Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Ken Arlett, Peter Dragonetti, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, and Axel MacDonald

Officers: Paul Bateman (Democratic Services Officer) and Paula Fox (Development Manager)

### Remote attendance:

Officers: Paul Bowers (Senior Planning Officer), Sharon Crawford (Team Leader), Will Darlison (Planning Officer), Michael Flowers (Democratic Services Officer), Roseanne Lillywhite (Assistant Planning Officer), Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer), and Davina Sarac (Planning and Development Officer)

### 102 Chair's announcements

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

### 103 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Tim Bearder, Elizabeth Gillespie, Jo Robb, Ian Snowdon, and Alan Thompson. Councillor Alexandrine Kantor, who had intended to be present as a substitute, also gave apologies.

### 104 Minutes of the previous meeting

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on Tuesday 22 February 2022 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

### 105 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### 106 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

## **107 Proposals for site visits**

There were no proposals for site visits.

## **108 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

## **109 P21/S5378/FUL - Ridgeway House, 1A Hagbourne Road, Didcot**

The committee considered application P21/S5378/FUL for the change of use of the existing office to a large (Sui Generis) House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) with the addition of a rear dormer.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer began their statement by clarifying that the application had come before the committee as the local town council had objected to the application and opposed the views of planning officers. The committee were then informed that the site had been granted permitted development for conversion of an office to a single dwelling. As the change of use had not yet been implemented, this remained a possible fall-back position and was material consideration for the committee should the latest application be refused. The planning officer added that whilst the site provided limited amenity space, its location relative to the town centre mitigated this, and any potential resident would be fully aware of the site and its location prior to moving into the property. While it was noted that concerns had been raised locally on the number of cars that could potentially need to use the site and its possible impact on parking space, the highways officer had raised no objections. Planning officers were content with the application before the committee, and subject to the recommendations in the report, the application was recommended for approval.

Eleanor Hards, representative of Didcot Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Adam Place, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the speaker to clarify whether each bedroom would have its own shower room. The applicant responded by explaining that each bedroom would have a bathroom but regardless, would meet the licensing requirements for an HMO with seven occupants. The speaker also added that there was ample space and did not consider there to be any concerns from a planning perspective. The committee subsequently asked the planning officer to comment on whether there were any bathrooms for each room. The planning officer replied to this question and explained that the floor-plan of the application showed no on-suites, but they did have their own sink and there were shared bathroom facilities. The officer also confirmed that two bathrooms would meet the legal requirements for an HMO of the size before the committee.

The committee asked a final series of questions on the location of the site in relation to the nearby conservation area and also on whether the damaged telephone pole outside the property could be conditioned for the application to fix. The planning officer responded that the site was to the west of the conservation area, and secondly, it would not be

appropriate for the applicant to be made responsible for the telephone line due to this being beyond the scope of expectations on the applicant.

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 P21/S5376/FUL due to a lack of amenity space.

## **110 P21/S3035/FUL - 21 St. Martins Street, Wallingford**

The committee considered application P21/S3035/FUL for extensions to the side and front elevation along with alterations. Change of use to dry cleaners on ground floor. New garage to rear of side extension and first floor access. Proposed creation of 2-bedroom apartment on 1st floor. New traditional timber style shop front. New timber and slate tile lean-to canopy to the rear elevation to replace uPVC canopy (as amended by drawings received 26 October 2021 reducing footprint and amended energy information received 11 November 2021).

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 the meeting.

The planning officer began their statement by clarifying that the application had come before the committee due to a call-in request from the local ward member. In addition, the local town council had objected to the application and opposed the views of planning officers. The planning officer provided contextual information, explaining that the site was a two-story property from the 1960's with a flat roof, and was set back from the two properties on both its sides. To the south of the site and opposite there were also listed buildings. The application sought full planning permission for extensions to the front, which would bring it forward and to the side. A pitched roof was also proposed as a replacement for the flat roof. The proposal would change the ground floor to a dry cleaner and the first floor would become a residential unit. The planning officer confirmed that whilst odour could be released from the building, it would be required to comply with existing laws and regulations surrounding this factor. The planning officer concluded that the site would improve the look of the building within a conservation area, would provide a residential unit, and had acceptable parking and access arrangements. For this reason, and subject to conditions, the planning officer recommended the application for approval.

Elliot O'Brien, Daniel Wadsworth, and Umesh Patel, the architects and applicant respectively, 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/S3035/FUL subject to the following conditions:

### **Standard Conditions**

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved Plans

### **Pre-commencement conditions**

3. Schedule of Materials

4. Archaeological Watching Brief
5. Implementation of Programme or Archaeological Work

### **Compliance Conditions**

6. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition
7. No Garage conversion into accommodation
8. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
9. Electric Vehicle Charging Points (details required)
10. Provision of a bird box

## **111 P21/S5332/FUL - The Cherry Tree Inn, Stoke Row Road, Stoke Row**

The committee considered application P21/S5332/FUL for an outdoor marquee and pizza oven.

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 the meeting.

The planning officer explained that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call-in from the local ward member. The site of the application was within the Stoke Row conservation area, and within the Chiltern AONB. The planning officer confirmed that only the marquee had been assessed, as the applicant had sought to retain it for flexible outdoor space. The committee were told that permitted development allowed temporary structures for up to 120 days per year subject to conditions (Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order). The marquee however did not meet the requirements of this order, and planning permission was therefore sought by the applicant to keep this as a permanent addition to the site. The planning officer confirmed that in their view, whilst the site had an impact on the street scene, this impact was limited, and additionally, the conservation officer had assessed the application and had raised no objections. The committee were also informed that the pizza oven did not require any planning permission and so could not be a reason for objection. Therefore, subject to the conditions proposed by the planning officer, the application was recommended for approval.

Roger Clayson, representative of Stoke Row Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Jeremy Tozer, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Dan Redfern and Alex Veitch, the applicant and the agent respectively, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the officer why they had recommended the retention of a marquee that had not been legally permitted. Additionally, a concern was raised on why the planning officer had said there was some conflict with policies, when the application was in an absolute conflict. The planning officer clarified that while the marquee did not meet permitted development rights, the applicant was applying for planning permission as they were aware the marquee did not quality for permitted development rights. Therefore, the application was relevant as it was for full planning permission.

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/S3035/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Planning permission for a temporary period of three years from the date of permission.
2. The landscaping scheme as shown on the approved plan Tree Planting Plan shall be implemented within the first planting season following the date of this planning permission.
3. The hours of use shall be restricted until 10pm.

## **112 P21/S4038/HH - 26 Ladder Hill, Wheatley**

The committee considered application P21/S4038/HH for a rear and side extension (as clarified by corrected proposed rear elevation received 19 October 2021 and by drawings received 22 November 2021, demonstrating an obscured glazed side facing window).

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 the meeting.

The planning officer explained that the application had been brought before the committee due to a call-in from the local ward member. The application was a two-story detached property which rose steeply from north to south, with properties stepping up in-line with the slope. The planning officer noted the concerns of neighbouring residents and the parish council's concerns on the amenities of number 24, which was set lower due to the gradient on Ladder Hill. However, number 24 projected further out rear wise than number 26, and the proposed rear and side extensions did not go out further than number 24, and this complied with the SODC guide for the 45 degree rule.

A condition had been recommended to ensure that the side-facing window facing number 24 would be obscured glazed and non-opening to mitigate any concerns on overlooking, and the planning officer felt this would address the concerns surrounding privacy. The agent had provided plans for a fallback position for use under permitted development which included a rear and side extension of the existing property. Due to the fallback position of extensions of a similar size, the application was not unneighbourly and complied with design guidance in the SODC design guide, and with policy DES6 of the local plan. Subject to the proposed conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Bharti Reddy and Chris Doughty, local residents, spoke against the application.

Fiammetta Gray and Kate Carruthers, the agent and applicant respectively, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the speakers if they could clarify their access to the courtyard. The speakers responded that there was an opening door within the side extension and the door pivoted into the courtyard and would also be glazed, in order to bring light into the extension.

The statement of Councillor Alexandrine Kantor, the ward member, was read out to the committee.

The committee asked whether the obscured window was next to the sunken courtyard and whether it could be changed at a later date by a possible future resident. The planning officer confirmed the obscured window faced the sunken courtyard, but as it was a condition, it could not be changed without a new planning application. A follow-up question was asked, seeking confirmation whether all windows that were facing number 24 would be obscure glazed. The response to this question was that only the new window would be obscured glaze, and planning officers could not demand any alteration to existing windows on the property. In response to a second supplementary question on the windows, the planning officer also confirmed that the new window would be non-opening and was fixed shut.

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/S4038/HH subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Obscure glazing

### **113 P21/S3199/FUL - St. Andrew's Field, Holton Road, Holton**

The committee considered application P21/S3199/FUL to widen an entrance. Removal of a section of wall. Installation of new farm gates (as amplified by corrected block plans drawing no s BLO-001A and BLO-002A received on 28/02/22).

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 the meeting.

The planning officer began their statement by clarifying that the application had come before the committee as the local town council had objected to the application and opposed the views of planning officers. The application would increase the width of the existing access onto the site, which would be an increase of five metres which would be served by two metal gates. This would require the demolition of part of the existing stone wall. The planning officer added that an ongoing enforcement investigation was also taking place at the wider site on the alleged change of use of land from agriculture from to mixed agriculture and leisure use, however this investigation would not preclude the termination of a planning application. The planning officer added that the demolition of the section of a boundary wall would not materially harm the boundary of the area, and that a significant amount of the wall would be retained in an un-altered state. Additionally, a new section of walling would be added to the side of the new gate. The planning officer was also proposing a new condition alongside those in the report had been to require that the wall was constructed using existing or matching materials to those currently in place.

The committee sought clarification on whether the material requirement condition to the recommendations meant the materials had to be the same or similar to the existing material wall. The planning officer confirmed that the condition required the same natural stone to be used in order to match the existing aesthetics of the wall.

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/S3199/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Existing vehicular access
4. The new boundary wall to be finished in the same natural stone as that of the existing boundary wall.

The meeting closed at 8.06 pm

Chair

Date

--