

# Minutes

## OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

## Planning Committee

**HELD ON WEDNESDAY 29 JUNE 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), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Elizabeth Gillespie, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, Axel MacDonald, Ian Snowdon, and Alan Thompson

Officers: Michael Flowers (Democratic Services Officer) and Paula Fox (Development Manager)

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Alexandrine Kantor and Jo Robb

Officers: Samantha Allen (Senior Conservation Officer), Sharon Crawford (Team Leader – Planning West), Andy Heron (Planning Officer), Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer), Cathie Scotting (Major Applications Team Leader), and Tom Wyatt (Team Leader – Applications East)

### **13 Chair's announcements**

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed at an in-person meeting which was being simultaneously broadcast and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

### **14 Apologies for absence**

Councillor Sam-Casey Rerhaye tendered apologies. Jo Robb, as substitute, attended the meeting remotely.

### **15 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27 April 2022 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

### **16 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **17 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **18 Proposals for site visits**

The committee requested a site visit for item 12 on the agenda – application P22/S0584/FUL.

**RESOLVED:** to agree a site visit for application P22/S0584/FUL and for the application to be deferred from the meeting until such a visit had taken place.

## **19 Public participation**

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

## **20 P21/S0343/FUL - Belmond Le Manoir aux Quat'Saisons, Church Road, Great Milton**

The committee considered application P21/S0343/FUL for full planning permission for the erection of a new Wellness Spa, Bistro, Garden Villas, Garden Rooms, Pavilions and Storage Barns, minor extensions and alterations to the existing Grade II\* Manor House, former Stables building and Staff Facilities building, new highway access, internal road and car parking areas, limited demolition and associated works (amended plans and information September 2021, Archaeological Evaluation Report October 2021 and Amended plans and additional information April and June 2022).

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 provided the context of the site and explained that this was referred to the planning committee due to the size of the scheme and its departure from greenbelt policy. If the application was approved, it would then be referred to the Secretary of State to issue a direction to identify whether they wish to determine the application themselves. The proposal was over 4000 square metres in floor area and the scheme was designed to provide an upgrade to the hotel and Michelin star restaurant.

The planning officer then provided the detail of existing and proposed buildings on the site masterplan and also highlighted the two new car parking areas. The employee number would go from 176 to 259 and the parking spaces would increase by 160 spaces to a total of 250 parking spaces. The planning officer then explained that the replacement conservatory would extend beyond the existing conservatory. With reference to the bistro, the roof would be clay tiled with the walls clad in green oak. The presidential villa would have Cotswold rubble stone as elevations, as would other buildings with a mixture of clay tiled roofs and flat sedum-roofs. Within the envelope of the manor house gardens, officers were not concerned with the proposed development. Whilst the application conflicted with policy regarding the greenbelt, there was not considered to be material harm to the openness of the landscape and green belt.

The planning officer then discussed the outer-field, and advised that parking would be valeted, and solar canopies would be located in the visitor parking area. The planning officer illustrated the public footpath and its location on the field. The committee were given an update that neighbouring residents were concerned about the water flows from the site and the potential impact on surface water flooding and biodiversity on nearby areas. The planning officer confirmed that an extra requirement was proposed for the drainage condition which would require a water management plan to address the release of water

off-site. A letter of support from the local public bus company was also highlighted in favour of the application, and the officer identified terms for the Section 106 agreement in relation to the subsidy for the local bus service. Officers had requested a continuation of the bus subsidy for five years with a review built in after 3 years and the 3 year period to include 2 years post completion. The County Council had advised that the subsidy should be £175,000 index linked per annum. The planning officer stated that very special circumstances needed to justify the departure from greenbelt policy and in relation to the harm to heritage assets, the public benefits needed to be substantial. The officer explained that these principally concern the economic benefits, the gain to biodiversity, the improvements to the sustainability of the existing buildings and an elevated target for the proposed buildings and the public bus subsidy. In summarising the application, the planning officer confirmed that in their view, the application was considered to be acceptable, and subject to conditions and the referral to the secretary of state, the application was recommended for approval.

Steve Harrod, representative of Great Milton Parish Council, spoke in favour of the application. The committee asked the speaker whether he was speaking as a representative of the parish or expressing his own views towards the application as an individual. The speaker confirmed that he was a chairman of the parish council but was speaking to express his own view. The speaker confirmed that the parish did not have a full agreement on their stance towards the proposed development.

Gwen Harris and Emma Treanor, local residents, spoke in objection to the application.

Sarah Moorhouse and Raymond Blanc, the agent and the applicant respectively, spoke in support of the application. The committee asked Raymond Blanc how he would be involved in the site going forwards, to which Mr Blanc confirmed that he would continue in his current role for two years before changing to a directorate role overseeing the commercial business. The speakers also responded to questions relating to employment and local bus services, confirming that most of the staff lived locally, and that the bus service was subsidised to provide late night public transport from 6am-1am. The committee then asked the speakers on why the parking area was three times the requirement. The speakers responded that there was an existing overflow in parking spaces, and that the application sought to both remedy existing parking issues and provide appropriate parking spaces that would reflect the increased demand that the application would bring from customers. The speaker then responded to an additional question asking if the cookery school was being relocated or closed. The speaker confirmed that they would be having an academy in place, but that this academy would be spread out across the site and would not be in one single confined location.

The committee asked the planning officer for clarification on Historic England's stance on the application due to the reservations they had expressed. The planning officer responded that correspondence with Historic England confirmed that the amended application, which had a low level of harm, was deemed acceptable by the organisation. A second question to the planning officer sought confirmation on the car park and its location near the existing footpath, and on screening. The planning officer responded to these questions by confirming that the footpath ran along the tree belt, and that screening was proposed to obscure the car park, which would be covered through conditions. In response to other questions from the committee, the planning officer clarified that the replacement conservatory would extend further south than the original plans. In addition, no material harm was expected with reference to the openness of the green belt in this part of the site, but it was accepted that the development had led to a demand for works within the open fields. The car parking was confirmed as being valeted and some of the visitor parking

area would feature solar canopies to contribute to green energy production to meet the requirements of policy, and these would be of a maximum height of 2.5 metres.

A motion moved and seconded, to grant planning permission was declared carried on being put to the vote. In accordance with the constitution of the council, the committee had agreed that the vote for this application item be subject to a recorded vote.

Ken Arlett	For
Tim Bearder	Abstain
David Bretherton	For
Peter Dragonetti	Against
Elizabeth Gillespie	Against
Victoria Haval	Against
Lorraine Hillier	For
Axel Macdonald	For
Ian Snowdon	For
Alan Thompson	Against

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P21/S0343/FUL subject to:

1. The completion of a S106 agreement for the infrastructure identified in the report and the following Conditions, the final drafting of which to be agreed for consistency under the delegated powers of the Chairman of Planning Committee and the Head of Planning, and
2. Confirmation from the Secretary of State that they do not intend to issue a direction under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) (Direction) 2021

**Conditions**

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Phasing
4. Archaeology WSI
5. Archaeology Mitigation and Recording
6. Tree Protection (Detailed)
7. Construction and Traffic Management Plans
8. Levels (details required)
9. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition
10. New Vehicular Access
11. Sample materials required (all)
12. Details Conservatory
13. Details Presidential Suite
14. BREEAM Outstanding and Excellent Ratings
15. Energy Statement – Details Required
16. Energy Statement Verification
17. Ecology and Wildlife Protection
18. Landscape Environment Management Plan
19. Landscaping Scheme
20. Landscaping Management Plan
21. Removal of PD rights for fencing and enclosures
22. Lighting Strategy and Details
23. Green Travel Plan
24. Turning Area & Car Parking

25. Cycle Parking Facilities
26. Electric Vehicle Charging Points (details required)
27. Noise Assessment (external noise & plant equipment)
28. SUDs Scheme Surface Water
29. Surface Water Drainage
30. Foul Water Network Upgrade
31. Foul Drainage details
32. Hours of operation

## **21 P21/S0428/LB - Le Manoir Aux Quat'Saisons, Church Road, Great Milton**

The committee considered application P21/S0438/FUL for listed building consent for internal and external alterations and minor extensions, repair and refurbishment works to the Grade II\* Manor House (amended plans September 2021 and amended plans and information received April and June 2022).

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 Grade II Manor House was dated from the 15<sup>th</sup> century and had undergone development over the course of its existence. The principal works on this application were to the manor house with a replacement to the conservatory, and the relocation of an Edwardian period window. The new window would be altered from a three bay window to a five bay window. The planning officer continued and, in the presentation, highlighted the planned location of the first floor dormer extension, and where the conservatory building would be located. The committee were also informed of a condition which would require details of the conservatory to be submitted to the planning authority. A further condition was also proposed for the submission of a report to record the opening up of the building and works of alteration to be submitted for the archive. Subject to amendments and conditions, Historic England evaluated the harm to be of low concern. Therefore, the planning officer confirmed that subject to conditions, the listed building consent was recommended for approval.

Jeremy Blake, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer whether the record of the works would be both photographic and in writing. The planning officer confirmed this would be the case.

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

**RESOLVED:** to grant listed building consent to application P21/S0428/LB subject to the Secretary of State confirming that they do not intend to issue a direction on application P21/S0343/FUL and the following conditions:

### **Conditions:**

1. Commencement three years – Listed Building Consent
2. Approved Drawings and Documents
3. Details of Manor House Conservatory
4. Samples of Materials for Listed Buildings
5. Record of works

## **22 P22/S0713/FUL - 15 Elton Crescent, Wheatley**

The committee considered application P22/S0713/FUL for the proposed demolition of existing garage and conservatory, part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to the existing dwelling, subdivision and erection of new dwelling and alterations to the vehicular access and parking (amended plans received 15 April 2022 to reduce depth of rear extension, and to extend red line area to enable visibility splays for access).

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 was referred to the committee due to an objection from Wheatley Parish Council, due to concerns over the appearance of the area, car parking, highway safety, and the impact on the neighbouring property due to a loss of light. The planning officer then provided the background to the site, explaining that it was an ex-council estate from the 1950's and had been brought to the committee due to an objection from Wheatley Parish Council over the character and appearance of the area, car parking and highway safety, and the impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light. The planning officer then added that over time, most of the surrounding properties had taken two storey side extensions and in the view of officers, this had changed the character of the area.

Addressing the application site and the proposed development, the committee were told that the single storey extension to the rear of the site would not go beyond the depth of the existing conservatory. Additionally, the footprint of the application would extend northwards, but would not cause a harmful impact on neighbouring properties in relation to a loss of light. For the side facing windows, the committee were told the window would be obscured glazing so as to respect the privacy of neighbouring residents. The planning officer also confirmed that a condition was added that would remove permitted development rights which would protect any further impact on neighbouring amenity. As the benefit of the application was considered to outweigh the harm, the planning officer recommended the application for approval, subject to conditions.

Mark Flanagan, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. The committee asked the speaker for clarification on his verbal statement on whether preliminary work had begun at the application site. The speaker responded that the applicant had already split the garden and put a fence up, with work taking place up to around 10pm at night. An additional question from the committee was raised to the speaker to clarify their view on the extensions and whether they were in character with the area. The speaker answered that in their opinion, the character of the area would be harmed by the application, as it contrasted in appearance to existing buildings and other approved extensions.

Councillor Alexandrine Kantor, local ward member, spoke on the application.

The committee asked the planning officer how a semi-detached house would improve the area, to which the response was that other developments from approved applications in the area were used comparatively, and the planning officers considered the development to be an overall improvement compared to the existing arrangements. A second question was asked on how drainage would be managed to which the planning officer responded that a condition had been added to require details of drainage proposals, and also it was

noted that the site was not within a critical drainage area, and no objections had been raised by the relevant officers.

The committee sought clarification on vehicle access and parking due to concerns on insufficient space for larger vehicles should the application be approved. The planning officer responded that whilst they recognised there was some existing issues with road usage in the area, it was compliant with the standards set by Oxfordshire County Council and therefore the committee needed to consider that an objection from road access issues would be difficult.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission to application P22/S0713/FUL due to the harm to the character of the area and amenities of the neighbour.

## **23 P22/S0332/FUL - 2 Stonehouse Cottages, Highmoor Cross**

Councillors Tim Bearder and Ian Snowdon left the meeting before the item was considered.

The committee considered application P22/S0332/FUL for a variation of condition 2 (Approved plans) on planning application P21/S1647/FUL to vary the style of the external appearance (two storey side extension, demolition of existing garage and erection of a new two storey house and associated parking).

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 confirmed that planning permission was granted by the planning committee in the previous year for a two-storey extension to the existing dwelling and for a new detached dwelling. The new proposal sought to vary the existing approved plans for the detached dwelling. The only difference for the proposal related to its external appearance. The cladding was proposed for natural vertical timber with slate roofing. Whilst the site was located in an Area of Outstanding Beauty, it was within a built-up settlement. As the site was a post-war site and architecturally unremarkable, planning officers were not satisfied that a different style would cause harm. Subject to conditions, the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Selena Craig, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The committee asked the speaker whether the material was wood or plastic imitation wood to which the speaker confirmed it would be natural wood. A second question from the speaker sought confirmation on the impact of water impact on the face of the building based on the design. The speaker explained that they had used their architect for the design but could not directly answer the query at the meeting. The speaker was asked by the committee whether the vertical cladding was natural timber or black. The speaker responded that the wood was painted black to fit the style of the village.

Jo Robb, the local ward member, spoke in objection 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 to application P22/S0332/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Development in accordance with approved plans
2. Development in accordance with specific materials
3. Carbon reduction energy efficiency measures to be implemented
4. Proposed access to be provided prior to occupation and existing access to be stopped up
5. Vision splays to be provided and maintained
6. Parking and turning areas to be provided prior to occupation
7. Landscaping details to be provided in accordance with approved details prior to occupation
8. Tree protection to be in accordance with approved details
9. Bird and bat boxes to be installed prior to occupation
10. Surface water drainage to be provided in accordance with approved details prior to occupation
11. Foul water drainage to be provided in accordance with approved details prior to occupation
12. Electric vehicle charging point to be provided prior to occupation

## **24 P22/S0584/FUL - Land to the south of Well Place Road, Ipsden**

Application P22/S0584/FUL was deferred to enable a site visit to take place.

## **25 P22/S1434/FUL - Land to the rear of 5 Lydalls Close, Didcot**

Councillor Jo Robb left the meeting before the item was considered.

The committee considered application P22/S1434/FUL for the erection of a new bungalow. As clarified by Agent's emails received on 9 May and 7 June 2022 regarding access.

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 referred to the committee as the applicant was related to Councillor Jane Murphy. The site was located near a care home which was to the west of the site and flats for the elderly to the south of the site. The application site was otherwise surrounded by residential dwellings. The site would include two parking spaces and a private garden area. The site was previously occupied by a repair service for agricultural vehicles and the principle of residential development was considered acceptable. The neighbour impact and design were found to be acceptable, and the parking and garden size were compliant with the standards. There were no objections and subject to conditions, the planning application was recommended for approval.

Alan Thompson, the local ward member, 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 to application P22/S1434/FUL subject to the following conditions:

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

**Pre Commencement Conditions**

- 3. Surface Water Drainage
- 4. Tree Protection

**Compliance Conditions**

- 5. Energy statement verification
- 6. Electric Vehicle Charging Point
- 7. Provide bird box
- 8. Retain hedges (biodiversity)

The meeting closed at 8.46 pm

Chair

Date

--