

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 12 October 2022
at 6.00 pm in Meeting Room 1, Abbey
House, Abbey Close, Abingdon,
OX14 3JE

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paula Fox (Development Manager), Sharon Crawford (Planning Officer), Paul Bowers (Planning Officer), Steve Culliford (Democratic Services Officer) and Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer)

Remote attendance:

Officers: Hannah Gibbons (Planning Officer), Will Darlison (Planning Officer), Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer)

69 Chair's announcements

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

70 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Axel Macdonald and Elizabeth Gillespie.

71 Declarations of interest

Councillor Victoria Haval declared an interest in item 76 of these minutes as she had chaired the Licencing Panel meeting where the corresponding licence for the application was granted.

72 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

73 Proposals for site visits

The committee discussed the proposal for a site visit for planning application P22/S2273/HH, Park View, 10A Manor Road, Henley-on-Thames. It was agreed that as the application had received two objections from consultees, and it is a development near a boundary, among several other considerations, a site visit should be conducted before the application is heard by the Committee.

A motion, moved and seconded, to conduct a site visit was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: that a site visit for application P22/S2273/HH, Park View, 10A Manor Road, Henley-on-Thames be conducted and therefore consideration of this application be deferred to a future Planning Committee meeting.

74 Public participation

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

75 P22/S2193/FUL - Sandy Acre, Woodperry Road, Beckley, OX3 9UY

The committee considered planning application P22/S2193/FUL for the retention of existing bungalow and alterations to layout and driveway to provide parking and garden areas with associated works, on land at Sandy Acre, Woodperry Road, Beckley.

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 introduced the report and highlighted that the application should be considered within the context that it has been submitted at that specific time and therefore the proposal would be considered an infill development, within the settlement, and so allowed in the Green Belt. In addition, it was stated that this would conserve the character of the conservation area it is adjacent to and would contribute to the sustainability requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework. Ultimately therefore, the planning officer considered retention of the existing bungalow as acceptable.

Ginette Camps-Walsh spoke on behalf of Beckley and Stowood Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Dom Holdsworth, a neighbour, spoke objecting to the application.

David Burson, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the discussion of the application. The committee asked the planning officer if a new application for the same bungalow would be approved if submitted, however the planning officer could not comment

without being presented with an actual proposal. When asked about the previous three applications on the site which contained conditions requiring the demolition of the bungalow, and if those applications were granted with the expectation of that demolition, the planning officer could not confirm.

The committee agreed that, as only replacement developments were permitted in a greenbelt, and that as this retention was considered to be an additional development due to the other developments on the site, this application should be refused. It was also noted that the bungalow was in place before the conservation area took effect and would likely not now get permission if it was put forward as a new application. Also the committee considered that the council should fulfil the conditions laid out in the three previous applications, that this bungalow would be demolished.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning application P22/S2193/FUL for the following reason:

- That retention of the bungalow, which is requires to be demolished by conditions attached to planning permissions for the erection of dwellings on the site, would consolidate the built up appearance of the site eroding its openness and character and the contribution it makes to the wider openness of the Green Belt contrary to Policy STRAT6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and that NPPF.

76 P22/S2192/FUL - Bishop Court Farm, 93 High Street, Dorchester-on-Thames, OX10 7HP

The committee considered planning application P22/S2192/FUL for the variation of condition 6 (Hours of operation) on application P21/S1411/FUL - to extend opening hours. Internal and external alterations to existing agricultural building and change of use to café (Use class E(b)), on land at Bishop Court Farm, 93 High Street, Dorchester-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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that this application was brought to the committee due to the objection of Dorchester Parish Council. The planning officer noted that the council's Environmental Protection team was consulted and confirmed they had no comments on the application and that the condition about lighting was brought forward based on the Crime Prevention Design Adviser's consultation. Ultimately, due to the separation from neighbouring properties and lack of complaints, the planning officer considered this application acceptable.

Chris Hill spoke objecting to the application.

Trevor Avery, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee raised the potential of putting a condition on the application for one year permission, however, it was considered that the sustainability of the opening hours could be controlled by the council's licencing function under the Licensing Act 2003. Therefore, due to the lack of complaints from residents and its distance from neighbouring properties there was agreement that this application should be granted subject to the planning officers proposed conditions.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P22/S2192/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Joinery Details as approved
4. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
5. Foul Water Drainage as approved
6. Hours of operation
7. External lighting

77 P22/S0924/FUL - Ridgeway Rise, Goring, RG8 0JY

The committee considered planning application P22/S0924/FUL for the erection of a detached two-storey house and detached garage (as amended by additional drainage information received 22 July 2022 and revised landscaping plan received 11 August 2022), on land at Ridgeway Rise, Goring.

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 introduced the report and highlighted that the new dwelling is proposed from the garden of a neighbouring property. They believed that the garage would be appropriate given its location and would not be harmful to the residential character of the area and that it is in compliance with local and national policies.

Laura White displayed a statement on behalf of Goring Parish Council, objecting to the application. The statement was read out on her behalf due to technical difficulties with Laura White's audio connection.

When asked about the distance the garage was from the delineating point between the owned property and bridleway, the planning officer informed the committee that it was 2.5 meters, measured electronically. The committee also noted that there is a double garage present further down the bridleway on the boundary.

A question was raised as to which applications the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty board are consulted on and the Development Manager informed the committee that only major applications would be referred to the board.

The committee generally agreed that the character of the area was not being changed substantially, adequate distance was maintained between the path and development, and that with soft landscaping this garage would be more enclosed. However, it was mentioned that some councillors would have liked to see both the house and garage being bought forward as one application and that ideally this garage would be sited further back.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P22/S0924/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Obscure glazing
5. New vehicular access
6. Close existing access (a)
7. Vision splay details
8. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
9. Surface Water Drainage
10. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition
11. Landscaping implementation
12. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
13. Energy Statement Verification

78 P22/S2273/HH - Park View, 10A Manor Road, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1LT

The committee deferred consideration of planning application P22/S2273/HH as a site visit was requested.

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm
