

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2016

DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

Joan Bland, Margaret Davies, Anthony Dearlove, Jeannette Matelot, David Nimmo-Smith, Richard Pullen, David Turner and Ian White

Apologies:

Toby Newman tendered apologies.

Officers:

Sharon Crawford, Kim Gould, Paul Lucas, Nicola Meurer, Marc Pullen and Davina Sarac

Also present:

Councillors Paul Harrison and John Walsh

136 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

None.

137 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 September, 19 October and 2 November as correct records and agree that the Chairman sign them as such.

138 Urgent items

None.

139 Applications deferred or withdrawn

None.



140 Proposals for site visit reports

None.

141 P16/S1850/FUL - Hawkhill Place, Stanton St John

The committee considered application, to P16/S1850/FUL to demolish the existing two-storey dwelling and integrated garages and erect a new two storey dwelling at Hawkhill Place, Stanton St John.

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.

Officer update: two further letters of objection have been received, reiterating concerns which had already been raised.

David Polgreen and Andrew Clark, representatives of Stanton St John parish council, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The grand, large-scale design is inappropriate for the area;
- The materials do not fit in with the local vernacular;
- The design does not enhance the greenbelt; and
- The volume allowed is inappropriate.

Tim Knowles, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The visual impact of the design will be harmful to the greenbelt;
- The materials are not appropriate;
- The style is alien to the area and will be highly visible from the road;
- The current building is not 'sprawling' but a farmstead, parts of which date back to the 19th Century;
- Shepherds Pit and Hawkhill Place currently work well together;
- Does not agree with the technical calculations of projected volumes which would need to be increased as the current building contains garages;
- The design and access statement is misleading in its relative heights of the two buildings; and
- A request for a site visit.

Anthony Hayes and Kenny Peters, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application:

- In comparison to the existing building, the new design is not considerably larger;
- The site sits in a dipped valley, the only view of it being from a narrow vista to the North;
- The access road will be in a dip and no different from the current access;
- The purpose of the design is to sit within the same footprint;
- The applicant has no intention of building a garage; and
- It is not an area where design is constrained.

John Walsh, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Disagrees with volume calculations being less than the recommended 10% increase within the greenbelt due to the inclusion of garages in the current building; and
- It is misleading to say that the new design would not have an impact.

In response, the officer stated that both garages/car port are attached and could be converted without planning permission, which is why they have been included in the volume calculation. The property also has unused permitted development rights, which could see it extended, thus increasing the potential volume in its current state. Any future additional outbuildings would require planning permission.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S1850/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class A) – no extensions etc.
4. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc.
5. Sample materials required (walls and roof).

142 P16/S2045/FUL - 1 Sandy Lane, Cholsey

The committee considered application, to P16/S2045/FUL for the erection of a new detached dwelling at 1 Sandy Lane, Cholsey.

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.

Alan Taylor, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Whilst sympathetic to the new design and grateful to the applicants for it being more in keeping with the street scene, Mr Taylor is concerned about the sustainability of the land on which the proposed building will be constructed;
- No-one knows where the decommissioned underground oil tank is;
- Concern for the impact on his property and garden; and
- Concerned that the conditions to remove the oil tank will not be done satisfactorily and in a safe manner.

Oliver Margison and John Saulet, the applicant's agent and solicitor, spoke in support of the application:

- Do not understand the parish council's objection to the proposal due to the loss of open space; and
- The safe removal of the oil tank is an established and enforceable planning condition.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S2045/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Schedule of materials.
4. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
5. No surface water drainage to highway.
6. No garage conversion into accommodation.
7. Contamination (preliminary risk assessment).
8. Withdrawal of permitted development rights.

143 P16/S2638/FUL - Land to the rear of 14 and 16 High Street, Watlington

The committee considered application P16/S2638/FUL to erect a two-storey three-bedroom dwelling following the demolition of the existing brick walls and timber fencing within the site on land to the rear of 14 and 16 High Street, Watlington.

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.

Tim Bindoff, a representative of Watlington parish council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Harm to the conservation area;
- Will close a gap in the street scene, which will be lost forever;
- The effect of intensified use of the existing substandard access will be an increased risk to pedestrians;
- The parking is insufficient and turning area not acceptable;
- No provision is made for the neighbouring empty bank being turned into residential unit/s;
- Access to public transport is not good in Watlington; and
- Using public car parks as overflow is not sustainable as provision is limited.

Paul Butt, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application. His speech included the following:

- The proposed design has been informed by the conservation officer and is visually attractive;
- A new small dwelling will be welcome in a central, underused location;
- The highways liaison officer has not objected to the number of car parking spaces but to the intensification of use of the access, which the applicant and officers disagree with – the provision of formal spaces and turning area will be an improvement.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S2638/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within three years.
2. Development to proceed in accordance with approved plans.
3. Details of levels prior to commencement.
4. Schedule of materials prior to commencement.
5. Obscure glazing of south-west facing first floor windows.
6. No additional openings in south-west facing first floor elevation.
7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings.
8. Details of refuse and recycling collection point prior to commencement.
9. Allocated parking and manoeuvring areas retained as shown on plan.
10. Details of cycle parking facilities prior to commencement.
11. Details of signage prior to commencement.
12. Details of hard and soft landscaping prior to commencement.

144 P16/S1140/FUL - Longwood, Maidensgrove

The committee considered application P16/S1140/FUL to demolish the existing dwelling and associated structures and to erect three detached dwellings and detached garages with separate access arrangements at Longwood, Maidensgrove.

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.

Officer update: there are two additional conditions to include in the recommendation on the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity and to restrict external lighting to the rear elevations to protect wildlife in the nearby ancient woodland; as a result, the Woodland Trust have withdrawn their objection.

Tom Bolt, a representative of Pishill with Stonor parish council and a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The impact on his Grade II listed property opposite the proposed development;
- The size, bulk and massing are out of keeping;
- Maidensgrove is a small hamlet in open countryside and therefore cannot support infill development, falling outside of planning policy CSR1;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- By moving the development away from the ancient woodland, it is now closer and will therefore harmfully impact the private un-adopted lane and public footpath, which is currently maintained by residents; and
- Flooding could be an issue.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate; whilst sympathetic to the concerns raised by Mr Bolt, some committee members did not feel that the change of use would be detrimental to the area and that the extensive conditions would be sufficient in minimising the impact. However,

some committee members felt that they could not easily make a judgement on the impact of the development without seeing the site.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was withdrawn and a deferral to allow for a site visit was passed when put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P16/S1140/FUL, to allow for a site visit to take place.

145 P16/S2923/FUL - Daisy's at the Dog, Peppard Common

David Nimmo-Smith, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S2923/FUL to convert the existing coffee shop into a new dwelling at Daisy's at the Dog, Peppard Common.

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.

Fiona Berry, a representative of Rotherfield Peppard parish council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- The parish council welcome the Dog being brought back into use as a residential dwelling yet have concerns about the loss of part of the brick and flint wall to allow for vehicular access. The wall enhances the historic environment and therefore they suggest that the access is changed to Dog Lane.

Ian Heriot, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Strong reservation of the safety of the parking and egress coming out on to a busy crossroads;
- The primary school is due to be relocated to a plot to the North of the site which would increase the danger of cars reversing out onto the road; and
- Request the access is moved to Dog Lane to minimise danger.

Keith Neill-Smith, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The proposal would enhance the conservation area by removing unsightly lean-tos and additions and conserving the historic parts of the building;
- The applicant considered the access on to Dog Lane yet felt on balance it would not be favourable due to the narrow access, loss of trees and the parking being closer to the neighbouring property; and
- The conservation officer has no objection.

David Nimmo-Smith, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- No objection to the principle of development;
- Concern for the loss of part of the brick and flint wall; and
- When the school is built, there will be too many direct accesses on to this very busy corner.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Committee members did not agree that the proposed access would be the best option for the development and requested a deferral to allow for negotiations to take place with the applicant.

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

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P16/S2923/FUL subject to further negotiations with the applicant with regard to the access.

146 P16/S2646/FUL - 2 Baskerville Road, Sonning Common

The committee considered application P16/S2646/FUL to erect a detached two-storey 4-bedroom dwelling with integral garage and formation of vehicular access at 2 Baskerville Road, Sonning Common.

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.

Carole Lewis, a representative of Sonning Common parish council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included the following:

- This site is not allocated in the Sonning Common neighbourhood plan, which was formally adopted in October;
- The size, height, density and mass would result in an overdevelopment of the site;
- The proposed development would be harmful to the amenity of the neighbours;
- The planning inspector who approved the neighbourhood plan warned of inappropriate backland development; and
- Parking and traffic concerns due to the site being close to a busy crossroads.

Helen Gavin and Ros Varnes, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The road is rural, not suburban as per the officer's report;
- The frontage of the proposed development would be a lot smaller in relation to surrounding properties;
- The design does not fit in with the street scene;
- The proposal will adversely impact the privacy of the neighbours;
- Would like to seek assurances that the back to back distances within the report are correct;
- Traffic generation and parking would have a harmful impact on pedestrian and highway safety; and
- There is no suitable parking for delivery vehicles.

Paul Harrison, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed development is too bulky and out of character;
- It is an overdevelopment of the site;
- Only two parking spaces for a four-bedroom house is insufficient; and
- It is close to a junction and would therefore compromise road safety.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Although advised that the Sonning Common neighbourhood plan allowed for infill development, the committee were concerned with the size and scale of the proposed dwelling not being in keeping with the street scene and the impact on the neighbours' amenity.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P16/S2646/FUL due to the following reasons:

1. Due to the scale, bulk, height and design the proposal represents a development that is considered to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and therefore contrary to policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, the saved policies G2, H4 and D1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and policies H3, D1, D1a and D1b of the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.
2. Due to its position within the plot the proposal would be overbearing and an unneighbourly form of development that is contrary to policy the saved policies H4 and D1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and policy H3 of the Sonning Common Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Chairman

Date