

Minutes



OF A MEETING OF THE

Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 30 NOVEMBER 2016

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

Present:

Felix Bloomfield (Chairman)

Joan Bland, Margaret Davies, Anthony Dearlove, Lorraine Hillier, Elaine Hornsby, Toby Newman, David Nimmo-Smith, David Turner and Ian White

Apologies:

Jeannette Matelot, Richard Pullen and Margaret Turner tendered apologies.

Officers:

Emma Bowerman, Paul Bowers, Victoria Butterworth, Sharon Crawford, Paul Fox, Kim Gould, Simon Kitson and Nicola Meurer

Also present:

Elizabeth Gillespie

147 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest

Anthony Dearlove declared that in relation to application P16/S3163/FUL – 7 Trent Road, Didcot, he would be stepping down from committee to speak on behalf of the parish council.

Joan Bland declared that in relation to application P16/S3268/FUL – 99 High Street, Wallingford, she would be leaving the room when this application was considered as she knows the applicants.

148 Urgent items

None.

149 Applications deferred or withdrawn

None.

150 Proposals for site visit reports

None.

151 P16/S2459/FUL - 116-118 Greys Road, Henley-on-Thames

Joan Bland and Lorraine Hillier, two of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and did not take part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S2459/FUL for a residential development comprising 17 residential units, together with associated access, car parking, cycle storage, landscaping and drainage following the demolition of all existing buildings at 116-118 Greys 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.

Officer update: a correction to paragraph 6.4 where 2.8 hectares should read 0.28 hectares.

Will Hamilton, a representative of Henley town council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- The application conflicts with the Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP) in respect of the higher number of units proposed (17 compared to the allocation of 13) and less than 40% affordable housing;
- The application also conflicts with the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Local Plan in respect of affordable housing allocation;
- Regarding viability, there are no sites in the HHNP that would be unable to support 40% affordable housing;
- The committee would need full access to the viability report to make a decision; and
- The neighbourhood plan has been years in the making, passed by successful referendum and praised by the prime minister and should therefore be respected.

Joan Bland and Lorraine Hillier, two of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The developers knew that the requirement was for 40% affordable housing and should have designed it as such; and
- The HHNP specifically allocated this as residential over commercial to ensure the requisite amount of affordable housing.

In response to matters raised, the planning officers reported that:

- According to policy CSH3 of the Core Strategy, 40% affordable housing will be sought on all sites *subject to viability*;
- BNP Parabas were instructed as independent consultants to review the applicant's viability assessment and were satisfied with their findings;
- Although the independent consultant recommended a review mechanism to reassess the scheme in the future, it was felt that the offer of five affordable houses would be more valuable than a review at a later date;

- The viability report includes sensitive, confidential financial information and is therefore not available online apart from a short summary; and
- The viability appraisal also includes detailed county council requests for costs.

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

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was declared lost on being put to the vote due to the committee not being content with the affordable housing allocation and a wish to see the viability report.

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/S2459/FUL to allow the committee to see the full viability report.

152 P16/S2714/FUL - Goats Gambol, Beech Lane, Woodcote

David Nimmo-Smith stepped down from committee and took no part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S2714/FUL to demolish and replace the existing dwelling with a two-storey five-bedroom dwelling; and to demolish and replace the existing stables with a three-bedroom bungalow at Goats Gambol, Beech Lane, Woodcote.

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.

Robin Peirce, a representative of Woodcote parish council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- Woodcote have an adopted neighbourhood plan, which should be adhered to;
- This application is in an isolated location on the edge of Woodcote, which could set a precedent;
- To demolish half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings would result in a large plain brick flank wall, which would be detrimental to the AONB;
- The inspector for the recent lost appeal for an application on the same site would be a clear intrusion into the AONB;
- Disagree that Goats Gambol needs demolishing, it needs maintenance;
- The proposed detached dwelling would be overbearing and un-neighbourly; and
- If minded to approve, the committee should ensure that any remedial work be completed before any further work starts by condition.

Robin and Carol Parsons, local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- They do not object to the bungalow element of the proposal, but strongly object to the five-bedroom house;
- Regarding the overbearing positioning of the house, they are very concerned with overlooking and loss of sunlight;

- They have never objected to a loss of view, as stated in the report; and
- The property could be refurbished instead, they don't consider it necessary to demolish.

Phillip Sparks and Andrew French, the applicant and agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The current property is poorly constructed with no cavity, insulation or adequate foundations and has had sub-standard work carried out in the past;
- Pre-application advice resulted in a recommendation to demolish the current building and start again;
- They have complied with constraints set out in the Woodcote local plan, design guide, local plan and Chilterns design guide;
- The applicants have responded to requests to address concerns by moving windows, the garage and moving the property away from the root protection area;
- They have concentrated on traditional Chilterns detailing in the materials, windows, boundary and edging treatments; and
- They are committed to providing good vernacular, sympathetic to the neighbourhood.

David Nimmo-Smith, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Although some members of the committee were minded to approve the application, with a strengthening of condition 13 to include timescales for the remedial work, the majority of the committee did not agree that the development would not be overbearing, unneighbourly and have a harmful impact on the AONB.

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

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/S2714/FUL, for the following reasons:

1. Having regard to the scale and position of the proposed two-storey dwelling and garage, the council considers that there would be a significant loss of daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring property at Hawthorn Cottage. Furthermore, the internal layout of the proposed dwelling would result in a loss of privacy through direct overlooking of parts of the neighbouring property from the first floor bedroom windows. As such, there would be a materially harmful impact upon neighbouring amenity, contrary to policies CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire design Guide and Policies H4, D1 and D4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.
2. Having regard to the scale of the proposed two-storey dwelling, its position within the site and inappropriate form and detailing, the council considers that the proposal would represent an intrusive form of backland development, causing material harm to the character and appearance of the site and the special rural character of this part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy H10 of the Woodcote

Neighbourhood Plan, Policies CSEN1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and Policies H4, D1, G2, G4 and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

153 P16/S1904/FUL and P16/S1835/LB - The Old Forge, High Street, Tetsworth

The committee considered application P16/S1904/FUL and P16/S1835/LB for the change of use and conversion into a two-bedroom dwelling at The Old Forge, High Street, Tetsworth.

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.

Marjorie Sanders, a representative of Tetsworth parish council, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included:

- The historic Grade II listed building has a significant place in the centre of the village for trade purposes;
- The junction where the property sits is an entry/exit pinch point in the village;
- There are already ongoing parking and access issues;
- There have never been regular vehicle visits whilst used for business reasons;
- The tarmac in front of the property is small and inadequate for parking;
- Since the submission of the application, the bus service to Thame has been withdrawn and the primary school is now full; and
- The lack of garden and amenity space is a major concern, the parish council do not agree that the village green is an acceptable alternative.

Caroline Cann, a representative of Tetsworth Memorial Hall, spoke objecting to the application. Her concerns included:

- To obtain planning permission to build an extension on to the memorial hall, they had to move the doors away from the residential neighbours to minimise noise – these are now 5.5m away from the proposed development;
- The hall is licensed for music, dancing and selling alcohol with around 500 bookings last year both during the day and in the evening;
- Despite the residential neighbour to the other side moving in with knowledge of the memorial hall's activities, they have had ongoing noise complaints;
- Overlooking of the grounds and car park and into the proposed dwelling would affect both the amenity of future occupants and users of the memorial hall; and
- Having no external amenity is contrary to policy.

Bruce Robertson and Corin Rea, the applicant and agent, spoke in support of the application:

- The application site has been used for 25 years as storage for the applicant's business;
- Over this period, they have sympathetically restored the building making it much more suited to residential use due to the cottage-like character;
- The applicant has never been approached by anyone wanting to use it as a forge;
- There are no objections from statutory consultee;
- The noise impact would be minimal from the memorial hall due to building regulation standards and restricted licensing laws; and

- The insertion of new inward-opening windows including one extra window would not affect the street scene.

In response to matters raised, the planning officers reported that:

- They considered that due to the size of the property and changes to Government policy, which supersede the Local Plan, it was not necessary to market it as a commercial opportunity;
- If the property wasn't listed, the applicants could convert it under permitted development rights; and
- The tarmac area allocate for parking is in ownership of the applicant and designated highway land.

The committee considered the planning application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Although some members were satisfied that the any future occupants would be aware of the memorial hall and that converting to residential use would ensure its maintenance, other committee members believed that the application would result in un-neighbourliness to both the occupants of the dwelling and the memorial hall, parking issues and had concerns with the lack of amenity space.

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

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

A motion, moved to approve listed building consent was not seconded.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P16/S1904/FUL, due to the following reasons:

The proposed development would result in a poor quality living environment for the future occupiers of the dwelling by way of lack of privacy and noise disturbance due to the proximity and use of Tetsworth Memorial Hall, would provide insufficient parking and lack garden amenity space. As such the proposal is contrary to saved policies H4, D3, D4, T2 and EP2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and Paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

RESOLVED: to refuse listed building consent for application P16/S1835/LB, due to the following reasons:

There is insufficient information to assess the full impact of the development on the listed building in respect of the provision of soundproofing to the building and windows to achieve acceptable levels of noise insulation. Without such information to show that the designated asset can be conserved in an acceptable manner, the limited public benefit of the proposal would not outweigh the potential harm to a designated heritage asset. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, saved Policy CON3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and Paragraphs 131, 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

154 P16/S2902/FUL - 2 Gidley Way, Horspath

The committee considered application P16/S2902/FUL to erect a detached two storey house and associated works, including revised access, parking and turning at 2 Gidley Way, Horspath

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.

Trevor Puttock, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Existing vehicular access.
4. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.
5. No surface water drainage to the highway.
6. Sample materials required (walls and roof).
7. Obscure glazing for landing window.
8. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.
9. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc.

155 P16/S3163/FUL - 7 Trent Road, Didcot

Anthony Dearlove stepped down from the committee to speak on behalf of Didcot parish council. He did not take part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S3163/FUL to replace the existing double garage with a new detached two-bedroom dwelling at 7 Trent Road, 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.

Anthony Dearlove, a representative of Didcot town council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The application is un-neighbourly and an overdevelopment of the site;
- It does not fall within the definition of infill and does not fit in with the street scene due to the two-storey design and setting; and
- This would set a dangerous precedent for the conversion of garages in the area.

Matt Brooks, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application:

- Following advice from the planning officer the design has been reduced from a four-bedroom to a two-bedroom property;
- It does constitute infill development;
- There are no highways objections;
- Loss of light will not be an issue for neighbouring properties; and
- Meets all statutory guidance.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Members did not agree that the proposed development would not be an overdevelopment of the site and that due to its scale, siting, design and massing it would not fit in with the surrounding built form.

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/S3163/FUL due to the following reasons:

The proposed development due to its scale, siting, design and massing, in relation to surrounding to surrounding development, would result in a cramped relationship with the adjacent built form and significantly harm the character and visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 and Policies G2, D1 and H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

156 P16/S3268/FUL - 99 High Street, Wallingford

Elaine Hornsby, one of the local ward councillors, stepped down from the committee and did not take part in the debate or voting for this item.

The committee considered application P16/S3268/FUL to demolish the existing barn and erect a part-single storey, part two-storey dwelling house at 99 High Street, Wallingford.

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 updates:

- Due to the plans now including details of how the foundation levels will be altered, the conservation officer is now content that sufficient steps have been taken to address their previous concerns regarding the maintenance of the curtilage wall;
- Wallingford town council have now approved the details in respect of the curtilage wall;
- A further neighbour objection has been received requesting that if minded to approve the application that the rooflights be kept to a maximum of three and are of heritage design and construction.

Andrew Harper, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included:

- Despite the changes to the design, Mr Harper and the neighbours for whom he is also representing, feel that it is still unneighbourly and will still have a harmful impact on the listed wall;

- The bulk and height still constitute an over overbearing development, contrary to policies G2 and H4 of the adopted local plan;
- The design, height, scale and materials are not in keeping; and
- Objections outweigh support from immediate neighbours.

Graham Wells and Mark Thackeray; the applicant and consultant, spoke in support of the application:

- In moving the proposed building away from the listed wall, they have addressed one of the reasons for refusal from the previous application;
- They have started with using the footprint of the existing barn and not increasing the height by dropping the land;
- It is a sizeable plot and therefore not overdevelopment of the site;
- The conservation officer has no objections; and
- There will be an archaeological watching brief.

Elaine Hornsby, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application.

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, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Sample materials required (all).
4. Remove permitted development rights for extensions, roof alterations and windows.
5. Submit written scheme of investigation.
6. Implementation of programme or archaeological work.
7. Turning area and car parking.
8. Air quality - provision of electric vehicle charging points.
9. Conservation style rooflights.
10. Minimum cill height of 1.7m for window in east elevation.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank