

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 21 OCTOBER 2020 AT 6.00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Present:

Ian Snowdon (Chairman)

Peter Dragonetti, Ken Arlett, David Bretherton, Kate Gregory, Lorraine Hillier, George Levy, Jo Robb, Ian White and Celia Wilson

Apologies:

Sarah Gray tendered apologies.

Officers:

Paul Bateman, Paula Fox, George Jackson, Simon Kitson, Paul Lucas, Davina Sarac, Tracy Smith,

31 Chairman's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the procedure to be followed in a virtual meeting.

32 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 September 2020 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

33 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

34 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

35 Proposals for site visits



Listening Learning Leading

A proposal, moved and seconded, for a site visit in respect of application P20/S0510/FUL, land to rear of 16 Reading Road, Henley-on-Thames, to ascertain the layout of the site, and highways issues was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P20/S0510/FUL, to allow members to visit the site.

A proposal, moved and seconded, for a site visit for applications P19/S0821/FUL and P19/S0822/LB, Goulds Grove, Old London Road, Ewelme, to ascertain the layout of the site, and highways and listed building issues, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of applications P19/S0821/FUL and P19/S0822/LB, to allow members to visit the site.

36 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was shared with members of the committee. Any statements from the public received prior to the meeting were circulated to the committee and would be published on the council's website.

37 P19/S2061/FUL - Highfield, 17 Stoke Row Road, Peppard Common, RG9 5EJ

Councillor Lorraine Hillier and Councillor Jo Robb, the local ward councillors, stood down from the committee for consideration of this application.

The committee considered application P19/S2061/FUL for the erection of a single storey detached 2-bedroom dwelling, with associated works to facilitate a new access, together with external landscaping (width and height of dwelling reduced and changes to external layout as shown on amended plans received 11th September 2019 and additional fire engine tracking plan received 24th October 2019 and reduction in width of rear patio and pedestrian footpath and details of boundary treatment and levels as shown on amended and additional plans received 5th February 2020 and corrections to existing tree heights, retention of existing close-boarded fence and replacement front hedging as shown on amended plans received 17th June 2020) at Highfield, 17 Stoke Row Road, 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.

The planning officer reported that application site had a restrictive covenant that applied to the former traditional orchard land to be "used only as an orchard or garden ground" in connection with the dwelling house known as Highfield. There was presently no obligation on the landowner to maintain the current ecological value of the land. The development would be sited on the vegetable patch and amenity grassland, avoiding impacts on the traditional orchard to the south-west.

The planning officer also reported that the roof of the proposed dwelling would be positioned below the eaves' height of No.17 and thus would only be viewed from the west, against the backdrop of the established line of two storey housing. In relation to light pollution, planning officers considered that the proposed dwelling would not add to this to any large degree, given its location within the built-up area of the village and the number of

dwellings in the surrounding area. A planning condition was recommended to require details of any desired external lighting to be agreed with the council prior to its installation. The garden areas for the proposed dwelling, and retained for No.17, would exceed the recommended minimum standards of 50 square metres for two-bedroom dwellings and 100 square metres for larger dwellings.

The proposed vehicular access onto Stoke Row Road would be unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network in the vicinity and, in conjunction with the anticipated low vehicle speeds along the driveway, would not increase the risk to highway and pedestrian safety to an unacceptable degree. The highway liaison officer had no objection to these arrangements.

The democratic services officer reported that the statement of objection from the Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Martin Pratt, a local resident of 15 Stoke Row Road, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Lorraine Hillier, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Jo Robb, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee considered that proposed dwelling and access, by reason of its position and appearance, would constitute a form of backland development that would be out of keeping with the prevailing two-storey frontage development and thereby detract from the sylvan character and appearance of the area.

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 P19/S2061/FUL for the following reason;

1. the proposal constituted a form of backland development that would be out of character with the appearance of the local area.

38 P20/S0928/FUL - Land at The Elms, Upper High Street, Thame

Councillor David Bretherton and Councillor Kate Gregory, local ward councillors, stood down from the committee for consideration of this item.

The committee considered application P20/S0928/FUL for the erection of an extra care development (Use Class C2) of 66 units; 3 guest rooms; a communal resident's centre with staff facilities; provision of car, cycle and mobility scooter parking; the creation of new public open space; the provision of new pedestrian/cycle links from Upper High Street to Elms Road and Elms Park; and associated infrastructure works and landscaping on land at the Elms, Upper High Street, Thame.

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.

The planning officer reported that site was located within the centre of Thame in the vicinity of several listed buildings. The site was within the Thame Conservation Area and currently there was no public access through the site.

The application site had an extant planning permission and listed building consent for 37 dwellings and associated works. The permission was extant as all pre-commencement conditions had been discharged and the access to the site had been implemented in accordance with the approved plans. The extant planning permission was a significant material consideration in the determination of this application. An application in 2018 was refused under delegated powers and was the subject of an appeal.

As part of the appeal process, the council and the appellant were required to agree common ground and this was set out in a statement of common ground (SoCG). This enabled the Inspector to identify the main issues. A copy of the SoCG was attached as Appendix 2 of the report. The Inspector set out the main issues in the determination of the appeal in paragraph 12 of the Decision Letter, which were set out in paragraph 2.4 of the report. The Inspector's conclusions on the main issues, which resulted in his dismissal of the appeal, were of significant importance in the determination of this current application (the inspector's reasons and details of the applicants' high court challenge were set out in paragraphs 2.7 to 2.37 of the report). The committee noted that the appeal decision had included a reference to less than substantial harm.

The planning officer reported that the proposed scheme opened up routes for public access and improved connectivity in Thame. Key visualisations of these routes were shown to the committee as part of the presentation of the report. The scheme had a 21% footprint reduction in comparison to the extant scheme. The report provided information on the significant need for older persons' accommodation in the district and gave details on the assessment of that need through the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014), updated through the Authority Monitoring Report (2019). These details were provided in paragraphs 8.26 to 8.31 of the committee's report.

The committee noted that the proposal was contrary to Thame Neighbourhood Plan policies, which allowed for only 45 residential dwellings at the Elms. The planning officer reported that the scheme would deliver a policy-compliant affordable housing contribution, of which there was an overwhelming need. The housing officer had confirmed that it was appropriate that this contribution was made off-site, having regard to the nature of the development. The contribution was a significant benefit, which should be afforded significant weight. Additionally, the proposed development would result in job creation during construction and operation, and the use would add to economic activity in the area.

Other benefits associated with the development would be the delivery of a good mix of housing types, a heritage benefit concerning improved public open space and the opening up of the park, and significant infrastructure benefits, besides the off-site affordable housing element, through the S.106 agreement.

Mr. Graeme Markland, a representative of Thame Town Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Adrian Reynolds, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr Mark Sitch, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Kate Gregory, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor David Bretherton, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee questioned the planning officer in respect of the basis of the calculation for the affordable housing element and were sceptical that the number of off-site units quoted in the report would be realised. The planning officer reported that the figures were the result of detailed work undertaken by a specialist housing officer, who was not present at the meeting. The committee considered that it required comprehensive information on affordable housing, the financial contribution and the number of units, and therefore at the present time did not have all the relevant information upon which to make a decision. It considered that it would be appropriate to defer consideration of this application and to invite the housing officer to the meeting when the application would be determined.

A motion moved and seconded, to defer consideration of the application, to permit further detail on the affordable housing element to be brought to the committee, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P20/S0928/FUL pending further information in respect of affordable housing.

39 P20/S0510/FUL - Land to rear of 16 Reading Road, Henley-On-Thames, RG9 1AG

Consideration of this application had been deferred, pending a site visit.

40 P19/S0821/FUL and P19/S0822/LB - Goulds Grove, Old London Road, Ewelme, OX10 6PX

Consideration of this application had been deferred, pending a site visit.

41 P19/S0480/FUL - Thame Service Station, Long Crendon Road, Thame, OX9 3SB

Part way through the consideration of this application, members took a vote just before the meeting guillotine of 8:30pm to continue the item they were on.

Councillor David Bretherton and Councillor Kate Gregory, local ward councillors, stood down from the committee for consideration of this item.

The committee considered application P19/S0480/FUL for two Drive Thru (A1, A3, A5) Pods with associated landscaping, hardstanding and other associated works (Bat survey submitted 21 August 2019, letter received 16 September 2019 in response to Thame Town Council's comments and Flood Risk Assessment Addendum received 26 September 2019.) (Updated Flood Risk Addendum and Annexe submitted 25 November 2019) at Thame Service Station, Long Crendon Road, Thame.

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.

The planning officer reported an error in paragraph 2.2 of the report, where the descriptions of the units' size were reversed; the larger proposed unit was Burger King and the smaller one was the coffee shop. Also, paragraph 6.2 referred incorrectly to a proposed use comprising a mixed Class E (café), whereas it was in fact Class A.

The planning officer also reported that recommended condition 7, 'Development to be carried out in accordance with tree protection details' required further explanation to the committee; the forestry officer was satisfied with the details without the need for a formal agreement prior to commencement.

The committee was advised that Thame Town Council objected to the removal of 7 bays of heavy goods vehicle and coach parking. The local highway authority did not wish to object to the granting of planning permission. A condition requiring parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained was recommended, which had been included in the recommended conditions in the report. The committee noted that where Thame town council had alleged an illegal use of some hardstanding for storage and jet wash facilities, these uses had now been discontinued. The committee was provided with a slide presentation of the existing parking areas. In response to a question from the committee regarding a possible different mix of uses for parking spaces in this scheme, the planning officer advised that the National Planning Policy Framework (at paragraph 107) placed councils under an obligation to expand lorry parking and that in the case of this application the owner had a discretion as to the use of the spaces.

Councillor Graeme Markland, a representative of Thame Town Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr Bruce Risk, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor David Bretherton, a local ward councillor, spoke to the application.

The planning officer concluded by reporting that although a small number of objections related to the loss of some lorry parking, the proposal would provide sustainable economic development that made effective use of previously developed land and would not be harmful to existing businesses within the Thame town centre.

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 P19/S0480/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Development must commence not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development must be implemented in accordance with the approved drawings.
3. A construction environmental management plan for Biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted and implemented in accordance with the approved details.
4. A full surface water drainage scheme, including details of the size, position and construction of drainage works, shall be submitted and implemented in accordance with e approved details.
5. A revised Flood risk Assessment shall be submitted and implemented in accordance with the revised approved details.
6. A scheme of landscaping of the site to be agreed and implemented
7. Development to be carried out in accordance with tree protection details
8. Trees planted next to hard surfaces must be planted in specific tree pits.
9. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans.

10. Parking & Manoeuvring areas shall be laid out in accordance with approved plans and retained thereafter.

The meeting closed at 8.42 pm

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank