

Minutes OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 3 NOVEMBER 2021 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, Lorraine Hillier, Alexandrine Kantor (substituting for Councillor Havel) Jo Robb, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paul Bateman and Paula Fox

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Maggie Filipova-Rivers

Officers: Andy Heron, Simon Kitson, Marc Pullen, Tom Wyatt and Susie Royse

20 Chair's announcements

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

21 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Victoria Havel and Axel Macdonald. Councillor Alexandrine Kantor substituted for Councillor Havel.

22 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 20 July 2021 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

Councillor Snowdon pointed out that the minute relating to Land at Former Didcot 'A' power Station (P21/S0274/FUL) omitted to provide details about the discussion relating to diesel generators.

23 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

24 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

25 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

26 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting.

27 P20/S4706/FUL - Land to the west of Wallingford Road, adjacent to sewage works, between Goring and South Stoke

The committee considered application P20/S4706/FUL for temporary planning permission for 25 years for the development and operation of a Transitional Hybrid Energy Project and associated infrastructure including access (2021-08-16 Amended Plans to extend red line, include additional landscaping and landscape details and temporary construction compound, and additional landscape and air quality details submitted 20/04/21 and 21/05/21) on land to the west of Wallingford Road, adjacent to sewage works between Goring and South Stoke.

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 reported that the application had been called in by the local ward councillor on the basis of visual impact, development within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and effect upon community amenity. The application was for temporary planning permission for a transitional hybrid energy project, designed to provide standby electricity from four containerised gas-powered generators in connection with transitions to renewable power sources at larger stations. The site at present could only be seen from the south of Goring and was screened to the north and west. The committee were shown slides of the site's location, as presently viewed, and with projected landscaping at one- and 15-years' maturity. A slide depicting the bund viewed from the south, and images of the site viewed from the Wallingford Road, were also shown to the committee. The planning officer also reported that the application had received no objections from technical officers and statutory consultees, including the Chilterns Conservation Board.

Councillor Sonia Lofthouse, a representative of Goring on Thames Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor Andrew Scrivener, a representative of South Stoke Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Paul Jenkins, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. In response to a question from the committee regarding his suitability to make a comment on the merits of the application, Mr. Jenkins declared that he was a qualified electrical engineer and a fellow of the institute of engineering and technology and a professional in the field for 35 years. In his view, the assumptions taken to justify the development were incorrect,

principally that there were no major electricity users in the distribution area served by this connection. He added that nitrous oxide could be emitted from the generators, which was toxic.

Mr. Richard Dew, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Dominic Gates, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Ms. Madeleine Bastawrous, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Ruarith Mitchell, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. In response to a question from the committee regarding the future value and relevance of the development, Mr. Mitchell stated that domestic boilers currently being produced and fitted were designed to run off a 25% hydrogen mix. Also in response to a question regarding the height of proposed flues, he reported that the generators operated at a very high temperature and that the height was necessary to ensure adequate dispersal of exhaust gases over a wider area.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the benefit of the development to the local community, Mr. Mitchell responded that the proposal would ensure a security of supply, which would be feeding into the local area. Small gas-powered stations such as these were required to deal with the transition to a mixed renewable supply, which necessitated rapid initiation and turning off.

In response to a question regarding air quality, the planning officer confirmed that air quality levels were acceptable and accordance with policy EP1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and policy 14 of the Goring Neighbourhood Plan. Also, he had not received any further evidence regarding air quality which would have led him to recommend refusal.

Mr. Robert Chamberlain, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The democratic services officer had sent to the committee prior to the meeting a statement by Jenny Hedge, Chair of Trustees, of the Anne Carpmael Charitable Trust.

The democratic services officer had also sent to the committee prior to the meeting statements from the following persons;

Ms. Anna Povey, a local resident

Mr. Alan Harrison, a local resident

Mr. Jeremy Lazenby, a local resident

Councillor Maggie Filipova-Rivers, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent to the committee prior to the meeting a statement by Councillor Filipova-Rivers.

Councillor Filipova-Rivers and the committee referred to paragraph 6.21 of the report, which stated that, "...planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest". The planning officer was asked about the definition of a 'major development' and whether this constituted such a proposal. He replied that this was always a matter of judgment and that although he would not recommend refusal, the committee was entitled to form a view. The senior planning officer advised that although the National Planning Policy Framework provided good information for planning officers on

nature, scale and impact, there was limited definitive guidance available on the size of applications regarding the definition of a major application. Officers took into account other applications in the district as precedents. However, although it was unusual to receive applications within the AONB, impact upon that area was a key factor to make a judgment upon.

The committee remained concerned at this proposal in the AONB, which it considered to be a 'major development' and which would be unacceptably harmful to character and appearance of a valued landscape and were minded to refuse planning permission.

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

RESOLVED: that planning permission is refused for application P20/S4706/FUL for the following reasons;

1. Harmful to the character and appearance of the local landscape.
2. Harmful to the visual amenity of this part of the AONB.

28 P21/S2229/FUL - 12 Gap Way, Woodcote

The committee considered application P21/S2229/FUL for the demolition of existing chalet bungalow and residential annexe, and erection of a 3-bed detached dwelling and a 4-bed detached dwelling (amended plans received 30th July and 15th September 2021, reducing the width of the proposed dwellings and increasing the separating distance from the plot boundaries) at 12 Gap Way 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 the meeting.

Prior to the presentation of the report on this application, the planning officer reported that there was an error in paragraph 1.2; it had been incorrectly stated that the existing bungalow had been demolished, whereas it had been recently vacated and part of the land cleared as part of the extant approval. Demolition was part of the present application. The committee was shown slides of a previously approved infill scheme, extant until 2023, retaining the bungalow and adding a dwelling; work on this proposal had not commenced. The planning officer also reported that the site was located within the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) but within the built limits of Woodcote, rather than in the open countryside. The Oxfordshire County Council, the highways authority, considered that the intensification of the use of Gap Way and the access was reasonable, including the low vehicular speeds, and consequently had no objection to the application. The forestry officer had no objection, subject to conditions. The appearance, scale and siting of the proposal were broadly in keeping with the local vernacular and existing built form. The amenity of the development was not in direct conflict with design guide standards and the garden size was similar to neighbouring properties. There were reasonable separating distances between the proposed dwellings and other properties. The internal layout of the proposed buildings avoided first floor windows in the rear projecting gables closest to the rear boundaries. The planning officer added that there did not appear to be any erosion of visual amenity of neighbours. Visual impact would be very localised. The landscaping elements of the proposal were satisfactory and the relationship of the development with neighbouring properties was also acceptable and in character with this part of Woodcote.

Councillor Geoffrey Botting, a representative of Woodcote Parish Council, spoke to the application. Councillor Botting and the committee raised the issue of the removal of permitted development rights and the planning officer responded that this issue was dealt with in recommended conditions 4 and 5.

Mr. David Parker, the agent, spoke in support of the application. He accepted, in principle on behalf of the applicants, any new conditions regarding the prohibition of fires during the construction phases, a requirement for the access to be repaired in the event of damage, coupled with a prohibition of the parking of construction of vehicles on Gap Way.

Councillors Lorraine Hillier and Jo Robb, the local ward councillors, spoke in support of the application.

The committee further discussed the issue of controlling construction in the interests of keeping the access clear and the repair of damage through a construction traffic management plan. The planning officer responded that such plans were not usually applied to this smaller scale of development. However, as the agent was amendable to rectifying damage to Gap Way and to keeping it clear during construction, a compliance condition would be appropriate. The committee noted with approval the agent's positive attitude to these proposals. With these additional requirements, the committee was minded to grant planning permission.

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 P21/S2229/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

- 1: Commencement within three years - Full Planning Permission.
- 2: Development to be in accordance with the approved plans.
- 3: Schedule of Materials to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of any development above slab level.
- 4: Withdrawal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.
- 5: Withdrawal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 Class E) - no outbuildings etc
- 6: Parking and manoeuvring areas to be provided as on plan and retained
- 7: No garage conversions into accommodation.
- 8: Energy Statement Verification condition.
- 9: Surface water drainage details to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development.
- 10: Foul drainage details to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development.
- 11: Landscaping plan to be submitted and agreed prior to commencement.
- 12: Prior to first occupation, all first floor side-facing windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening where below 1.7m from finished floor level.

29 P21/S2106/FUL - HMP Huntercombe, Huntercombe Place, Nuffield

The committee considered application P21/S2106/FUL for the construction of a replacement kitchen building with associated external works and part demolition of an existing building (as amended by additional supporting information received in July and August and September 2021 relating to bats, newts, biodiversity, noise, odour, lighting and energy) at HMP Huntercombe, Huntercombe Place, Nuffield.

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.

Planning officer reported that the committee was being asked to consider the application as Nuffield Parish Council had objected to it. He reported that the existing kitchen was not suitable for the present inmate population and was in poor physical condition. The development would be within the area of the existing buildings and would have no visual impact. The proposed building would be 25m. from the nearest neighbouring properties, and at least 30m. from any other neighbour. The proposal had no outward looking windows. The planning officer reported on concerns regarding neighbours' amenity, namely noise and smell issues. The council's environmental protection team had raised no objection to the proposal, as it was satisfied that an acceptable odour system could be put in place in the kitchen. The team also considered that proposed noise mitigation measures were appropriate. The countryside officer had considered that the proposed development was acceptable, subject to the requirement for some planting to obtain a biodiversity net gain. There was no objection from any of the other technical officers.

Mr. David Redhouse, the Governor of HMP Huntercombe, spoke in support of the application.

The committee noted that the existing kitchen was small and in poor physical condition; it catered for 480 people, though it was designed for 240. The facility suffered from condensation and mould owing to an inadequate ventilation system, and no floor drainage. This was the only site suitable for vehicular access and connectivity with secure areas and important buildings. The former kitchen would be converted to a multi-faith room, and the inadequate existing chapel would be demolished. It was noted that the prison valued its relationship with the residents of Bradley Road and regularly interacted with it. Noise would only be evident during the working day; it would not be possible to open the kitchen's windows and food deliveries would be limited to or three or four per week.

In response to a question regarding possible alternative sites at HMP Huntercombe, Mr. Redhouse responded there were no options for sites outside the secure perimeter, owing security of inmate and food safety concerns.

In response to a question regarding possible noise created by glass bottles being deposited in the bins close to boundaries and neighbours, Mr. Redhouse reported that bins were placed on the opposite side of the kitchen and far away from residents, no glass was permitted in the prison, and all drinking and food containers were plastic. Rubbish bins were regularly compacted and there was a refuse collection every week.

Councillors Lorraine Hillier and Jo Robb, the local ward councillors, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered that a new kitchen was badly required at HMP Huntercombe and that its concerns regarding the amenity of residents had been satisfactorily answered. The committee was therefore minded to grant planning permission.

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 P21/S2106/FUL, subject to the following conditions;

- 1 : Commence the development within three years of the date of permission.
- 2 : Development to be implemented in accordance with plans submitted.
- 3 : Development to be built using external materials as demonstrated on plan/documentation.
- 4 : Development to be carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of new licence.
- 5 : All surface water drainage measures to be implemented in accordance with details submitted.
- 6 : All carbon reduction energy efficiency measures to be implemented as per approved Energy Statement.
- 7 : Details of noise and odour control techniques from the kitchen extraction units to be submitted and approved – including details of maintenance.
- 8 : All plant, machinery and equipment shall be installed, maintained and operated so as to ensure that the rating noise level from the equipment shall be at least 5 dB below the pre-existing background noise.
- 9 : Development to be implemented in accordance with requirements of Odour Risk Assessment.
- 10: Landscaping scheme to ensure the creation of new biodiversity habitats/biodiversity net gain on site in accordance with biodiversity matrix, to be submitted and agreed.
- 11 : All new external lighting shall be designed and installed so the main beam angle is not directed towards any receptors.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Chair

Date

--	--

This page is intentionally left blank