

Minutes OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

**HELD ON TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2022 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, Victoria Haval, Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, Jo Robb, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paul Bateman and Cathie Scotting

Guests: Councillor David Bartholomew

Remote attendance:

Councillors: George Levy, Sue Roberts and Ian White

Officers: Nathan Bamsey, Michael Flowers, Paul Lucas, Susie Royse, Nicola Smith and Will Sparling

70 Chair's announcements

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

71 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022 as a correct record and agree that the chair sign these as such.

72 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

73 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

74 Proposals for site visits

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer planning permission in respect of application P21/S1389/O, Kingsley House, Crowsley Road, Lower Shiplake, to enable a site visit to take place, was declared carried on being put to the vote. The committee wished to have the opportunity to visualise the proposals in the proposed setting and a site visit was

necessary, in order to have a clearer understanding of the development in the context of the site and its surroundings.

RESOLVED: to hold a site visit for application P21/S1389/O and defer the consideration of the application until the visit had been completed.

75 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee before the meeting. In addition, statements which had been received had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting.

76 Kingsley House, Crowsley Road, Lower Shiplake, RG9 3LU

Consideration of this application was deferred to facilitate a site visit.

77 76 High Street, Wallingford, OX10 0BX

The committee considered application P21/S4342/FUL for the removal of condition 5 (building to be used only for the purposes specified in the application) on planning application P75/W0446 (internal alterations providing kitchen, dining areas & new toilet/bathroom areas. Change of use to restaurant.), at 76 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 the meeting.

The planning officer reported that the premises were in a conservation area and were currently vacant. Officers did not consider that refusal to the proposal would be justified as there would be no harm to the viability of the town centre in granting the recommendation. The application sought to remove condition 5 of permission P75/W0446; the condition had allowed for the change of use of the former public house to a restaurant.

Mr. Michael Simpson, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Sue Roberts, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

Councillor George Levy, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The senior planning officer clarified the situation by stating that the removal of the condition did not provide for permitted development as a dwelling, only use in Class E (that was, retail, restaurants, professional services, offices, gyms, surgeries, nurseries and other high street uses). The intention of the removal of the condition was to provide flexibility of use to the owner. Any conversion to a dwelling would require a separate application for planning permission.

The committee concluded that there was no sound planning reason upon which to refuse permission and agreed to the removal of condition 5, as stated in the report.

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/S4342/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans.

78 Land East of Reading Road, Lower Shiplake

The committee considered application P21/S4102/RM for approval of Reserved Matters (scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) following consent granted under reference P18/S3210/O (approved under appeal reference APP/Q3115/W/19/3220425) - extra care development of up to 65 units comprising of apartments and cottages (Use Class C2); associated communal facilities; provision of vehicular and cycle parking together with all necessary internal roads and footpaths; provision of open space and associated landscape works; and ancillary works and structures (As amended by revised landscaping plans received on 3 February 2022) on Land East of Reading Road, Lower Shiplake.

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 this was a reserved matters application following consent granted under application P18/S3210/O for up to 65 dwellings, which had been granted on appeal. It was also reported that members of the committee had attended a site visit at the location on Monday 21 February 2022.

The planning officer reported that some changes to the size of some elements of the application had been made. Appendix D of the report depicted how the footprint of the buildings had been reduced by a modification of the size of the clubhouse (block A) and a re-orientation of block E. The remainder of the differences were limited to a less engineered road layout and a re-organisation of the car parking layout. These differences had been made in order to achieve a better, less engineered and more welcoming scheme than the approved parameter plan had suggested.

The Site Parameters Plan identified two buffer zones around the edge of the development, a 10 - metre landscaping buffer zone comprising existing and proposed structural planting, and a further 5 - metre buffer zone, which excluded built form, and was designed to offset the buildings from the structural planting. The layout shown on the approved Site Parameter Plan indicated several locations where parking areas encroached into the inner 5 - metre buffer zone, together with the bin storage area encroaching into the outer 10 - metre buffer zone as well. These locations were highlighted on the Comparison Plan at Appendix D of the report. The planning officer also reported that the plans submitted with the application indicated that the proposed building heights and block sizes complied with the maximums set out on the approved parameters plan. All landscaping proposals had been maintained and additional proposed planting in the north east and by the bin store would incorporate trees of a heavier standard. The proposals for landscaping were acceptable for the purposes of screening, as set out in the inspector's report.

The planning officer reported on some design aspects of the proposal; council planning officers had concluded that this was a well - designed scheme. In Block B there had been an intention to move away from an institutional appearance to the buildings, incorporating overlapping eaves and the club house was designed to resemble a barn. The applicants had consulted the Chilterns design guide for inspiration. Also, it was noted that there had been some concern in respect of the height of some of the proposed units. The planning officer reported that a sub - division of Block C incorporated a 'step down' in following the contours of the land, which allowed for extra flats. The finally resulting development would be no higher than the maximum height featured in the outline planning permission

documentation. The planning officer reported on concerns in respect of potential lighting glare to properties on Baskerville Lane, using computer generated imagery in a slide presentation. The cottages and club house would be served by low level bollard lighting, which would be controlled by a planning condition in the event of planning permission being granted. Also regarding light emissions, it was reported that the overhanging gable design would minimise light spill. In respect of the club house, a proposed planning condition setting the hours of use, as communal facilities would be provided, was recommended to ensure that lighting was not used late at night. The committee noted from the report that the applicants had produced a lighting statement technical note to assess the potential impacts of the proposals.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the maximum number of units in the development, the planning officer responded that the parameter plan provided an indicative figure of a maximum of 65 units, but that fewer units could be acceptable.

Councillor Chris Penrose, a representative of Shiplake Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Ms. Charlotte Taylor-Drake, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Mr. Nick Baker, the architect, spoke in support of the application.

Mr. Scott Curran, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the basis of the calculation for the number of car parking spaces, the agent replied that the provision had been stipulated by the Oxfordshire County Council, the highways authority.

In response to a question from the committee regarding access to the facility by people with limited mobility, the architect responded that there would be lifts in every apartment building and that the cottages could accept stairlifts.

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

The planning officer reported that it had been established at outline stage that the site would result in a net loss of biodiversity. At that time the Council considered this acceptable, subject to a suitable condition requiring the loss to be offset. However, the requested offsetting condition was not applied by the Inspector. This reserved matters application also showed a net loss of biodiversity. Officers therefore considered it necessary to impose a condition requiring the loss of biodiversity to be offset.

The planning officer reported that Shiplake Parish Council had prepared a submission draft neighbourhood plan, the publicity period on the draft plan concluded on Tuesday 7 December 2021 and the draft plan had been submitted for independent examination. At this stage, the policies in the plan could only be given limited weight, as it has not been examined.

The committee concluded that concerns regarding some aspects of the proposal had been adequately addressed in the recommended conditions and that planning permission should be granted.

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

RESOLVED: to grant reserved matters approval for application P21/S4102/RM subject to the following conditions:

1. Development in accordance with approved plans
2. Biodiversity offsetting
3. Landscape implementation
4. Restricted hours of operation (clubhouse) for lighting and use of internal blinds
5. Cycle Parking
6. Energy Statement Verification

79 Land at Crowell Road, Chinnor

The committee considered application P21/S0804/O in respect of an outline application (with all matters reserved except Layout and Access), for the erection of up to 54 age restricted dwellings (for people aged 55 and over), including 40% affordable housing and communal facilities, on land to the north of Crowell Road, Chinnor. New vehicular access to be created off Crowell Road, along with the retention of the existing pedestrian access to Oakley Road to the North (additional information received 31 March 2021 and 6 June 2021 and 29 October 2021 on Land at Crowell Road, Chinnor.

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 referred to the committee at the development manager's discretion for a resolution on how the application would have been determined, had the applicant not submitted an appeal for non-determination. At the current time, the application would have been recommended for refusal on matters covered in the report. Were the proposal refused, the committee would be requested to confirm its putative reasons, which would then be used to inform the main issues to be considered through the appeal process.

The planning officer referred to paragraphs 6.16 and 6.17, which summarised several issues which council officers considered should be addressed. These included the need for additional photomontages to allow a full assessment of the impact on the landscape and conservation area; details of actual building heights in metres; the provision of continuous and linked footpaths; the need for boundary planting on the north western boundary; the inappropriateness of a slope to the sides of the attenuation basins, as it would not create an attractive feature and would not allow access to these areas for elderly residents; appropriate lighting details would be required to avoid harmful impacts on heritage and landscape; and further information was required to demonstrate that refuse vehicles could adequately access the proposed bin stores within acceptable distances.

The committee noted the report stating the importance of the need for a 'Grampian' condition, to secure foul water upgrades in agreement with Thames Water, and for a sustainable drainage scheme, to ensure that the proposal was in accordance with Policy EP4 (Flood Risk). Also of significance was that the clinical commissioning group had considered the application and had no objection to the proposal, stating that local healthcare should have sufficient capacity to deal with any additional needs.

The planning officer reported that South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 Policies H1 and H13, and Policy CH H5 of the Review Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan were supportive of the

proposal in terms of it providing specialist accommodation for older people, particularly given that the site was located on the edge of Chinnor, a larger village. The council monitored the need for specialist elderly accommodation, which was growing. Refusal of this development was not proposed on the grounds of a departure from policy.

The representative of Chinnor Parish Councillor was unable to attend the committee meeting owing to a family medical emergency. Local ward Councillor Ian White read the parish council's statement of objection to the committee. The democratic services officer had sent the parish council's statement and supporting documentation to the committee prior to the meeting.

Mr. Giles Brockbank, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Ian White, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee supported the reasons for refusal and requested that the final drafting of the notice be subject to consultation between the head of planning and the chair of the committee.

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

RESOLVED: that, had the council been able to determine application P21/S0804/O, it would have refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposal fails to demonstrate a design and layout of high quality that incorporates tree planting, landscaping and drainage features and that the development can provide adequate areas of usable open space for residents. The proposed development will be detrimental to the landscape of the area and would result in unsatisfactory amenity space for residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV1 (Landscape and Countryside), Policy DES1 (High Quality Development Proposals), Policy DES2 (Enhancing Local Character), Policy DES4 (Masterplans), Policy DES5 (Outdoor Amenity Space), Policy EP3 (Waste Collection and Recycling) and Policy CF5 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation in New Residential Development and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal fails to provide safe and secure access arrangements for all vehicles and pedestrians. As such, the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety and contrary to Policy TRANS5 (Consideration of Development Proposals), Policy EP3 (Waste Collection and Recycling) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The development fails to secure the provision of affordable housing to meet the identified needs of the district. The proposal has not included sufficient evidence to demonstrate it would secure the delivery of 40% affordable housing of a suitable mix, type or tenure as required by the Development Plan. As, such the proposed development is contrary to Policy H9 (Affordable Housing), Policy DES1 (High Quality Design), Policy CH H2 (Affordable Housing), Policy CH H4 (Allocation of Affordable Housing for Local People) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. In the absence of a completed Section 106 Legal Agreement, the proposal fails to secure the necessary affordable housing to meet the needs of the district and local area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy H9 (Affordable Housing), Policy CH H2

(Affordable Housing), Policy CH H4 (Allocation of Affordable Housing for Local People) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5. In the absence of a completed Section 106 Legal Agreement, the proposal fails to secure the infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development. As such, the proposed development is contrary to the Development Plan, including Policy TRANS5 (Consideration of Development Proposals) and Policy INF1 (Infrastructure Provision), Policy INF4 (Water Resources), Policy TRANS2 (Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility), Policy EP3 (Waste Collection and Recycling) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting closed at 8.15 pm

Chair	Date

This page is intentionally left blank