

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 20 JULY 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), Ken Arlett, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Elizabeth Gillespie, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, Alexandrine Kantor, Axel MacDonald, and Jo Robb

Officers: Michael Flowers (Democratic Services Officer) and Paula Fox (Development Manager)

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Anne-Marie Simpson

Officers: Paul Bowers (Senior Planning Officer), Sharon Crawford (Team Leader – Applications West), Andy Heron (Planning and Development Officer), and Marc Pullen (Planning and Development Officer)

26 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed at an in-person meeting which was being simultaneously broadcast and advised on emergency evacuation arrangements.

27 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Bearder and Peter Dragonetti. Councillors Alexandrine Kantor and Jo Robb attended as substitutes respectively.

28 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

29 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

30 Proposals for site visits

The committee requested a site visit for application P22/S1297/FUL.

RESOLVED: to agree a site visit for application P22/S1297/FUL – Stow House, Thames Road, Goring.

31 Public participation

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak was tabled at the meeting.

32 P21/S0666/FUL - Southernwood 70-72 Park Road, Didcot

The committee considered application P21/S0666/FUL for the removal of lettable cabins; erection of two new dwellings with associated parking, secure and covered bicycle storage, refuse and recycling storage and private amenity space. (as amended plans to change size and design of dwellings received 9 March 2022 and 27 April 2022).

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 introduced the report, and explained that the application was previously considered at the committee meeting on 8 June 2022, and was deferred for a site visit which was conducted on 18 July 2022. The planning officer confirmed that their recommendation continued to be for approval, but that they proposed an additional condition for the cabins to be removed prior to the occupation of the proposed dwellings.

The application was referred to the committee due to the objection from Didcot Town Council who held concerns on the size of the dwellings and the impact on neighbouring amenities. In addition, seven neighbouring objection letters were received during the consultation, with a further two being received in the second consultation. The main concerns were on the impact to the character of the area, loss in privacy, and overdevelopment. The current site had six cabins as part of a bed and breakfast, and the proposal would remove the lettable cabins and put two new dwellings on the site with the other proposed aspects of the application. The dwellings would be constructed with red brick and with a varied roof structure to reduce scaling. Following the end of the presentation and background information, the officer confirmed that the application was recommended for approval subject to the recommended conditions.

Mr Phil Larrs, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

The committee asked if the site met the minimum requirements of amenity space and distances from habitable rooms from adjoining properties, to which the planning officer confirmed it did meet the minimum requirements. A second question followed seeking clarification from the planning officer on how they would describe the character of the area and the surrounding landscape. The planning officer clarified their descriptive view and stated that the view from Park Road from the front was predominantly bungalows, but the rear of the site featured semi-detached two-storey dwellings.

The planning officer was asked on whether the height of the proposed buildings would be higher than the studio, and if so, how much higher would the proposed buildings be. The planning officer responded the studio would be 200 millimetres smaller than the application buildings. Following this, the committee were shown images of the design of the building following a request for more clarity on what the buildings would look like. It was confirmed that the buildings were uniformed in design.

The committee asked whether access to rubbish bins and their collection would be impacted, to which the planning officer confirmed there were no known issues with bin access related to the application.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission to application P22/S0666/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Sample materials
4. Surface water drainage
5. Foul water drainage
6. Parking and turning
7. Landscaping
8. Tree protection
9. Energy statement verification
10. Electric vehicle charging points
11. Hours of operation – construction/demolition
12. Removal of lettable cabins prior to occupation

33 P22/S0584/FUL - Land to the south of Well Place Road, Ipsden

The committee considered application P22/S0584/FUL for a proposed agricultural barn (as amended by plan received 14 April 2022 to reposition the building further from the protected trees).

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 introduced the report and explained that the application had been referred to the committee following a call-in from the local ward member, due to concerns on its location within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The planning officer also confirmed that the application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the planning committee to enable a site visit to take place. The application lied within a rural area and was in a grass field that bordered Well Place Road. In addition, the site plan showed an area of hardstanding, and while this was not in the committee report, it was within the site plan. The committee were then informed that the site was visually prominent, but the barn would be located at the bottom of the valley, but that planning officers considered the proposed development as keeping in character of the landscape, and was also modest in size and height. In addition, the application was considered proportionate to the site. The planning officer also confirmed in relation to planning conditions, that tree protection measures would be required in writing, and external lighting would need to also be agreed by officers. The committee were also given confirmation that for condition four, details would need to be submitted in writing. The planning officer concluded and confirmed that subject to conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Mr Robert Booth, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. The committee asked the speaker where the local residents who had objected to the application resided,

to which the speaker explained that these objectors were spread out across the neighbouring area, but that all of these residents could be considered local to the application site.

Mr Peter Holtom and Mr Nick Turner, the applicant and the architect respectively, spoke in support of the application. The applicant was asked about their relationship to the site and were queried on the current ownership of the land. The speaker explained that the land was currently owned by their godfather and was in the process of being transferred to the applicant, but that this paperwork was currently being processed. Following a supplementary question on current animal ownership, the applicant confirmed he had 100 sheep and ewes, with one batch being in Checkendon and the other in Benson. The applicant however explained that they did not own the land in Benson, and so they were applying for land they would be in ownership of. The applicant also informed the committee following a request for clarification, that they also had the support of the tenant nearby whose land they had used.

Councillors Lorraine Hillier and Jo Robb, local ward member, spoke to the application.

The planning officer clarified to the committee that as the site was under five hectares of land, that they were not entitled to permitted development rights, and only those of five hectares or more would be able to use permitted development rights for a similar type of development.

The committee asked the planning officer if they were aware of the regulatory standards of spacing in relation to animal welfare and the usage of the building for animal storage. The planning officer responded that they did not know the spacing requirements for animals, but the application was not solely related to animals, and the application was not being proposed as a site for the specific storage of animals. In response to a supplementary question, the planning officer also confirmed that any breach of animal welfare standards was a separate matter to the planning permission, and so there would be no negative impact on the planning authority in that aspect.

The committee asked if a condition could be required to specify livestock farming solely. The team leader – applications west, explained that the condition proposed covered a limited range of activities, but that a condition could be worded to require the barn be used for specified purposes as the applicant had proposed in their application. The committee then asked whether drainage conditions would be required due to the animals that would go into the building. The planning officer responded that based on the application that had been submitted, a specific condition on drainage would not be a requirement.

The committee asked if there was a way to specifically tie the application to agricultural use only, to reduce the risk of the building being changed for use at a later date. The planning officer responded that the wording already given in the condition would be appropriate in ensuring the use that had been applied for. The committee then expressed concern on the lack of a threshold on the number of machineries in storage before a breach of planning conditions may occur due to a differential of use compared to what had been applied for. The planning officer addressed this concern and stated that there was no limit that could be imposed on machinery, but they could make the condition related to the specified use that was stated in the application. In response to an additional query from the committee, the planning officer also clarified that based on the comments raised by the committee during the agenda item, that it would be reasonable to require the details of the surface water drainage and for these to be agreed by the planning officers.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission to application P22/S0584/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within three years
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan and for the agricultural barn to be constructed using dark timber materials
4. Landscaping to be submitted and agreed
5. Tree protection measures
6. Improvement of existing vehicular access
7. Gate to be set back from highway
8. Details of any external lighting to be agreed
9. Agricultural use only and as specified in the planning application
10. Surface water drainage – to be agreed with planning officers

34 P22/S1297/FUL - Land at The Byre Mackney Lane, Brightwell cum Sotwell

The committee considered application P22/S1297/FUL for the erection of an agricultural building and associated works (As amplified by email and accompanying information received 26 May 202 and amended by revised floor plan).

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 introduced the report and explained that the application was brought to the committee due to the objection from the local parish council. The application site sat between Brightwell-cum-Sotwell to the north, and Mackney to the south. The demolished building that was removed for the current application was described as not being of a comparative size and could not have provided the space required for the applicant's intended use of the new agricultural building. The committee were told that the council had sought the professional advice of Reading Agricultural Services in relation to whether there was a need for the building, and the recommendation was that the size was appropriate and there was a valid agricultural need. Subject to conditions, the planning officer confirmed that the application was acceptable and therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Celia Collett, a representative of Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. The committee asked the speaker whether this application fell under a local neighbourhood development plan conflict. The speaker confirmed that work was still underway on these plans, and that the parish had been proactive in supporting businesses and other local development, but that this objection was down to the specific site that was being applied for development.

Ms Sara Tucker, the agent, spoke in support of the application. The speaker was asked why this parcel of land had been chose for the application, to which the speaker explained that the site would be the main area for livestock, and this parcel would become the centre of livestock production. A second question was asked by the committee on waste and drainage from the barn, to which the speaker clarified that animals would be given straw bedding, and manure and urine would be absorbed or spread in accordance with the legal

requirements. The speaker also confirmed that they were aware of a surface water condition which was already proposed.

Councillor Anne-Marie Simpson, local ward member, spoke in objection to the application.

The planning officer was asked whether a condition could be tied to the current applicant requiring the building to be demolished should ownership of the site change. The planning officer confirmed that condition six could be modified to incorporate this request. The committee discussed the importance that the proposed agricultural building fit appropriately in its design to the local area, and requested confirmation from the planning officers on whether a condition requiring a dark coloured timber for construction was possible. The planning officer confirmed that this request could be added as a condition and factored into the existing fifth planning condition.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission to application P22/S1297/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans

Pre-commencement conditions

3. Surface Water Drainage
4. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy

Compliance conditions

5. Materials as on plan and for the agricultural building to be constructed using dark timber materials
6. Agricultural use only and as specified in the planning application
7. No external lighting on the eastern elevation

35 P22/S0788/FUL - Stow House Thames Road, Goring

The application was deferred to enable a site visit to take place.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm

Chair

Date

--