

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 2 November  
2022 at 6.00 pm in Meeting Room 1,  
Abbey House, Abbey Close,  
Abingdon, OX14 3JE

**Open to the public, including the press**

### **Present in the meeting room:**

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Victoria Haval, Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, Ian Snowdon, and Alan Thompson

Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Paul Bowers (Planning Officer), Dani Rogers (Planning Officer), Boris Van Der Ree (Conservation Officer), and Paula Fox (Planning Manager)

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Sam Casey-Rerhaye

Officers: Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer), Sharon Crawford (Planning Officer), Hannah Smith (Planning Officer), and Tom Wyatt (Planning Officer)

## **79 Chair's announcements**

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

## **80 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tim Bearder.

## **81 Minutes of the previous meeting**

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

## **82 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **83 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **84 Proposals for site visits**

A proposal for a site visit for application P22/S0211/FUL at the main Gate, Culham Science Centre, near Clifton Hampden, was proposed. However, the proposal did not receive a seconder and so was not put forward for a vote.

## **85 Public participation**

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

## **86 P22/S2273/HH - Park View 10A Manor Road Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1LT**

The committee considered planning application P22/S2273/HH for the proposed single storey side extension (as amended by plans received 11 August 2022), on land at Park View 10A Manor 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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application presents revised plans for a one storey extension, down from the initially proposed one and a half storey side extension.

The planning officer also informed the committee that the gap between the extension and the boundary would be 200mm and that the main wall would be less the one metre above the height of the boundary fence, with the roof sloping away from the boundary. As the planning officer did not consider there to be any material harm to the neighbour from the proposed modest extension, and that, as there were other dwellings on the street with similar side extensions close to boundaries, this proposed extension would not be out of character with the existing street scene and was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Ken Arlett spoke on behalf of Henley-on-Thames Town Council, which objected to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the discussion of the application. The committee noted the concern by the Town Council about a potential loss of light for the neighbour but overall felt the modest extension would not cause significant harm and that there were other properties with similar extensions close to boundaries along the road.

Overall, although the committee expressed concern around extensions coming close to boundaries, they could see no material planning reasons why the application could be refused and therefore felt that on balance this application should be approved.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S2273/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
3. Matching materials to be used

## **87 P22/S0211/FUL - Main Gate Culham Science Centre near Clifton Hampden, OX14 3DB**

The committee considered planning application P22/S0211/FUL for the construction of replacement entrance facility, including security hut and associated parking and landscaping (As amended by Archaeological Desk Based Assessment dated February 2022 and amplified by Phase 1 Desk Study dated November 2021 received 22 March 2022, Master Plan received 13 April 2022, Heritage Assessment received 27 April 2022 and Biodiversity Impact Assessment received 17 May 2022 and Section Plans and site plan accompanying Highways Note and email from agent received 29 June 2022 and revised planting plan received 3 August 2022), on land at Main Gate Culham Science Centre near Clifton Hampden.

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 highlighted that the application was brought to the committee due to the objection of the parish council. This application was a standalone application from the other applications on the site and is for a new replacement entrance facility.

The planning officer informed the committee that the current facility was of no architectural merit, whereas the proposed facility would provide architectural interest, and was sufficiently set back from the road so as to not be intrusive. The planning officer also clarified that the development would replace all parking spaces lost through the demolition and building of the new facility and that it would not create additional vehicle movement. Overall, as the planning officer believed that the proposed application would enhance the entrance to the Culham Science Centre while not being intrusive, it was recommended for approval.

Jaqi Mason spoke objecting to the application.

Steven Sensecall, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application and Ian Wallace, representing the applicant, also spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Sam Casey-Rerhaye, a local ward councillor and representative of Culham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

Some members of the committee expressed an interest in conducting a site visit for the application in order to examine the site and see how effective the tree screening would be when viewed from neighbouring properties. However, the committee felt like

a site visit was not necessary to make a judgment about the application due to the evidence provided in the planning officer's report and presentation.

It was also noted that this was a standalone application and not conditional or dependant on the granting of permission for any further applications, or the completion of Oxfordshire County Council's Housing Infrastructure Fund proposal.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer consideration of the application in order to conduct a site visit was lost when being put to the vote.

The committee then asked the planning officer about the potential loss of trees but was satisfied with the response that any trees lost by the demolition and construction of the replacement facility would be replaced on site, and that the tree officer was happy with the replacement trees and their locations. The committee also noted that a replacement nursery for the one being lost in the demolition was also being proposed and was currently in the outline application stage.

Overall, as this was a standalone application where no increased movement of vehicles was being predicted, and that the proposed facility itself was set further back from the road than the existing one and was not overly prominent but still of a good design, the committee agreed that the application should be approved.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S0211/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans

Prior to commencement conditions:

3. Archaeological Watching Brief
4. Implementation of Programme or Archaeological Work
5. Tree Protection (Detailed)
6. Surface water drainage works (details required)
7. Plan of Car Parking Provision (specified number of spaces)
8. Cycle Parking Facilities
9. Construction Traffic Management (details required)
10. External Lighting - scheme to be approved
11. Contaminated Land - Linked Conditions

Prior to occupation conditions:

12. Contaminated Land - Linked Conditions
13. Surface Water Drainage
14. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)
15. Landscaping implementation
16. Sustainable Design Features - as approved \*
17. Confirmation of BREEAM Excellent standard

Compliance condition:

18. Materials as on plan and design and access statement

## **88 P22/S2932/LB - Wall between No. 104 & 105 High Street Thame, OX9 3DZ**

Councillor David Bretherton stood down as chair as he is a ward member for the application but still participated in the discussion and voted on the application.

The committee considered planning application P22/S2932/LB for the creation of new opening at the first floor level between 104 & 105 High Street to allow for increased covers for Caffe Gloria, on land at the wall between No. 104 & 105 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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that it was called into the committee by Councillor David Bretherton. The planning officer felt that the listed building consent to breach the wall between 104 and 105 High Street to allow for more seating for the café should not be granted. The conservation officer had recommended refusal due to the harm to the listed building and the planning officer did not consider the public benefit to outweigh the harm.

The conservation officer then informed the committee that in terms of category of harm, the buildings were at 'less than substantial harm' and that the bricks and their arrangement were not rare, although they looked to be original to the building's construction.

Councillor Andy Gilbert spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, objecting to the application.

Dr Carole Fry, the heritage consultant for the applicants, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor David Bretherton, a local ward member, spoke in support of the application.

The committee noted that the bricks were original, and that there could be reasons for refusal, although it was still felt by some members that the economic benefit outweighed the effect on the historic buildings.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application for listed building consent was lost on being put to the vote with the chair exercising their casting vote.

Overall, the councillors generally agreed that as the bricks, their arrangement, and the skirting board were not rare, and that there would be an outsized benefit brought about through the inclusion of the vacant office space in 104 High Street by the Café in 105 High Street, the economic argument outweighed the architectural merit of the

wall and therefore that the application should be granted, subject to the standard listed building consent conditions.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application for listed building consent was carried on being put to the vote with the chair exercising their casting vote.

**RESOLVED:** to approve listed building consent application P22/S2932/LB subject to the following conditions:

1. 3 year commencement condition, “The works hereby permitted shall be begun not later than three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.”

2. approved plans listed building conditions, “That the works hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans, except as controlled or modified by conditions of this consent.

Reason: To secure the proper planning of the historic environment in accordance with Development Plan policies.”

## **89 P22/S2416/FUL and P22/S2417/LB - Town Farm 8 Oxford Road Thame, OX9 2AH**

Councillor David Bretherton declared a personal interest as he knew the applicant and so would speak as a ward member but would not take part in the debate or vote on the applications.

The committee considered planning applications P22/S2416/FUL and P22/S2417/LB for the formal approval required for No.6 to be a separate dwelling, following previous renovation works to No.8 to create No.6, on land at Town Farm 8 Oxford 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 the meeting.

The planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that it was called into the committee by a local ward member, Councillor David Bretherton. The site related to a grade 2 listed building and the application proposed changing the existing annex into a separate dwelling.

The planning officer also showed the committee the plans and photographs of the area, noting that the existing and proposed plans were the same as the work was done when the annex was built under previously approved plans. Overall, as the new additions of a garden and parking space met the requirements, the planning office recommended the application be approved.

Councillor Andy Gilbert spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, objecting to the application.

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

The committee discussed the amenity space proposed for the new dwelling but was satisfied that the area would be in excess of 40 square metres and thus meet the requirements. Overall, the committee could not see any material planning reason for refusal for either the planning application or the listed building consent application and therefore agreed that the applications should be approved.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S2416/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within 3 years
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
3. Boundary treatments and hardsurfacing to be agreed prior to occupation

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve listed building consent application P22/S2417/LB, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within 3 years
2. Works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans

## **90 P22/S3052/HH - 8 The Croft Aston Tirrold, OX11 9DL**

The committee considered planning application P22/S3052/HH for the loft conversion including dormer window, on land at 8 The Croft Aston Tirrold.

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 highlighted that the application required planning permission as it was for a dormer window within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Outside of these areas, dormers are normally allowed through permitted development rights.

The planning officer highlighted that, although the dormer would not be easily viewed from the public footpath, as it was out of character with the surrounding area and not of a high-quality of design, the proposal was contrary to the policies in the Local Plan and should therefore be refused.

The committee agreed with the planning officer, that the proposed application was a poor design, out of character with the building and the surrounding area, and agreed that the application should not be approved.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P22/S3052/HH, for the following reason:

1. That, having regard to the size, bulk and flat roofed design of the proposed rear dormer and its relationship to the eaves, ridge and hip of the existing roof, the proposal represents a poor form of design that is out of keeping with the character of the existing building and the prevailing character of the surrounding area which lies within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It is acknowledged that the dormer will have limited visibility from public vantage points however, it does not meet the high test to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB required by paragraph 176 of the NPPF. In addition, the proposal is contrary to Policies DES1, DES2 and H20 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and the advice in the Joint Design Guide.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm

---