

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 4 October 2023  
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, Tim Bearder, Axel Macdonald, James Norman, Ed Sadler and Katharine Keats-Rohan

Officers: Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Victoria Clarke (Planning Officer), Paula Fox (Development Manager), Andy Heron (Planning Officer), Simon Kitson (Planning Officer) and Tom Wyatt (Planning Officer)

**Remote attendance:**

Officers: Lilua Ihezor-Ejiofor (Planning Officer) and Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer)

### **81 Chair's announcements**

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

### **82 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sam James-Lawrie, Ali Gordon-Creed, Ben Manning and Sam Casey-Rerhaye who was substituted by Councillor James Norman.

### **83 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **84 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **85 Public participation**

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

## **86 P23/S1226/FUL - Land Adjacent to 55 Broadway Didcot, OX11 8AJ**

The committee considered planning application P23/S1226/FUL for the erection of a three-bedroom detached dwelling with parking space, on land adjacent to 55 Broadway Didcot, OX11 8AJ.

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 recommended for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report. He went on to advise that the application was referred to committee following an objection from Didcot Town Council. The town council's objection cited highway safety concerns as vehicles would have to reverse out onto the highway.

The planning officer informed the committee that the site was located within the Didcot conservation area to the west of 55 Broadway and benefitted from vehicular access from the north via Broadway. The proposal benefitted from one parking space. The planning officer highlighted that the applicant had taken advice following a previous application which had sought to erect two dwellings on the site. The planning officer went on to state that the roof and ridge height would be below that of neighbouring properties, the garden would be of a similar size to nearby dwellings and the construction materials would match those of nearby dwellings.

The planning officer advised that the local highways authority had raised no concerns subject to suggested conditions. The proposal benefitted from onsite driveway which other properties in the area did not have. The planning officer confirmed the vision splays were adequate. The planning officer concluded that the site had a high level of accessibility, being within walking distance of the town centre, and that as there were local parking restrictions in place, the proposal was unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the local highway network.

The planning officer confirmed there were no technical objections to the application from specialist officers and that the benefits outweighed any harm.

Jane Leadbetter, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked if the planning officer was of the view that a single parking space was sufficient for a three-bedroom property. The planning officer confirmed that no objection had been raised from the local highways authority on the basis there was only one parking space for the proposal. He went on to advise that the parking arrangement was typical of that of other properties in the area where vehicles are driven onto the drive and must be reversed off. The planning officer also confirmed that the parking arrangement was already in existence at the site.

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

The committee noted that whilst the road was narrow for wider vehicles such as buses, the site before them was opposite Travis Perkins with no roadside parking directly opposite the site and therefore there would be more space for vehicles entering and leaving the site than for other properties in the area. The committee did not believe the proposal to be unreasonable or there to be any grounds for refusal.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S1226/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Energy Statement Verification
4. Cycle parking
5. Plan of Car Parking Provision
6. Vision splay protection
7. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
8. Materials

## **87 P23/S1722/FUL - Well Place Stables Urquhart Lane Ipsden, OX10 6QZ**

The committee considered planning application P23/S1722/FUL for the replacement of existing stable yard and grooms accommodation to provide 10 stables and associated facilities for use as 7 full liveries and 3 DIY liveries and use of existing arena in association with the liveries, on land at Well Place Stables Urquhart Lane Ipsden, OX10 6QZ.

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 concerned the replacement of existing equestrian facilities. The site was located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and was subject to conditions tying it to the nearby listed Well Place Manor to the west. The planning officer advised that the applicant proposed to demolish the existing buildings and construct a commercial livery with an onsite groom. The existing buildings were loosely arranged around a courtyard and were utilitarian in appearance and of a generally poor condition. The planning officer confirmed that the proposal was of a similar layout but larger in volume and the menage would be retained for use in connection with the livery but would be excluded from use for riding lessons, competitions and other commercial activities.

The planning officer highlighted that the low height, traditional form and character of the proposed buildings was wholly appropriate to the surroundings and wider landscape. He went on to advise that the conservation team were supportive of the design.

The planning officer highlighted that the access road served other residential and agricultural properties but that the local highways authority had raised no objection to the proposal. The livery use would not cause a significant increase in vehicle movements at peak times.

The planning officer then informed the committee that whilst the proposed building range would have a greater visual presence within the site, they were of the view that it would be of a higher quality design. The views would be framed by the roofscape in the background and the buildings would not be an isolated feature on the landscape, therefore the proposal would not compromise the open character of the area.

Kerry Pflieger (RAW Planning), the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer if the clock tower was a necessary element of the proposal as this had formed a point of objection for some. The planning officer confirmed officers did not feel this was an issue as it was a small feature which did not detract from the overall character and appearance of the area.

The committee asked the planning officer to comment on the consultation response received from Ipsden parish council which identified that the site had been used in contravention of the current conditions. The planning officer confirmed that whilst they were aware of this, no enforcement investigation had been opened and that it did not impact upon the applicants right to apply for the permission sought.

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

The committee commented that the proposal sat well within its environs and was an improvement on the existing buildings. It felt the proposal was suitable for the purpose it was designed for.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S1722/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development to be implemented in accordance with the approved plans unless varied by other conditions of consent
3. Schedule of external materials to be agreed
4. Tree Protection details to be agreed
5. The use of the groom's accommodation hereby permitted shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed in the equestrian use of the site
6. The use of the equestrian facilities shall be restricted to the stabling of horses/ livery yard. No part of the property shall be used for riding lessons, competitions or other non-equestrian activities
7. The balance of livery and DIY stabling to be retained as per the planning proposal (i.e. 7x full liveries and 3x DIY liveries).
8. The parking and turning areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved site plan and retained unobstructed.
9. Full surface water drainage details to be agreed
10. Surface water drainage condition, specific details of bund and filter drain to be agreed
11. Foul water drainage details to be agreed
12. Surface water management during construction phase – details to be agreed
13. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) compliance report to be submitted
14. External lighting details to be agreed
15. Implementation of biodiversity mitigation measures as approved

16. Biodiversity compensation measures - details to be agreed
17. Energy Statement Verification to be submitted
18. Withdrawal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions or alterations without planning permission

## **88 P23/S1345/FUL - Greenways, Sewell's Lane, Sydenham, OX39 4LW**

The committee considered planning application P23/S1345/FUL for the removal of existing dwelling, construction of replacement two storey detached dwelling with car port, access, car parking and associated works (as amended by plans received 5 June 2023 re-siting and reducing the car port to three bays, additional biodiversity information received 5 July 2023 and bat survey received 31 July 2023), on land at Greenways, Sewell's Lane, Sydenham, OX39 4LW.

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 recommended for approval by officers and had been referred to the planning committee due to the objection of Sydenham Parish Council. The site was located on the edge of the village and the access was also a bridleway which continued along the side of the site. The planning officer informed the committee that the site abutted a conservation area and the neighbouring property to the west was grade II listed with open fields to the other side of the property. The proposal sought demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with a two-storey red brick and flint dwelling. The planning officer advised that the height of the proposal was relatively modest and would not be overly prominent in the landscape with views of the open countryside retained. The planning officer went on to confirm that the conservation officer supported the proposal and was of the view the materials were in keeping with the character of the area and it would not harm the setting of the listed building.

Michael May spoke on behalf of Sydenham Parish Council, objecting to the application.

William Stancliffe spoke objecting to the application.

Simon Bushell, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer to clarify the difference in ridge heights which had been raised by an objector. The planning officer advised that the difference in ridge heights between the existing and proposed was three metres and was not significant when considered in the context of the surroundings. The proposed dwelling was 20 metres from the neighbouring property and therefore it was not felt the increase was dominating. The planning officer went on to highlight that there were a variety of properties along Sewell's Lane and that whilst the immediate neighbouring properties were not similar in design, this was not out of keeping with the character of the village.

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

The committee was content with the advice provided by the planning officer in relation to the ridge heights of the building and that it had been considered in the context of the surrounding buildings. The committee commented that whilst the property was of a significant size it was not vast and was sited in a large plot with a significant distance to the neighbouring property.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S1345/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement with three years
2. Development in accordance with the approved plans
3. Photographic schedule of materials required
4. Joinery details required
5. Demolish existing buildings
6. Levels details required
7. Obscure glazing of first floor bathroom window
8. Energy Statement Verification and post occupancy monitoring
9. Safety measures for site access by construction vehicles to be agreed
10. Gates to be set back from bridleway and open inwards
11. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)
12. Implementation of agreed tree protection measures

## **89 P23/S2229/HH - 167 Greys Road, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1TE**

The committee considered planning application P23/S2229/HH for first-floor extension above the existing kitchen and bathroom. The extension will be comprised of 2x roof lights and 1x new sash windows to the rear elevation, at 167 Greys Road Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1TE.

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 related to a Victorian terraced property in Henley-on-Thames. The property was neither listed nor in a conservation area. The planning officer advised the committee there had been a number of applications at the property this year. He then went through these applications which included a rear dormer which was done through permitted development, a small dormer on the front elevation similar to others seen in the street, a flat roof single story extension which could be carried out under permitted development and a rear two storey extension which was refused planning permission due to the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and that the side facing windows and depth of the extension would be harmful to the neighbouring amenity.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application before them was only for the first-floor extension with a pitched roof. He advised that the application had been narrowed to set the extension away from the neighbouring property, that it adhered to the 45-degree rule of thumb from the Joint Design Guide and no objections had been received from neighbours. The planning officer highlighted that the town council had objected to the application but that the type of extension was common to Victorian buildings in the town and the front of the property remained largely unaltered. He further advised that there were similar extensions in the area and there was no

public visibility of the rear of the property. The planning officer concluded that the application before the committee addressed the previous refusal reasons and was therefore recommended for approval.

There were no registered speakers for this item.

The committee asked the planning officer to confirm that there had been eight applications on the site since 29 March 2023 and enquired as to why the dormer was not shown on the submitted plans. The planning officer confirmed that the application before the committee was for just the blue edged development on the associated plans. Both the rooflights and front dormer could be built under permitted development rights and therefore the planning officer was of the view it was not material to the application that the front elevations showed rooflights.

The committee asked the planning officer how this application differed from the previous flat roof extension other than that the application before the committee was for a pitched roof. The planning officer advised that the application before the committee was not of the same imposing nature as the previous application as it had been moved away from the neighbouring property. The planning officer also confirmed that the Joint Design Guide discouraged flat roofs but that the current application with a traditional pitched roof was compliant with the design guide.

The committee enquired as to whether there was a limit on the number of applications which can be put in on the same site. The planning officer advised that there was not a limit on the number of applications which could be submitted but that not all the applications had been for full planning permission on the site.

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

The committee commented that there were a number of similar extensions in the area and that this was the only realistic way for people to extend the properties to allow a better standard of living. There had also been no objections from neighbours. The committee noted that a lot of the works to the property could be carried out under permitted development rights.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S2229/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development to be in accordance with the approved plans
3. Materials & details to be as shown on plans & supporting documents

## **90 P23/S2202/HH - 11 Queens Road Thame, OX9 3NF**

The committee considered planning application P23/S2202/HH for a loft conversion with box dormer and insertion of a second-floor window on the southwest facing gable of the existing house (Dormer on the rear roof wing shown to be omitted on amended plans received 17 August 2023), at 11 Queens Road Thame, OX9 3NF.

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 town council's views conflicted with the officer recommendation and this was the reason the application was before the committee. The planning officer informed the committee that the property was a two-storey end of terrace and did not fall into any areas of special designation. The application had originally sought to install a dormer which extended over the two-storey extension but following concerns being raised that this was detrimental to the character of the area and for reasons of neighbour impact, the application had reduced in size. The planning officer went on to advise that since the dormer had been reduced in size, consideration had been given as to what could be carried out under permitted development rights. As the site was not within a conservation area and the property had full permitted development rights intact, they concluded the works applied for could be carried out under permitted development.

The planning officer went on to advise the committee that there were similar dormers in the area and the proposed materials were considered to be sympathetic to the area. With regards to the neighbour impact, it was felt that the scale, design and position meant the impact on neighbour amenity was acceptable. Finally, the planning officer confirmed that the proposal accorded with the relevant development plan principles.

Graeme Markland spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, objecting to the application.

The committee enquired as to the number of applications which had been received in relation to the site. The planning officer confirmed this was the only application and that it had been amended since original submission which would have required full planning permission.

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

The committee commented that the proposal did not look out of character for the area and therefore they were supportive of the application. Some members commented that they disliked flat roof dormers, but they were satisfied that this was to the rear so could not be seen and was in a non-designated area. The committee expressed a need to ensure decisions of the committee were fair and consistent and having seen photos of other properties in the area, they agreed there were no grounds to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S2202/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development to be in accordance with the approved plans
3. Materials & details to be as shown on plans & supporting documents

The meeting closed at: 19:35