

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD AT 6.00 PM ON WEDNESDAY 13 JULY 2016

DIDCOT CIVIC HALL, BRITWELL ROAD, DIDCOT, OX11 7JN

Present:

Toby Newman (Chairman - substitute)

Joan Bland, Margaret Davies, Anthony Dearlove, Jeannette Matelot, David Nimmo-Smith, Richard Pullen, David Turner and Ian White

Apologies:

Felix Bloomfield and Margaret Turner tendered apologies.

Officers:

Emma Bowerman, Paula Fox, Kim Gould, Simon Kitson, Paul Lucas, Nicola Meurer and Tom Wyatt.

Also present:

Councillor David Dodds

39 **Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest**

None.

40 **Urgent items**

Councillor Felix Bloomfield had sent his apologies for the meeting. A motion, moved and seconded, to nominate Councillor Toby Newman as Chairman was declared carried on being put to the vote.

41 **Applications deferred or withdrawn**

None.

42 **Proposals for site visit reports**

None.



Listening Learning Leading

43 P15/S1637/O - Kingsmead Business Park, Howland Road, Thame

Councillor Jeanette Matelot, a local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P15/S1637/O for outline planning permission to demolish all existing buildings and erect a food store, car park, petrol station and employment development at Kingsmead Business Park, Howland 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 this meeting.

Helena Fickling, Bob Austin, Mike Dyer, Linda Emery and Graham Hunt, representatives of Thame town council, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The applicant hasn't addressed the continuing prosperity of the town centre;
- The Tuesday market is efficiently run and flourishing;
- Businesses have been destroyed in other towns where there are out of town supermarkets;
- There are excellent independent shops and low vacancy rate;
- The Cattle-market site is allocated for a mixed development, where more shops and restaurants are welcome;
- There is free short term parking in town;
- The proposal is twice the floorspace of the identified need for this type of development; and
- The level of impact on linked shopping would be a concern.

Sue Gilbert, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- The proposal is a threat to the shops, market and principles of neighbourhood planning;
- The applicant's impact statement is contradictory;
- The beneficial effect of Waitrose has been dismissed by Tesco;
- There is a lack of transparency in the transport statement;
- Impact on neighbouring properties; and
- Concerns about overflow of staff parking.

Chris Lindop, a local business owner, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Thame has a cohesive town centre with full occupancy; and
- It's busy every day, distinctive and historic.

Miles Young, Peggy Long and Rachel Lester, spoke in support of the application. Their speeches included the following:

- Thame is losing ground to surrounding towns;
- There is only 200 square metres overprovision of convenience store floor space;
- Effect of projected population of 600 additional dwellings in retail study;
- No good reason to retain as employment site;

- Bus link to town, improvements to the Phoenix Trail and public art contribution offered;
- Thame is an expensive place to live and shop – it must cater for families who cannot shop little and often;
- It is possible to do a weekly shop out of town and still use the town centre shops; and
- Concerns about those who don't have cars.

David Dodds and Jeanette Matelot, the two local members, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- Lack of staff parking and associated effect on Cotmore Gardens and Towersey Drive;
- Thame has won several awards – one of 10 rising stars in Great British High Street competition and identified as the second best place to live in Britain; and
- There are great transport links for those without cars.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate. Their discussion included the following points:

- Concerns about the impact on the town centre and linked purchasing; and
- Concerns about the loss of an employment site.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse outline planning permission for application P15/S1637/O for the following reasons:

1. The application site is located on the eastern edge of the built up area of Thame and is located outside of the town centre. In this location the provision of a supermarket of the size proposed would divert trade from the town centre and would have an adverse impact on its viability and vitality. The proposal would therefore undermine the important economic and social role of the town centre and the 'town centre first' policy and would be contrary to Policies CS1, CSS1, CST1, and CSTHA1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, Policy TC7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and the objectives of the Thame Neighbourhood Plan and National Planning Policy Framework and related guidance within the National Planning Practice Guidance.
2. The application site lies outside of the town centre boundary and is currently in active employment use. In relation to the requirements of Policy WS12 of the Thame Neighbourhood Plan, the site is not redundant for employment use but, notwithstanding this, it has not been marketed for either the existing employment use or any other suitable employment use. As such it has not been demonstrated that a continuing Class B employment use of the whole of the application site is economically unviable. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy WS12 of the Thame Neighbourhood Plan and Policy E6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The application fails to secure infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development, contrary to policy CS11 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, D12 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and Policy D1 of the Thame Neighbourhood Plan.

44 P16/S1468/O - Land north of Mill Lane, Chinnor

Councillor Ian White, a local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item.

The committee considered application P16/S1468/O for outline planning permission for the construction of up to 78 dwellings (including affordable housing) with associated access, amenity space and landscaping on land north of Mill Lane, 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 this meeting.

Officer updates:

- Condition 1 of the officer's report should read – Reserved matters within two years and commencement from reserved matters within one year;
- Seven further objections have been received, as outlined in the report;
- Further details of Oxfordshire County Council's traffic flow data forecast to 2021 takes account of recent developments;
- The applicant has agreed to incorporate a cycle lane into the road layout.

Robin Williams and Pat Haywood, two representatives of Chinnor parish council, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- Despite originally being one of three preferred options identified, this site is no longer considered appropriate;
- The decision would be premature due to the imminent publication of the neighbourhood plan and emerging local plan;
- Overdevelopment of Chinnor;
- Construction noise and disturbance affecting the neighbouring school during term time;
- Heightened traffic accident fears;
- Lack of infrastructure; and
- Loss of hedgerow.

Holly Cringle, Michael Gregory, David Poole and Cliff Culbert, four local residents, spoke objecting to the application. Their concerns included the following:

- Raw sewage flooding is already a problem on Mill Lane;
- Impact of construction on school;
- Traffic dangers;
- School is already full;
- Concern for the bat community;
- Mill Lane is a narrow run, used as a rat run;
- Should introduce 20mph speed limit and traffic calming measures; and
- Need to preserve the entire hedgerow.

Nik Lyzba and David Burson, the applicant's agents, spoke in support of the application. Their speech included the following:

- No objections from the County Council;
- The reasons for refusal since the last application was refused have been addressed;

- There is a condition to ensure the sewerage network is sufficiently upgraded before occupation;
- A construction traffic management plan can be imposed;
- The applicant has had discussions with the school and offered to pay for replacement class rooms – the County Council did not agree that this would be appropriate with regard to CIL money allocation;
- Ecological surveys have taken place and the impact on the bat and reptile populations can be mitigated; and
- The site is regarded as a suitable allocation and would contribute to the five year land supply.

Ian White, one of the local ward members, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- Chinnor has doubled in size since the sixties and has taken more than its fair share of late;
- The vibrant rural community will be swamped by dormitory workers;
- A lot of money is required to upgrade the school;
- The two surgeries are at capacity; and
- The cumulative impact of all the other developments approved and awaiting consideration.

The officer responded to questions and comments raised as follows:

- Oxfordshire County Council are aware of the schooling issues and are working on a project to increase capacity;
- All technical consultees have offered infrastructure mitigation options and have no objections;
- The ecologist is satisfied with the mitigations proposed by ecological surveys;
- Thames Water have to look at capacity and will undertake further offsite works, which will be secured by condition, which in turn could improve the current problems experienced by residents

The committee were not satisfied that the impact of the proposal alongside other developments could be understood without a site visit.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer the application to allow a site visit, was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P16/S1468/O to allow a site visit.

45 P16/S1336/FUL - Brookfield Mill Road, Lower Shiplake

The committee considered application P16/S1336/FUL to demolish the existing single dwelling and construct a new single dwelling on Brookfield Mill 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 this meeting.

Malcolm Leonard, a representative of Shiplake parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Chris Tapp, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission P16/S1336/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans.
3. A schedule of all external materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development.
4. All areas of hardstanding with the site shall be of permeable, SuDS (Sustainable Drainage) compliant construction.
5. Except in the case of any building work hereby permitted, no change in the levels of the land shall take place unless in accordance with a detailed scheme which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development commences on site.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, no development falling within Part 1, Classes A, B or E of the Order shall be erected within the site without the prior grant of planning permission.
7. The trees within the site shown to be retained shall be protected in accordance with the measures detailed within the submitted arboricultural method statement and accompanying tree protection and landscaping plan.
8. The submitted landscaping scheme shall be implemented as approved within 12 months of the commencement of the approved development and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.
9. Prior to the commencement of the development, a bat survey report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This report shall identify whether a licence from Natural England will be required to undertake the development and propose a proportionate mitigation and enhancement strategy.
10. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until foul drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details that have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
11. The existing dwelling at Brookfield must be demolished within three months of first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved.
12. The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in all respects. Any variation to the approved details must be approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development.
13. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The approved CTMP shall be implemented prior to any works being carried out on site, and shall be maintained throughout the course of the development.

14. Any parts of the north-west facing window openings below 1.7m from floor level shall be obscure glazed prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and retained as such thereafter.

46 P16/S1201/FUL - Land at the rear of Waynflete, Station Road, Lower Shiplake

The committee considered application P16/S1201/FUL to vary conditions 2 (approved plans) and 5 (obscure glazing/fixed shut openings) of planning permission P12/S1481/FUL to remove the requirement for obscure glazing of two of the west facing first floor windows on land at the rear of Waynflete, Station 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 this meeting.

Malcolm Leonard, a representative of Shiplake parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Nicholas Blandy, a local resident, spoke objecting to the application.

John Hancock, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission for application P16/S1201/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans.
2. Obscure glazing to specified windows.
3. All other conditions on the previous planning permission remain in force.

47 P16/S1299/FUL - 95 High Street, Wheatley

Councillor Toby Newman, the local ward councillor, stepped down from the committee and took no part in the debate or voting on this item. A motion, moved and seconded, to nominate Councillor David Nimmo-Smith as Chairman was declared carried on being put to the vote.

The committee considered application P16/S1299/FUL to erect a new two storey one bedroom dwelling with provision of an enclosed bin store at 95 High Street, Wheatley.

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 this meeting.

Andrew Walkey, a representative of Wheatley parish council, spoke objecting to the application.

Peter Devlin and Tess Harris, two local residents, spoke objecting to the application.

Marc Chenery, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Toby Newman, the local ward member, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee did not agree that the application would not have a harmful effect on the conservation area. They felt that this was an undesirable sub-division and would have inadequate standards of amenity for future occupants.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P16/S1299/FUL, due to the following reason:

Having regard to the dwelling's position and the restricted size of the site, the proposal fails to respect the domestic proportions of residential buildings in this area and appears cramped and incongruous in the street scene. As such it fails to reinforce local distinctiveness and the new dwelling would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The benefits associated with the provision of a small unit of residential accommodation would not outweigh the identified harm to local distinctiveness and the character of the conservation area. As such the proposal is contrary to policies CSEN3 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, CON 7, D1 and H4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and paragraph 134 of the NPPF

48 P16/S1304/FUL - 75 Wantage Road, Wallingford

The committee considered application P16/S1304/FUL to remove condition 15 on application P15/S2021/FUL, to allow the demolition of 75 Wantage Road, Wallingford and the construction of three new dwellings with garages and modified access by reducing the single storey store on plot 3 and removing five dormer windows on plot 1 and replacing them with rooflights.

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 this meeting.

Nik Lyzba, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee considered the application, with advice from officers where appropriate.

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

RESOLVED: to grant planning application P16/S1304/FUL, which has the same conditions as applied to P15/S2021/FUL:

1. Commencement three years - full planning permission.
2. Approved plans.
3. Levels (details required).
4. Schedule of materials.
5. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.
6. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc.
7. New vehicular access.
8. Existing vehicular access.
9. Vision splay dimensions.
10. Turning area and car parking.
11. Construction traffic management.
12. No surface water drainage to highway.
13. Lighting to be submitted.
14. Tree protection (detailed).
15. No garage conversion into accommodation.
16. Air quality measures to be submitted.
17. Landscaping (including access road and hard standings).

The meeting closed at 9.20 pm

Chairman

Date

This page is intentionally left blank