

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



Listening Learning Leading

held on Wednesday, 27 April 2022 at 6.00 pm  
in First Floor Meeting Space, 135 Eastern  
Avenue, Milton Park, OX14 4SB

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

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

Councillors:, Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair) in the chair, Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Victoria Haval, Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, Jo Robb, Ian Snowdon and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paul Bateman, Paula Fox and Marc Pullen and Dani Rogers

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: Sam Casey- Rerhaye and Jane Murphy

Officers: Paul Bowers, Andy Heron, Bertie Smith and Tom Wyatt

Guests: Michael Deadman (OCC Highways), Judith Goodwin (OCC Highways), and James Sherwood (OCC Highways).

### **114 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.

### **115 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from the chair, Councillor David Bretherton.

### **116 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 2 March 2022 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

### **117 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **118 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **119 Proposals for site visits**

There were no proposals for site visits.

## **120 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been sent to the committee. Statements which had been submitted were sent to the committee prior to the meeting.

## **121 P21/S1257/FUL - Land west of Main Avenue, Culham Science Centre, Clifton Hampden**

The committee considered application P21/S1257/FUL for the erection of an employment building and associated multi-storey car park. As amended and amplified by:

- Written Scheme of Investigation and Archaeological Evaluation dated June 2021.
- Archaeological Evaluation dated September 2021 and additional ecological information submitted 7 September 2021.
- Amended by drawings and tree information received 5 November 2021.
- Additional Addendum Transport Assessment dated 24 November 2021.
- Revised parking provision and tree, drainage and ecological information received 28 February 2022.
- Addendum transport statement dated 31 March 2022 and Master Plan January 2022 and construction traffic management plan received 4 April 2022.
- Amended Arboricultural Method Statement received 11 April 2022) at land west of Main Avenue, Culham Science Centre, 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. A site visit, involving members of the committee, had taken place on Tuesday 26 April 2022.

The planning officer reported an error in the report at paragraph 6.6; the height of the multi storey garage was stated as being 17m. in height, whereas the sentence should correctly have read; "its subservient associated multi storey garage at 13 metres high".

The planning officer reported that officers of Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC) highways department were present virtually at the meeting, to answer any highways or transportation issues. These officers were Mr. Michael Deadman, Ms. Judith Goodwin and Mr. James Sherwood.

The planning officer introduced the report by stating that the Culham Science Centre (CSC) was the home of the UK's national fusion research programme which was a world renowned centre for fusion energy research and that this application would help to facilitate its ongoing work. The planning officer reported that after extensive discussions between the applicant, the agent, council officers and OCC, 61 car parking spaces had been removed from the proposed total of 292, giving a reduced final figure of 231 spaces, which accorded with current standards. The applicant had

also supported the application with a copy of the Culham Science Centre masterplan, indicating the proposed growth and longer-term vision for the site in line with the requirements of Policy STRAT8 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP).

The planning officer also reported that in combination with the adjacent strategic allocation (set out in Policy STRAT9), the site would deliver at least a net increase in employment land of 7.3 hectares. The policy intended to ensure that site would deliver a net increase in employment land, a net gain in biodiversity and it was confirmed that the site was now removed from the Oxford Green Belt. Council officers had concluded that the application also represented a net increase in biodiversity. The planning officer drew the committee's attention to the detail contained in paragraphs 6.9 to 6.35, which gave a full assessment of the highways impact of the development. Paragraph 6.34 provided information on the content and funding of a proposed S.106 agreement. Of particular note was a contribution of £325,000, to improve the existing footway on the south side of the A415 to a 3m. shared footway/cycleway facility within the existing public highway, from the CSC site entrance towards the train station (approximately 900m). These specific pedestrian and cycle improvements were intended to promote active travel in the local area, including for journeys to and from CSC. The committee noted a contribution of £303,050.87 towards improvements of the local bus services to the CSC, including, but not limited to, improved services to Cowley, Berinsfield, Abingdon and Didcot.

Council officers had concluded that the application was acceptable in terms of policy compliance, S.106 content, visual impact, net biodiversity gain and mitigation measures and therefore recommended approval.

Caroline Livingstone, a representative of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. In response to a question from the committee regarding whether the CSC would be meeting its objectives to be clean and green, when it was developing car park facilities, Ms. Livingstone replied that car parking supported the science vale cluster centre and the proposal contained fewer spaces than the policy objective.

Mr. Steven Sensecall, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

In response to a question from the committee regarding capacity to deal with waste water and the need to have safeguards in place, Mr. Sensecall replied that the CSC was working closely with Thames Water to find solutions. In addition, tenants of the CSC were managed to ensure compliance with discharge regulations.

In response to a question from the committee regarding safeguards to ensure that that new business tenants' operations accorded with those of the CSC, Ms. Livingstone responded that all activities of occupiers, existing or prospective, were scrutinised to ensure that they complied with the CSC's science and technology ethos attaching to the fusion cluster.

Councillor Sam Casey-Rerhaye, local ward councillor, spoke to the application.

In response to a question from the committee regarding capacity to deal with waste water and the need to have safeguards in place, Mr. Sensecall replied that the CSC was working closely with Thames Water to find solutions. Tenants of the CSC were managed to ensure compliance with discharge regulations.

The committee referred to the fact that local areas were having to wait for Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) monies for improved bus services in the local area, in particular serving Long Wittenham. In response to a question from the committee regarding the bus services in the vicinity of the CSC, and in particular the reinstatement of the 95 service, OCC representatives reported that in 2017 discussions had commenced in respect of funding a modal shift from car travel to other forms of transport, particularly buses. It was an ambition to have a service to Didcot, Oxford and then Berinsfield. The OCC travel and transport plan was designed actively to effect the modal shift, which in itself, was a longer term prospect. OCC representatives assured the committee that there would be a bus connection between the CSC and Didcot, notwithstanding any delays in implementing plans funded by S.106 monies. The committee concurred that this funding would be valuable to settlements around the CSC.

The committee considered that overall the application was acceptable in terms of local employment, modal shift ambition, biodiversity, mitigation measures and highways/transport improvements.

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/S1257/FUL subject to the following conditions and the signing of a S106 agreement;

**Standard conditions -**

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans \*

**Prior to the relevant part of construction conditions –**

3. Schedule of Materials
4. Landscaping Scheme (trees and shrubs only)
5. Ecology – Evidence of biodiversity offsetting
6. Ecology – Faunal biodiversity enhancements
7. Surface water drainage
8. Plan of car parking provision (specified number of spaces)
9. Water supply details
10. Water network improvements

**Prior to occupation conditions –**

11. Cycle parking facilities
12. Green travel plans
13. Travel plans
14. Energy Statement verification

**Compliance conditions -**

15. Construction traffic management plan – as approved
16. BREEAM Standard
17. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
18. Wildlife protection (mitigation as approved)
19. External lighting

## **122 P21/S2684/RM - Manor Farm, Henton**

The committee considered planning application P21/S2684/RM, a reserved matters application, following outline permission (P18/S1553/O) for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The erection of eight dwellings (amended plans submitted 18th October 2021, with reductions in scale and multiple changes to the design of the dwellings, as clarified within the agent's covering letter. Additional arboricultural report, ecological report and SuDS drainage scheme also received) at Manor Farm, Henton.

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 did fall within a conservation area or the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). However, there was a strong rural character to the surrounding landscape. The application sought approval of reserved matters, namely appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The committee was provided with a slide presentation of the site's existing buildings, with an indicative layout, as depicted at outline stage.

The planning officer reported that full discussions with the applicant had taken place to ensure that the proposals would be in line with the local built form and landscape. The amendments to the scheme had made a number of important changes which had addressed the key issues raised by officers. The development would be significantly closer to the type of traditional farm type layout which this scheme sought to incorporate having an agricultural aesthetic, taking cues from a range of vernacular barn buildings. The overall forms of the buildings had been simplified, a greater proportion of the development would be 1-1.5 storeys and there would be a more legible hierarchy of buildings within the site. The materials had also been changed, glazing had been reduced and the proposal would now largely use timber boarding, red multi bricks and flintwork.

The planning officer reported that the site's access arrangements were acceptable to the Oxfordshire County Council, the highways authority. There was some visibility of the site from existing footpaths and there would be orchard planting near to the pond. There would be a mixture of native hedging and tree planting and the forestry team had requested the planting of larger tree species close to the boundary. Council officers had accepted that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that flood risk and surface water drainage matters had, or could be feasibly addressed without exacerbating flood risk to the site or within the locality.

In response to a query from the committee regarding the legitimacy of the dates of submission of the applications, the planning officer responded that, as a principle, once outline planning permission had been granted for an application, a reserved matters application must be made within three years of the consent. The senior planning officer confirmed that this was a valid submission.

Mr. Jack Spence, the agent, spoke in support of the application. A statement by Mr. Spence had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

In response to a question from the committee regarding the provision of solar panels in the proposal, the agent responded that these would not be a feature of the development but, to meet sustainability targets, air source heat pumps would be installed.

The democratic services officer reported that one of the local ward councillors, Councillor Ian White, had registered to speak on the application, but was unable to do so through illness.

The committee considered that the proposed application was of an appropriate scale and design, respecting the rural character of the surrounding area and would not cause material harm to the amenity of the neighbouring properties, with acceptable ecological and environmental impacts, and with no problems of highway safety.

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/S2684/RM subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement condition - Reserved Matters Approval.
2. Materials to be in accordance with the schedule shown on the submitted plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing.
3. All areas of flintwork shall be of traditional construction.
4. Details of the glass coating for the external glazed areas in excess of 2sq.m in area shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation.
5. The privacy screen to Plot 1 as shown on the submitted elevation RM- 4A shall be glazed in obscure glass with a minimum of level 3 obscurity prior to the first occupation of the accommodation and it shall be retained as such thereafter.
6. No external lighting shall be provided on site other than that which has first been permitted in accordance with a lighting scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
7. Prior to the commencement of any site works or operations, including demolition and site clearance relating to the development hereby permitted, an Arboricultural Method Statement and accompanying Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
8. Prior to the construction of any development above slab level, a scheme for the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include all planting, the external orchard areas, the treatment of the access road, hard standings and boundary treatments. All agreed measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation unless otherwise an alternative timescale has been agreed in writing by the Council.
9. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with all of the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures included in the supporting Initial Ecology and Protected Species Appraisal.
10. GCN license condition - No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's organisational licence (WML-OR112).

11. GCN license condition - No development hereby permitted shall take place unless and until a certificate from the Delivery Partner (as set out in the District Licence WML-OR112), confirming that all necessary measures in regard to great crested newt compensation have been appropriately dealt with, has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and the local authority has provided authorisation for the development to proceed under the district newt licence.
12. GCN license condition - No development hereby permitted shall take place except in accordance with Part 1 of the GCN Mitigation Principles, as set out in the District Licence WML-OR112.
13. Prior to the commencement of development, a surface water management statement, a ground water management statement, and full surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation.
14. Prior to the commencement of development, a full foul water drainage scheme, including details of the size, position and construction of drainage works, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation.
15. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the parking and turning areas shall be provided in accordance with the approved site plan and shall be constructed, laid out, surfaced, drained and completed to be compliant with sustainable drainage (SuDS) principles, and shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking of vehicles associated with the development at all times.
16. Withdrawal of Permitted Development P.D. rights for extensions and outbuildings (Part 1 Classes A, B and E).
17. Withdrawal of Permitted Development P.D. rights for fences etc (Part 2, Class A).

## **123 P21/S4995/FUL - Upthorpe Farm, Moreton Road, Aston Tirrold**

The committee considered planning application P21/S4995/FUL for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide five dwellings with associated works (amended plans to reduce height of dwellings, layout and design received 14 February 2022) at Upthorpe Farm, Moreton Road, 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 reported that the application had been referred to the committee as a result of an objection received from Aston Tirrold Parish Council, which had raised concerns with respect to sustainability and a purported lack of infrastructure to support the development. The planning officer reported that the site was located within

the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Aston Tirrold conservation area and neighbouring listed buildings were situated to the south-west. Amended plans had been received to meet officer concerns regarding the impact on the surrounding character of the rural area. The amended plans had reduced the height of the dwellings and altered the layout and the design of the development. The planning officer also reported that the proposal would follow the layout of the development to the east, with a traditional farmyard layout. The tallest dwelling would be 8.75m in height; although tall, the height of the dwellings would be less than the existing barn structures, which had a maximum height of 8.95m. The overall mass and scale of the buildings were in fact smaller than the existing structures on the site.

The planning officer explained that as the current application was within the AONB, the council should therefore be seeking 2 affordable units. The council's affordable housing development team had been consulted and confirmed that an off-site financial contribution would be required for development of less than 10 homes within the AONB. For a site of 5 units, this would equate to 2 affordable homes. The commuted sum amount was calculated at £244,530. The committee queried the apparent modest size of the contribution. The planning officer responded that a consultancy had undertaken a viability study on behalf of the council, employing an approved and tested methodology, to reach the calculation. As a general rule, smaller villages, such as this, brought forward smaller sites, and a commuted sum was provided to give off site affordable housing provision. In this case, the applicant was not required to provide the actual value of the housing and the housing provider would obtain their own funding as well.

Councillor Jane Imbush, chair of Aston Tirrold and Aston Upthorpe Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement by Aston Tirrold and Aston Upthorpe Parish Council had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting. In response to a question from the committee regarding the extent of services and facilities in the village, Councillor Imbush replied that there was no bus service except school buses, there was no post office, except for a limited service in the parish hall, a small garage, a stud farm, no GP practice and no shops.

Mr Henry Venners, the agent, spoke in support of the application.  
Mr. Bob Rendell, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Jane Murphy, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee asked whether the council could require film to be added to the lighting. The planning officer replied that proposed condition 17 would control external lighting. The senior planning officer also reported that an additional condition would be added in the event of permission being granted, to require details of glazing to be submitted to the council.

The committee asked whether a condition could be imposed to prevent conversion to more dwellings. The planning officer replied that this would require a separate application, which would be duly assessed at the time.

The committee had some concerns regarding the size of the dwellings but concluded, in agreement with the report's recommendation, that overall, in the planning balance, the benefits of the development outweighed any potential harm.



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/S4995/FUL subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement for affordable housing, and 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. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan
  7. Construction traffic management plan
  8. Landscaping
  9. Tree protection
  10. Boundary details
  11. Contamination - phased risk assessment
  12. Energy Statement Verification
  13. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
  14. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
  15. Contamination- phased risk assessment
  16. Contamination (unsuspected contaminated land)
  17. External lighting
  18. Maintenance and upkeep of the site
  19. Hours of operation - construction/demolition
  20. No garage conversion
- Additional condition; details of glazing.

## **124 P21/S3998/HH - 11 Coombe Hill Crescent, Thame**

Councillor Ian Snowdon left the meeting prior to the consideration of this planning application and therefore did not participate in the debate or voting upon it.

The committee considered planning application P21/S3998/HH for a two-storey annexe extension (amended plans received 12 January 2022 showing a reduction to the width and depth of the annexe and lowering the height of the roof ridge) at 11 Coombe Hill Crescent, 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 committee discussed the subservient nature of the proposed annexe extension and noted that amended plans had been received which indicated a reduction to the width and depth of the annexe. This was a result of council officers' concerns that the original proposal was not subservient to the main dwelling and its scale would have been harmful to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Councillor Linda Emery, a representative of Thame Town Council, spoke, objecting to the application. A statement by Councillor Emery had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Mr. Gerald Reilly, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee concluded that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area, or the amenity of neighbours and considered therefore 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 planning permission for application P21/S3998/HH subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Annex conversion to separate dwelling (informative)
5. Neighbourhood Plan Policies (informative)

## **125 P21/S5334/FUL - 3 Chazey Close, Chazey Heath**

Part way through the consideration of this application, members took a vote just before the meeting guillotine of 8:30pm to continue.

Councillor Tim Bearder left the meeting prior to the consideration of this planning application and therefore did not participate in the debate or voting upon it.

Councillor Alan Thompson left the meeting prior to the consideration of this planning application and therefore did not participate in the debate or voting upon it.

The committee considered planning application P21/S5334/FUL to subdivide an existing 7-bed dwelling to form 1x 5-bed dwelling and 1x 2-bed dwelling, utilising existing parking and vehicular access to Chazey Close; single-storey front extension and addition of new porch and access; associated works. (as amended by plan received 04 March 2022 to alter access and parking arrangement) at 3 Chazey Close, Chazey Heath.

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 intended to sub-divide the existing dwelling into two dwellings. The two-storey side aspect of the dwelling would be divided from the original dwelling to form a two-bedroom house and the original would become a five-bedroom property. The application also included a single storey front extension to the two-bed unit and a front porch on the five-bed unit

Councillor Jane Bowen, a representative of Mapledurham Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. A statement from Councillor Bowen had been sent to the committee by the democratic services officer prior to the meeting.

Ms. Julianna Beecroft, a local resident (who was also speaking on behalf of local resident Mr. Frank O'Neill), spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. Stephen Young, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Peter Dragonetti, the local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee noted paragraph 6.5 of the report and recalled that the housing and development policies within the council's development plan sought to ensure that all new developments were of a design and size that were in keeping with the surroundings and did not harm the character of the area. Referring to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the committee considered that the application did not comply with the requirement to ensure that development was sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and the landscape setting. The committee was also of the view that the sub-division of the property was unneighbourly and out of keeping with the existing character of the street scene. It also considered that the proposed development would be cramped and represent overdevelopment. The committee was not minded to grant planning permission.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning permission for application P21/S5334/FUL for the following reasons;

1. Adverse impact on established character and appearance of the neighbourhood.
2. Sub division of the site is out of keeping with the plot width.
3. Adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbours.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm

---