

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE

Planning Committee

HELD ON THURSDAY 8 APRIL 2021 AT 4.00 PM

A VIRTUAL MEETING

Present:

Ian Snowdon (Chair)

Peter Dragonetti (Vice Chair), Ken Arlett, David Bretherton, Elizabeth Gillespie, Kate Gregory, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald (substituting for Councillor Celia Wilson), Jo Robb and Ian White

Apologies:

George Levy and Celia Wilson tendered apologies.

Officers:

Paul Bateman, Sharon Crawford, Paula Fox, Roseanne Lilywhite, Marc Pullen and Susie Royse

Also present:

137 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and outlined the procedure to be followed in a virtual meeting.

138 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 February 2021 as a correct record and agree that the Chairman sign these as such.

139 Declarations of interest

With respect to item 8 on the agenda, Mulberry Barn, Church Lane, Rotherfield Peppard (P20/S4809/HH), Councillor Robb declared that several years ago she had spent two



Listening Learning Leading

nights in bed and breakfast accommodation at the premises but considered that this did not preclude her from participating in the consideration of this item.

140 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

141 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

142 Public participation

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

143 P20/S4809/HH - Mulberry Barn, Church Lane, Rotherfield Peppard

The committee considered application P20/S4809/HH for an extension and remodelling with associated landscaping, at Mulberry Barn, Church Lane, Rotherfield Peppard.

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 sought planning permission for an extension and remodelling of the existing building. The building had been previously ancillary to Slaters Farm but had since been granted planning permission to be converted into a separate, self-contained, dwelling house. No technical objections to the proposal had been received. In the view of the planning officers, the proposed development was not considered to represent any adverse impact upon the site or the surrounding area. It would conserve the appearance of his part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area. Additionally, the proposed development would not result in any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours, would preserve landscape features and would not harm any protected species. Subject to the recommended conditions, officers considered that planning permission should be granted.

Councillor Sue Rowland, a representative of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application.

In response to a question regarding bats (which had been mentioned in the parish council's representation and referenced in the planning officer's report), Councillor Rowland responded that her council's principal concern was that the increase in light caused by the development would be harmful to these animals. In response to a question regarding the parish council's concerns regarding traffic generation, Councillor Rowland clarified that in that council's view, the proposal would create safety issues in Church Lane, opposite a primary school.

Ms. Sarah Flindall, a local resident of Church Lane, spoke objecting to the application. The democratic services officer had sent to the committee, prior to the meeting, Ms. Flindall's statement.

Mr. Paul Davies, a local resident of Church Lane, spoke objecting to the application.

Mr. David Colin, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The democratic services officer had sent to the committee, prior to the meeting, Mr. Colin's statement

The democratic services officer had sent to the committee, prior to the meeting, a statement by Ms. Hilary Roberts, a local resident of Cowslip House (also known as Talbotts), a neighbouring property.

The democratic services officer had sent to the committee prior to the meeting a statement by Miriam Armstrong, a local resident of Little Acres, a neighbouring property.

The committee noted that the Oxfordshire County Council, the highway authority, had made an assessment regarding car parking needs in respect of the proposal, but had not submitted a highways safety report. It considered that a fully informed decision on the application could not be possible without this information. The committee was also concerned about the unclear information regarding the ridge height of the proposed development, owing to an apparent miscalculation by the developer. Additionally, the committee noted concerns regarding overdevelopment in the conservation area and the area of outstanding natural beauty, potential overlooking and effect upon neighbours' amenity. It considered that these concerns would warrant a site visit and therefore the committee agreed to defer consideration of the application.

A motion moved and seconded, to defer planning permission to enable a site visit to take place was declared carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to defer planning permission for application P20/S4809/HH, to facilitate a site visit, to view the layout of the site and its relationship to neighbouring properties.

144 P21/S0414/HH - 5 Lydalls Close, Didcot

Councillor Ken Arlett left the meeting prior to the conclusion of this item and therefore did not participate in the vote on this application.

The committee considered application P21/S0414/HH for single and two storey extensions to existing bungalow at 5 Lydalls Close, Didcot.

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 report recommended refusal, as it was considered that the proposed side extension, particularly by reason of its footprint and overall height, would dominate, and be out of keeping with the modest character of the existing bungalow, detracting from the visual amenities of the street scene. The applicant had revised the footprint and eaves of the side extension, the proposed eaves now being level with the existing property. However, these modifications did not address the reasons for refusal in the view of the planning officer.

Gemma Willis, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The democratic services officer had sent to the committee, prior to the meeting, Ms. Willis's statement.

The democratic services officer read to the committee the statement of Councillor Alan Thompson, a local ward councillor, which supported the application.

The committee considered that, taking into account all the factors considered in the report and discussed in the meeting, the proposal did not seem out of character, or be harmful neighbours' amenity. In addition, it was supported by a local ward member and Didcot Town Council had no objections. The committee concluded that these reasons were sufficiently compelling to overturn the officers' recommendation and to grant planning permission. The senior planning officer advised the committee on the reasons for granting planning permission, including the standard conditions which would be applied in the event of permission being granted, such as approved plans, materials compliant with design standards and sufficient surface drainage measures.

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/S0414/HH for the following reasons;

1. The proposal is not out of character with the local area;
2. The proposal does not represent harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties;
3. Materials to be used in construction would be of good quality and in sympathy with the local vernacular.

The meeting closed at 5.25 pm

Chairman

Date

--