

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 20 September  
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, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Ali Gordon-Creed, Georgina Heritage, Sam James-Lawrie, Alexandrine Kantor, Axel Macdonald and Ed Sadler.

Officers: Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Will Darlison (Planning Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager) and Tom Wyatt (Planning Officer).

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Andy Heron (Planning Officer), Paul Lucas (Planning Officer), Marc Pullen (Planning Officer) and Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer)

Guests: Councillor Jo Robb

## **70 Chair's announcements**

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

## **71 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ben Manning, Katharine Keats-Rohan, who was substituted by Councillor Georgina Heritage, and Tim Bearder, who was substituted by Councillor Alexandrine Kantor.

## **72 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meetings held on 23 August and 30 August 2023 as correct records and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

## **73 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **74 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **75 Public participation**

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

## **76 P22/S3105/FUL and P22/S3106/LB - 6 Duke Street, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1UP**

The committee considered planning application P22/S3105/FUL and associated listed building consent application P22/S3106/LB for the proposed works consisting of a rear extension at first and second floor in line with the neighbouring properties to the north and south. The extension will redesign the existing flat, while also creating space for an additional residential flat. As part of these works the entrance to the residential properties would be moved to Duke Street. (As amended by plan to demonstrate cycle and bin storage and supported by Heritage Statement submitted 19 December 2022) (As amended by plans and documents submitted 01 March 2023 to better reveal heritage importance of building) (Further amended by plans 2023-04-26 to rearrange internal layout to better retain historic fabric) (As amplified by additional information - noise report received 04 July 2023), on land at 6 Duke Street, 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 sought permission for extensions and alterations to form one additional flat. The proposed extension was contained to the rear. The officer noted that the existing access was from the rear of the property but that this would be closed off and both flats would be accessed via a shared access from the front of the property on Duke Street.

The planning officer informed the committee that the main objections raised were in relation to concerns regarding the relationship of the proposed flat and the pub to the rear, over-development of the site, the lack of parking provision which was proposed and the means of disposing of waste and recycling.

The planning officer concluded that the application was recommended for approval with the addition of a condition for the provision of mechanical ventilation.

Deidre Wells (Redkite Development Consultancy) representing W H Brakspear and Sons, spoke objecting to the application.

Claire Truman (Heritage Revival), the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the meeting. The committee asked when the conditioned acoustic report would be required and if the developer would have time to install any additional measures prior to occupation of the flat. The planning officer confirmed that the acoustic glazing would be in place initially and the acoustic report would then need to be carried out prior to first occupation. The

planning officer confirmed that the proposed glazing was sufficient in line with the submitted acoustic report. He noted that in making their assessment as to acceptable noise levels, environmental health were required to take into account the character of the area.

The committee went on to enquire as to why there was no allocated parking for the proposed flat and whether this was in line with the local highway authority's policy. The committee noted that the Henley and Harpsden Joint Neighbourhood Plan required proposals to be in line with current Oxfordshire County Council standards. The planning officer confirmed that the relevant policy was a county wide plan and that the comments submitted by the local highway authority were consistent with this strategy. Henley-on-Thames was a sustainable location with good transport links and therefore the lack of parking provision was not considered to be a constraint.

The committee then asked if the proposed waste cupboards were of a sufficient size. The planning officer confirmed this had been considered by the waste team who were aware of the local area and the issues which could arise. He confirmed that the waste team was satisfied with the provisions which had been made. The committee went on to ask how practicable it was to require the prompt return of waste caddies. The planning officer confirmed that immediate return was not required recognising that residents would be out of the house at work, for instance.

The committee also asked if the use of carbon neutral construction materials would make the flat hotter and if the impact of the installation of mechanical ventilation had been considered. The planning officer advised that insulation would be required between the two flats and the commercial unit below but that the eco credentials of the proposal had not yet been presented. The planning officer then confirmed that they were satisfied that the mechanical ventilation would assist sufficiently with air circulation in the property.

Motions moved and seconded to approve the planning permission and listed building consent applications were carried on being put to the vote.

The committee was concerned that the waste cupboards were not large enough to store residents waste and that the proposal meant more waste would be placed out on Duke Street for collection. The committee noted that when permission had been granted for another development in the area the waste collection was arranged from the rear of the property on Tuns Lane and this was therefore possible. The committee noted that due to the size of the proposed flat it was unlikely that there would be more than two occupants and therefore the waste storage would be sufficient.

The committee was concerned that the proposal was to build to the lowest possible standards whilst still being acceptable. It did however note that the proposal was in an urban area and the character was therefore different to suburban areas and that this character should be preserved. The committee also noted that there was a need for smaller, more affordable properties in the district.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S3105/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commence development within 3 years
2. Implement development in accordance with approved plans
3. Schedule of Materials to be agreed in writing
4. Glazing specification in accordance with acoustic report

5. Noise levels to be confirmed on site prior to first occupation
6. Mechanical ventilation

**RESOLVED:** to approve the listed building consent application P22/S3106/LB, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commence development within 3 years
2. Implement development in accordance with approved plans
3. Joinery Details for all windows and doors to be agreed in writing
4. Schedule of Materials to be agreed in writing

## **77 P22/S3152/S73 - Greylands, Gravel Hill, Peppard Common, RG9 5HD**

The committee considered planning application P22/S3152/S73 for the Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) on application P20/S3876/FUL (Demolition of existing house and erection of 6 houses):

1. Additional windows to all plots;
2. Alterations to roof profile of Plots 1 and 2;
3. Alterations to first floor rear windows of Plots 1 and 2;
4. Alterations to footprint of Plot 1;
5. Alterations to ridge heights of all plots; and
6. Installation of solar PV panels to roof slopes of all plots.

(position of Plot 1 altered to reflect surveyed distances to boundary, ridge heights of all plots altered to reflect surveyed heights, solar PV panels added to all plots, overlays of approved and proposed footprint and elevations of Plot 1 and details of hard and soft landscaping including boundary wall treatment provided, as shown on amended plans received 6th July 2023), on land at Greylands, Gravel Hill, Peppard Common.

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 sought to vary the approved plans of an extant permission. The planning officer confirmed that the development had commenced and the application was therefore retrospective. He confirmed that the development remained acceptable under Local Plan policy H16. Furthermore, following detailed assessment the planning officer confirmed that the changes applied for in relation to the location of the properties, notably plot one, was on balance an acceptable interrelationship of the properties. He noted this was subject to the imposition of planning conditions requiring the side windows to be obscured glazing and fixed shut and the removal of certain permitted development rights for extensions, outbuildings and other alterations.

The planning officer clarified to the committee that the reduction of the boundary wall to 2.5 metres in height on the application site would result in a reduction of the wall to 1.84 metres in height on the opposite side. He also confirmed that the proposed changes had no discernible impact on the approved parking and access arrangements and did not impact the previously agreed market housing mix.

The planning officer concluded that the application complied with the relevant local plan policies and therefore the application was recommended for approval.

Sue Rowland spoke on behalf of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Anna Murphy and John Murphy spoke objecting to the application.

Neil Boddington (Boddingtons Planning), the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Jo Robb, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee had conducted a site visit prior to the meeting. The committee asked the planning officer to comment on the concerns raised in relation to the validity of the previous planning application. The planning officer confirmed that the application was valid despite the failure to include all land within the applicant's ownership as there was no development on the land in question so there was no requirement to include the land in the application and therefore the matter did not go to the heart of the application.

The committee then asked the officer to explain which windows were subject to change as part of the application. The planning officer confirmed that there were no side windows in plot one under the original planning permission. He went on to confirm that the proposed side windows would be obscure glazed and this was secured by condition, and therefore if the windows currently installed were not, these would need to be replaced prior to first occupation. The planning officer then advised that the approved rear windows would be moved 24cm away from the boundary under the current application.

The committee asked for clarification that the variation of conditions application addressed the issues raised by objectors as to the misrepresentation of the location of plot one. The planning officer confirmed that the variation of conditions application before the committee addressed all of the changes which had been made and included some changes to the footprint of the building. The committee reflected that it was not possible to address the objectors' misunderstanding of the plans and therefore the positioning of the property in the original application via a variation of conditions application.

The committee then queried the planning officer on a statement in their report with regard to distances from the rear windows being less than that set out in the Joint Design Guide and that this did not apply as the distances in the Joint Design Guide apply to back-to-back measurements. The officer confirmed that as this was an oblique view the guidance did not apply. Officers were required to make a judgement in these cases. The planning officer further clarified that the distances were window to window and not window to garden measurements.

The committee went on to ask if the existing wall at its highest point could be retained and extended at that height for the full length of the wall. The planning officer confirmed that the boundary treatment plan showed the wall was to be retained and that sections which were in poor condition where outbuildings had previously been built against the wall would be removed and the more historic sections of the wall would be treated. The planning officer confirmed that it was within the committee's gift to require the wall to be rebuilt at a higher level should they feel this was appropriate. The officer confirmed that the reasoning for the proposed works to the boundary wall was not for the purposes of screening but to repair and tidy up the wall. Officers were of the view that screening was not required as the level of overlooking was acceptable.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application with the inclusion of an additional condition to retain the boundary wall at 3.3m in height through it's length, was carried on being put to the vote.

The committee reflected that the application was very complex but that the officer report was very helpful in understanding the application. The committee had reservations about the impact of the overlooking from plot 1 into the neighbouring property. The committee felt that by increasing the wall height to 3.3 metres along it's full length the concerns of the neighbours could be mitigated.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S3152/S73, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
2. Materials as agreed
3. Obscure glazing to side facing windows
4. Rooflights (Plots 5 and 6) to be at least 1.7m above floor level
5. Withdrawal of permitted development for extensions / outbuildings / hardsurfacing
6. Energy Statement Verification Report to be agreed prior to occupation
7. Refuse & Recycling Storage to be implemented as agreed prior to occupation
8. New vehicular access to be formed prior to occupation
9. Vision splays to be provided prior to occupation
10. Vision splays as approved to be retained
11. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas Retained as shown on approved plan
12. Landscaping implementation prior to occupation
13. Alterations to boundary wall prior to occupation
14. Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Measures to be provided prior to occupation
15. Contaminated Land - Remediation Report to be agreed prior to occupation
16. Surface Water Drainage details to be agreed prior to occupation
17. Foul Water Drainage details to be agreed prior to occupation
18. Electric charging points to be provided prior to occupation

## **78 P23/S1760/FUL - Santannas Place, Watlington Road, Stadhampton, OX44 7UQ**

Councillor Kantor was not present for the start of this item and therefore did not participate in the debate or vote on this item.

Councillor Heritage stood down from the committee and did not debate or vote on this item following her address of the committee as ward member.

The committee considered planning application P23/S1760/FUL for the change of use of paddock land to form hardstanding (retrospective) including siting of an additional 1 x mobile home for residential purposes and general alterations to the previously approved scheme P16/S2987/FUL and subsequent amendments P21/S3017/FUL, on land at Santannas Place, Watlington Road, Stadhampton.

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 site was located to the east of Stadhampton village and was an established traveller site. The planning officer confirmed that there was no listed building on or neighbouring the site. The application sought to increase the number of mobile homes on the site from one to two and to enlarge the area of hardstanding.

The planning officer informed the committee that policy H14 of the local plan set out that provision of pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers could be delivered through the extension of existing sites to meet the needs of existing residents and their families. The planning officer confirmed that the additional mobile home was required due to the applicant having a growing young family. The mobile home was to be positioned close to the existing which would minimise the visual impact it would have. The officer confirmed that the proposed increase in hardstanding would be used in part for access to the rear paddock and stables and advised that there were no objections from the highways authority.

Councillor Georgina Heritage, a local ward councillor, spoke on the application. Having spoken as local ward councillor, Councillor Heritage then stood down from the committee and did not participate in the debate or vote on this item.

The committee enquired if the granting of planning permission would close the enforcement case for the site. The planning officer advised they did not believe this to be the case. The conditions which have not yet been complied with would be carried over onto this planning permission should it be granted and would still need to be complied with.

The committee noted there was a need for nine additional traveller sites and that the development plan aimed to deliver ten. The committee asked if this additional pitch would be one of those. The planning officer confirmed this was in addition to those set out in the development plan. The officer went on to confirm that policy fully supported additional sites regardless of the delivery of strategic sites.

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

The committee highlighted that to approve this application would help to address the requirement to provide sites for gypsies and travellers.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S1760/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans \*
3. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained \*
4. Materials as on plan
5. No Trade / Business Use
6. No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes parked or stored
7. Occupancy condition
8. No more than 2 pitches
9. Surface Water drainage works (details required)

## 79 P23/S2093/S73 - Upper Farm, Brook Lane, Denton, OX44 9JQ

During this agenda item, the meeting length had reached almost two and a half hours. In accordance with the council's Constitution, the committee voted to extend the meeting in order to finish this item.

The committee considered planning application P23/S2093/S73 for the variation of conditions 2 (Approval of drawings) and condition 3 (Approval of materials) on applications P18/S3750/FUL and P19/S3211/FUL for design of house changed and choice of materials changed. (Description from P19/S3211, Variation of conditions 2 and 11 of P18/S3750/FUL to allow for the barns to be demolished, a phased approach to implementation to comprise of: Phase 1: Demolition of two buildings and site clearance. Phase 2: erection of a single residential dwelling, garage and associated works, and the enlargement of the garage.), on land at Upper Farm, Brook Lane, Denton.

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 before the committee as the officer recommendation conflicted with the view of the parish council. The site was located within the Oxford Green Belt. The planning officer advised that the application sought to vary the approved drawings and materials condition of an application granted permission in 2019. He went on to confirm that the permission had materially commenced with demolition of one of the barns previously located on the site. The application would allow for changes to the design, appearance and position of the new dwelling and would introduce an additional vehicular access to the site. The planning officer confirmed that there would still be a reduction in the volume of built form on the site as the two barns had been greater in volume than the proposal. The highways authority found the proposed new access to be acceptable and unlikely to have an adverse impact.

The planning officer informed the committee that the proposal was proportionate to the size and character of the plot. A sensitive approach had been taken to the proposed materials and the position of the building afforded separation from nearby properties so as not to be harmful to their amenity. The planning officer confirmed that the proposal provided generous amenity space which was in excess of the Joint Design Guide and that the parking provisions set out were in line with the local highway authority's standards.

Dafydd Wynne, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee had no questions for the officer.

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

The committee noted that it was pleased to see applications for good quality homes such as this.

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P23/S2093/S73, subject to the following conditions:



1. Time Limit - Variation of Condition
2. Approved plans \*
3. Materials as on plan
4. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc
5. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc
6. Demolish existing buildings (all)
7. New vehicular access \*
8. Vision splay dimensions \*
9. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained \*
10. No Garage conversion into accommodation
11. Surface water drainage works (details required)
12. Foul drainage works (details required)
13. Contaminated Land (preliminary risk assessment)
14. Contaminated Land - Remediation Strategy
15. Phasing of Development (Full)

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

As the meeting time had expired, the application was deferred to another meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.36 pm

---