

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 1 November
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, Georgina Heritage, Ali Gordon-Creed, Sam James-Lawrie, Alexandrine Kantor, Ben Manning, and Ed Sadler

Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Paula Fox (Development Manager), Kim Gould (Planning Officer), and Simon Kitson (Planning Officer)

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Sam Casey-Rerhaye

Officers: Bertie Smith (Broadcasting Officer) and Tom Wyatt (Planning Officer)

100 Chair's announcements

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

101 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence was received from Councillors Axel Macdonald, Tim Bearder, who was substituted for Councillor Georgina Heritage, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, and Katharine Keats-Rohan, who was substituted for Councillor Alexandrine Kantor.

102 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meetings held on 11 October 2023, 4 October 2023, 20 September 2023 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such, subject to the correction of item 78 on the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2023 to read, "Councillor Georgina Heritage, a local ward member, spoke on the application".

103 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

104 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

105 Public participation

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

106 P23/S2705/HH - 2 Brook Lane, Thame, OX9 2EG

The committee considered planning application P23/S2705/HH for the complete refurbishment and reconfiguration of existing house, demolition of existing storeroom building and conservatory. Erection of two storey rear extension (as amended by plans received 2 October 2023 omitting first floor side extension, altering fenestration serving bedrooms 2 and 3 and changing proposed light coloured timber cladding), on land at 2 Brook Lane, 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 planning officer introduced the report and highlighted that the application was called into the committee by a local ward member, Councillor David Bretherton. However, it was noted that due to an amendment, he no longer was in objection to the application.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application site was in the residential area of Thame and contained a two-storey dwelling which was not in any specific area of designation. The dwelling itself was situated on a corner plot fronting onto Brook Lane and Spring Path.

Permission was sought for a two-storey rear extension and that both the proposed and existing dwelling would be clad with a timber finish and have a powdered metal roof sheeting. The planning officer confirmed that, although the proposal was substantial and not subservient to the existing dwelling, the position of it on the plot and its siting allowed for the proposed size of the extension to fit acceptably.

The planning officer highlighted that the original proposal included a first-floor side extension, but in order to address concerns, the applicant submitted the current plans without that element.

Overall, as the planning officer considered that the position of the proposed extension would not harm the amenity of the neighbours, and that the windows would be positioned to avoid overlooking, he recommended that the application be approved subject to a further condition which would be necessary to prevent the further installation of windows on first floor rear of the elevation.

Councillor Linda Emery spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, in support of the application.

Rich Henderson, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee was satisfied with the officer's report and agreed that, as there were no material reasons to refuse the application, that it should be approved subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/S2705/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement within three years
2. Development in accordance with the approved plans
3. A schedule of materials for external finishes of walls and roof required
4. Parking and manoeuvring areas shown on plan to be retained
5. Surface water drainage scheme required
6. Construction traffic management plan required
7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights - no extensions
8. No additional windows at first floor level in rear elevation

Informatives:

1. Bats are a protected species
2. Thame Neighbourhood Plan policies

107 P22/S4323/FUL - Land to the west of the Green Marsh, Baldon, OX44 9LL

Application P22/S4323/FUL was deferred until the next meeting of the planning committee in order to allow for a site visit to take place.

108 P22/S3242/FUL - 77 Gidley Way, Horspath, OX33 1RG

The committee considered planning application P22/S3242/FUL for the partial conversion of existing garage into facility as kitchen area for catering business 'Cranston Pickles Ltd' (as amplified by odour assessment received 5 July 2023), on land at 77 Gidley Way, Horspath.

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 brought to the committee due to the objection of Horspath Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application was part retrospective and sat within an established residential area and was in the Green Belt. She also noted that the existing use was acceptable in local plan policy terms as well as in national policies, so the principle of the application was considered acceptable.

The planning officer noted the objections from several neighbours and that they primarily revolved around the odour that was caused from the pickling process. In

response to a request by Environmental Health for an odour assessment to take place, an independent consultant was brought in to assess the odour impact and found that there would be no loss of amenity to neighbours subject to the installation of an updated filter being installed on the extractor, and that it be regularly maintained. As a result of the assessment, Environmental Health had no objection subject to that installation. After this took place, the planning officer informed member that the applicant had confirmed to her that the suggested filter had been installed. Therefore, she recommended that the wording of suggested condition two be updated to reflect that and add in the need for the filters' regular maintenance.

Overall, as the planning officer considered the business to be of a modest size, with only one employee, that it would not generate unacceptable traffic movement, and that there were no objections from technical consultees, subject to conditions, she recommended that the application be approved.

Fiona Cranston, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the planning officer about if there was any consultation with the neighbours on the application and she confirmed that they were consulted, visited by the planning officer, and invited to speak on the application at the committee meeting.

On potential problems with the odour in the future as a result of the application, the planning officer emphasised that that any complaints of that nature could be reported to Environmental Health.

Although there was some discussion about the retrospective nature of the application and how the applicant had been operating for several years, they were satisfied that the application would regularise the current position.

Overall, the committee was satisfied with the officer's report and that the suggested conditions would mitigate any potential odour issues that would come about as a result of the pickling process. In addition, they noted that the limited amount of time that pickling would be occurring on the site would also help limit odours. Member also noted the modest scale of the operation and found it to be acceptable for its setting. For these reasons, the committee agreed that the application should be approved, subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P22/S3242/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. Extract system fitted and maintained in accordance with the odour control report

109 P23/S1818/O - 5 Burcot Park, Burcot, OX14 3DH

The committee considered planning application P23/S1818/O for the outline application with all matters reserved for the proposed demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space (as amplified by ecology information received 27 July 2023 and as amplified by Bat Emergence Survey dated 8 September 2023 and as amplified by plan P-054), on land at 5 Burcot Park, Burcot.

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 brought to the committee due to the objection of Burcot and Clifton Hampden Parish Council. In addition, she informed members that since the report was published, the forestry officer had registered no objection as they expected more information to be proved at the reserved matters stage.

The application itself was for the demolishing of a single dwelling and the subdivision of the plot to create two dwellings. She also confirmed that the application had received 14 letters of objection from residents and that the parish council had also objected.

The planning officer also emphasised to the committee that the application was for outline permission only with all other matters to be considered in future reserved matters applications, such as design and access. Therefore, only the principle of replacing one dwelling with two was being dealt with by the committee at the current stage.

The site was washed over by the Green Belt. However, the planning officer confirmed to members that limited infill in the village was acceptable in the Local Plan and that, due to the position of the site in the village, this application would be considered an infill development as so was acceptable on those grounds.

On the concerns of neighbours, the planning officer clarified that she did not believe there would be any loss of character to the area as a result of the buildings demolition as it was not listed in any way, and she also highlighted that there were no policies preventing non-listed buildings being demolished. Furthermore, as the application only proposed indicative designs, the future character of the area could not be assessed at the current stage, but rather when the reserved matters application was submitted. On potential loss of amenity space, she also noted that both proposed properties would have amenity space in excess of that required in the design guide. In addition, the parking and highway aspect of the scheme had also received no objection from the local highways authority.

The planning officer also brought members' attention to the plot size of the proposed dwelling and that they would not be dissimilar to the others in the cul-de-sac.

On drainage, the drainage engineer had registered no objection subject to conditions, and on the bat assessment, it was confirmed that the presence of a maternity roost meant that the applicant had to enter into a license scheme with Natural England before there would be permission to demolish the dwelling.

Overall, as the demolition and subdivision of the plot was policy compliant, and as there were no objections from technical consultees, she recommended that the application be approved.

Caron Greene, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

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

The committee asked for clarification about if the proposed application would meet the criteria for an infill development. In response, the planning officer confirmed to members that the National Planning Policy Framework allowed for infill within villages in Green Belt and therefore, as the site was within the built-up limits of Burcot, it was considered infill by officers and therefore acceptable on those grounds.

Members inquired into the status of the Burcot Neighbourhood Plan and if it could affect the definition of infill. In response, the development manager clarified that as it was not made and adopted, the plan carried limited weight. However, she emphasised that neighbourhood plans were not permitted to contradict the Local Plan and so it would not change the definition of infill to material effect the proposed application.

On a question about if the construction of the building would have an impact on the application, the development manager confirmed that the buildings' design would not be materially relevant to the application before the committee.

The committee noted that there were a number of plots in the cul-de-sac of a similar size to the proposed subdivision, including the plot directly opposite the site which was almost identical in size to the proposal, and that other matters such as design would be considered at the reserved matters stage.

Overall, as the committee agreed that there were no material planning reasons for refusal, they agreed to accept the outline application subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/S1818/O, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement - Outline with Reserved Matters
2. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas retained
3. Foul drainage details required
4. Surface water details required
5. Drainage report required
6. Energy Statement required
7. Electric Vehicle (EV) charging point

110 P23/S2337/O - Chiltern View, Moreton, OX9 2HW

The committee considered planning application P23/S2337/O for the outline application (including access and layout reserved matters) for the demolition of the existing conservatory and outbuildings and the erection of a detached two-storey dwelling together with access, parking and amenity space, on land at Chiltern View, Moreton.

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 brought to the committee due to the objection of Thame Town Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application would fix the layout and access of the site, but all other matters would be left for the reserved matters stage. He also noted that the site was not in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a conservation area, and that the neighbourhood plan allowed for infill development in the settlement.

The proposal was for the demolition of the existing building and the creation of a proposed dwelling with private amenity which was assessed as being in accordance with the requirements in the design guide. Once the demolition was carried out, the planning officer also believed the plot to be wide enough for the dwelling.

The planning officer also emphasised that the parking provision was in line with Oxfordshire County Council requirements, and that the highways authority had no objection to the proposed front access, but that the boundary treatment would also be in the reserved matters application.

Although the appearance and scale of the dwelling on the site was reserved, the planning officer emphasised that an indicative street elevation was provided, and he noted that it appeared to indicate the dwelling would be a transitional building in size between a bungalow on one side and a substantial two storey dwelling on the other.

The planning officer informed members that, whilst the dwelling would be visible from the neighbouring garden, it would be the normal and expected amount of visibility from a row of dwellings such as those on the road, and that privacy measures could be conditioned at the reserved matters stage. Although there was a window in the neighbouring kitchen that faced the proposed site, it was noted as being a secondary opening to the primary one in the kitchen that faced south-east, which would not be affected by the application.

As the planning officer considered the plot large enough to fit the proposed dwelling, that the principle of development was acceptable as it was considered infill, as there were no concerns about neighbouring amenity, and as there were no objections from technical consultees, he recommended that the application be approved.

Councillor Linda Emery spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, objecting to the application.

Jack Spence spoke objecting to the application.

Jake Collinge, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee enquired into the plot size and the planning officer confirmed that there were a variety of plot sizes in the area and the one provided in the application exceeded the requirements for amenity space as required by the council's design guide, and this response satisfied members.

On parking, the planning officer also confirmed that two off-street parking spaces was the requirement by Oxfordshire County Council for a four-bedroom house, but the scale of the dwelling would be confirmed at the reserved matters stage.

Members were satisfied with the officer's report and the information provided on the parking standard. On vision splays, they noted that they would come out in future application, as well as the position of the windows. They also agreed that the proposed development would not negatively affect neighbouring amenity and that it should be considered an infill development.

Overall, the committee emphasised that the application before them was only an outline application and as they saw no material planning reasons to refuse it, they agreed that it should be approved, subject to conditions.

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

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/S2337/O, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement - Outline Planning Permission with Reserved Matters
2. Submission of Reserved Matters - General
3. Development to be in accordance with the approved plans unless varied by other conditions of consent
4. An access plan with vision splay details to be agreed prior to construction above slab level
5. Parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained as on plan
6. Cycle parking facilities to be agreed prior to construction above slab level
7. Energy Statement - details required at reserved matters stage
8. Biodiversity enhancement details to be agreed prior to construction above slab level
9. A landscaping scheme detailing the planting, hard surfacing and boundary treatments to be agreed prior to construction above slab level
10. Surface water drainage works – details to be agreed prior to construction, excluding demolition
11. Foul drainage works – details to be agreed prior to construction, excluding demolition
12. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (PD) rights for extensions

The meeting closed at 7.37 pm