

# Minutes

## OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

## Planning Committee

**HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16 MARCH 2022 AT 6.00 PM  
FIRST FLOOR MEETING SPACE, 135 EASTERN AVENUE, MILTON PARK,  
OX14 4SB**

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

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Elizabeth Gillespie, Victoria Haval, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, Jane Murphy (as substitute for Ian Snowdon), Sam Casey-Rerhaye (as substitute for Jo Robb), and Alan Thompson  
Officers: Michael Flowers (Democratic Services Officer) and Paula Fox (Development Manager)

### **Remote attendance:**

Councillors: David Bartholomew and David Rouane  
Officers: Sharon Crawford (Planning Team Leader), Paul Lucas (Senior Planning Officer), Marc Pullen (Planning and Development Officer), Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer), and Cathie Scotting (Major Applications Team Leader)  
External Officers: Michael Deadman and Jason Sherwood (Oxfordshire County Council)

### **91 Chairman's announcements**

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

### **92 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Bearder, Jo Robb, and Ian Snowdon.

The democratic services officer at the request of Councillor Snowdon, explained to the committee that Councillor Snowdon, following consultations with the democratic services manager, had been advised not to take part in application P19/S0720/O due to living at the boundary of the application site.

### **93 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 2 February 2022 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

## **94 Declarations of interest**

Councillor David Bartholomew who was attending the meeting as a local ward member declared that he lived in the vicinity of application P21/S1389/O, although he stated there would be no direct impact on his property. Councillor Bartholomew had consulted with the democratic services manager prior to the meeting and received confirmation that he could attend the meeting in a non-committee member capacity and would therefore speak on the application as its local ward member.

## **95 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **96 Proposals for site visits**

There were no proposals for site visits.

## **97 Public participation**

The list showing members of the public who had registered to speak had been circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

## **98 P19/S0720/O - Land at Ladygrove, East Didcot**

The committee considered application P19/S0720/O for an outline planning application for a residential development comprising up to 750 dwellings (with up to 40% affordable housing provision), public open space comprising green infrastructure, community use, allotments and play areas, pedestrian and cycle links, landscaping and associated supporting infrastructure. Means of access to be determined via Hadden Hill (A4130). Access to NPR3 reserved for later consideration along with all other matters. (as revised by information received 22 January 2021 and updated Parameter Plan and Biodiversity Calculations received 5 May 2021).

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 explained that vehicle access was to be determined at the outline stage of the application. On the application site, it was explained that the area to the west was land owned by the council, with the area displayed in the middle of the application being the built development. Sites that were coloured green on the officer's presentation indicated allotments, a community facility, and a play area. In addition, the planning officer confirmed that the masterplan was illustrative, and that drainage would now be on the other side of the road, adjacent to the golf course. It was noted that there had been a significant level of representation made from local residents, and a lot of work had been done regarding the drainage strategy in response to these concerns. At a high level strategy, the levels on the site sloped downwards from east to west, and there was also an existing carrier of water from the site.

The committee were informed that the developers had confirmed they would provide the parkland with the first two-hundred and fifty dwellings, and the terms of the transfers of land ownership would be agreed prior to any commencement of works. Additionally, the town council was interested in taking control of the allotments and community centre. The

committee were also told that contributions would be received for offsite leisure facilities that were within Didcot. The planning officer also added that there had been a typo in the report at section 7.6. This was in relation to health and fitness where the figure was listed as '£14,6507' but the correct figure was '£146,000'.

The committee were then reminded that as this was an illustrative masterplan being presented, a detailed layout would be presented to the committee at a later date. With specific reference to the southern area of the application, this was described as higher density, with some lower density housing on the edges of the border, and where existing properties were already located. The lower density would also be towards the area of natural beauty and beyond. The design code that would take forward the parameters would also be subject to a public consultation, to allow relevant parties to have an input on the process.

The planning officer concluded that the site was allocated, and with seven-hundred and fifty dwellings, it would provide much needed housing, with a combination of mixed and forty percent affordable housing. Confirmation was also given that public consultations would continue for key elements for the scheme and key infrastructure would be delivered. Subject to the conditions recommended, officers therefore recommended the application for approval.

Rebecca Fenn-Trip, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Ms Fenn-Tripp was accompanied by Peter Jones (Technical Team), James Yeoman (Agent), and Leigh Abley (Consultant) who were available to respond to any questions from the committee.

The committee asked the speaker whether they would be willing to have a condition added for the preservation of the two oak trees. The agent responded that while they were aware of the interest in the trees, they viewed them as already being protected, but while they would seek to preserve them, one could have to be removed. David Rouane, the ward councillor, spoke to the application.

In relation to NPR3, Jason Sherwood explained that this was not tied to the Ladygrove East development, but was a project in itself. They were looking to complete the preliminary design towards the back end of the year, with planning permission to be sought in early 2023, and construction with a completion in 2025. The county council officer confirmed that funding was already in place, and the county was both behind the scheme, and intended to deliver it.

The planning officer and OCC officers were asked whether the proposed road for the A4130 a T-Junction would be. The Growth Manager (OCC) responded that there was likely to be a roundabout of some form, but this would require careful consideration for the timing of such a traffic control measure and whether mitigation work was required. The committee asked that in relation to NPR3, when this would be finished so that a complete road would be built around Didcot. The response from officers was that the project had a total completion timeline for the middle of 2026, but the sectioned delivery and finer detail were not available until the contractor had been spoken to.

The committee requested clarification on whether the two proposed ponds would be within the applicant's land, or if it was within council ownership. The response from the officer was that ponds were in the applicant's land.

The committee asked how enforceable the condition was which related to a permanent health centre before a thousand dwellings were completed, as the committee highlighted

the difficulties that had occurred with the Great Western Park development. The officer responded by explaining that healthcare provision was a complicated matter, and work was currently being done for a new practise at Great Western Park which involved now secured land and relevant S106 triggers.

The committee asked a series of questions relating to traffic calming measures, including whether any would be placed in Abingdon Road and for officer views on the most effective traffic calming measures that could be used. The county council officer responded that they were looking for 20mph speed limits for the discussed road and also noted that humps could also be introduced to contribute to a lower speed limit along the road.

A question was asked by the committee seeking confirmation on whether the Oak Tree Health Centre could cope with taking on extra patients, and subsequently if they could not, would a new GP be opened in Didcot Northeast. The response was that the Clinical Commissioning Group had stated that all local practises were at full capacity, and there was an urgency to get a new healthcare centre opened in Great Western Park as a result. The planning officer confirmed that the council would support a new site, but it would be for the health practises and the CCG to implement any new site.

The committee asked a question regarding the biodiversity net gain on the site. The planning officer responded that the two per cent net gain was a prediction, but due to its marginal figure, it would be monitored for a number of years should permission be granted. A further question was asked on the issue regarding risks of flooding in the site. The planning officer commented that high level drainage work would be undertaken, and the addition of swells and ditches around the site, and with an added watercourse, would all contribute to the minimisation of flood risks.

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

**RESOLVED:** to grant planning permission for application P19/S0720/O subject to the following conditions:

- A. The completion of a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and all the infrastructure as outlined in the report, and
- B. The following conditions:
  1. Commencement – Outline with Reserved Matters
  2. Approved plans
  3. Land use budget
  4. Submission and Content of Reserved Matters
  5. Phasing
  6. Design Code
  7. Housing Mix and Delivery Document
  8. Tree Protection (Detailed)
  9. Hours of operation – construction/demolition sites
  10. Construction Management Plan (including traffic routes)
  11. Archaeology WSI
  12. Implementation of Archaeological Work Programme
  13. Contaminated Land – risk assessment
  14. Contamination Land – remediation
  15. Parameters Plan – Biodiversity (BPP)
  16. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

17. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP)
18. Levels
19. Surface Water drainage scheme (each phase)
20. Surface water drainage works (details)
21. Foul Water drainage
22. Surface Water drainage completion
23. Energy Statement
24. Energy Statement Verification
25. BREEAM Excellent – Community Building
26. Hadden Hill Access
27. New pedestrian access Abingdon Road and Hadden Hill
28. Estate accesses, driveways and turning areas
29. Landscape Environment Management Plan (LEMP)
30. Tree pits design
31. Landscaping (including hard surfacing and boundary treatment)
32. Landscape Management Plan
33. Open Spaces and Play Areas
34. Noise
35. Lighting
36. Green Travel Plans
37. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
38. Air Quality – Restriction on gas boilers
39. Provision of fast fibre broadband

## **99 P21/S1389/O - Kingsley House, Crowsley Road, Lower Shiplake**

Councillor Jane Murphy left the meeting before the start of the item.

The committee considered application P21/S1389/O for an outline application for refurbishment, extension and alteration of Kingsley House from 4 flats to up to 8 flats incorporating access matters with all other matters reserved (block, site and site access plans revised on arboricultural grounds received 21st May 2021 and corrected by plans received 7th June 2021 and footprint of Firs Lodge corrected and details of parking, bin storage and extension proposals removed as shown on amended plans received 24th June 2021).

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 informed the committee that the highway authority only saw a modest increase in vehicle numbers. In addition, the planning officer added that they considered the access alterations to be acceptable. The planning officer also confirmed that there would not be any significant additional noise nuisance, and this would comply with policy DES6. With regards to the historical nature of the building, the committee were informed that the council's conservation officer had confirmed that due to conversion of the building into flats during the 1970's, the building was classed as having lost integrity and was therefore not a listed building. However, the building could be considered a designated heritage asset in order to retain its existing characteristics. The planning officer concluded

by confirming that for the application before them, it complied with the relevant criteria and was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Chris Penrose, representative of Shiplake Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Nick Meredith, local resident, spoke against the application.

John Stewart and Paul Southouse, the applicant, and the agent respectively, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the speaker why no detailed planning application had been presented at the meeting. The speakers responded that the application was to agree the principles of access and a further application, if the existing application was granted, would then follow. A follow-up question was then raised and asked how the applicant could seek the committee to consider up to eight residential units as flats without the information presented. The speakers replied stating that a full topographical and site survey had been carried out and they considered eight dwellings feasible if the existing building was re-worked, however they had not pursued this further until the principles of access were agreed.

The committee also asked the speaker a question on the driveway and its practicality for vehicle use. The response to this from the speaker was that there would be a widening to ensure two cars could pass each-other, and two sections would be constructed to enable passing places where the road was not wide enough for opposing traffic to move past one another at the same time.

Councillor David Bartholomew, the local ward member, spoke against the application.

The committee asked whether the road was strong enough for the proposed application, or whether it would suffer a fast rate of erosion. The response to the committee was that the driveway was in the ownership of the applicant, and it would therefore be in the interests of the owners to maintain it. Additionally, the planning officer also added that separate households would use it, and due to it being a private road, any maintenance would be between the relevant parties.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse outline planning permission for application P21/S1389/O due to the harm to the amenity of neighbours through the increase in traffic movements along the access.

## **100 P21/S3371/FUL - Tree Tops House, Gillotts Lane, Henley-on-Thames**

Councillor Alan Thompson left the meeting before the start of the item.

The committee considered application P21/S33371 for the demolition of house. Construction of five apartments with detached car ports and bin/cycle store.

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 application, and explained that it had been referred to the committee due to objections from Henley Town Council for reasons identified within section 2.1 of the report. The planning officer also confirmed that the application had been deferred at the previous committee meeting to enable a site visit to take place. The application's background was then provided, with the context of the site's history detailed. The planning committee were told that the existing dwelling had been damaged by fire in 2019, and an outline application for two new dwellings had been granted in 2020. The planning officer added that more recently, planning permission had been granted for a new single detached dwelling.

With respect to the application before the committee, the planning officer confirmed that their view was that the principle of the current application was acceptable and would adhere to existing policy. The site's location on a brownfield site would provide a net gain of four residential units, and met the Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan's aim of the intensification of brownfield site development. The committee were told that the site was deemed to have a neutral impact from a wider viewing, and no physical harm had been identified from the proposed application. Additionally, the design was considered similar to the existing dwelling and similar properties within Henley. In relation to the materials used for the application, officers were content that acceptable external materials could be secured by a planning condition.

With reference to trees on-site, confirmation was given to the committee that most trees were protected by a tree protection order, and that no objections had been received from the council's forestry officer in relation to this. A planning condition however was proposed to require tree protection measures, and for new trees to be planted as a replacement for any existing trees removed.

The committee were then told that the proposed development would be accessed by existing vehicular access, but that the width of the road would be increased with additional required visibility splays. Additionally, there would be ten parking spaces, two visitor spaces, and bicycle storage facilities. This was confirmed to meet local highway authority standards, and no objections had been received from this authority regarding the application. Conditions were also recommended to ensure the provision and retention of any on-site parking.

The planning officer concluded with a recommendation for a condition that was not listed in the report, which would require any external lighting scheme to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval before installation. Subject to the conditions laid out in the report, and newly proposed, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Ken Arlett, representative of Henley Town Council, spoke against the application.

Paul Dickinson, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked the speaker for confirmation on tree removal on the site and whether they would retain any. The speaker replied that only those trees impacted by the fire damaged building would be removed. Additionally, the speaker confirmed that whilst at the site visit, the conifer tree had been marked for removal, that tree alongside a number of others were now being retained.

The committee asked the planning officer whether the land was in the neighbourhood plan for development, which the planning officer confirmed it was not. Additionally, in response to a question on light spillage, the planning officer confirmed that there was a planning condition on the application, which would require any external lighting scheme to be approved by the council.

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/S3371/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Development to be in accordance with the plans hereby approved
3. Development to be built with materials as submitted
4. All external glazing to be coated to prevent illumination and light spill
5. An organised archaeological watching brief should be maintained on site during construction
6. Findings of watching brief to be submitted for approval
7. Development shall be implemented in accordance with all of the ecological mitigation measures stated in supporting Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
8. A biodiversity enhancement plan (BEP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority
9. Details of surface water drainage works to be submitted for approval
10. An Arboricultural Method Statement and accompanying Tree Protection Plan shall be submitted for approval
11. Details of landscaping of the site to be submitted for approval
12. Existing vehicular access to be improved in accordance with highway standards prior to occupation
13. Vision splay dimensions measuring 2.4 metres by 43 metres to be put in place prior to occupation
14. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas provided as approved and thereafter retained
15. Details of cycle parking to be submitted for approval
16. No surface water from the development shall be discharged onto the adjoining highway
17. Any gates provided shall be set back a minimum of 5.0 metres from the edge of the carriageway and shall open inwards into the site
18. Details of new gate to be submitted for approval
19. Energy Statement Verification – verification report to demonstrate energy efficiency measures have been implemented
20. Each dwelling to be provided with an Electric Vehicle Charging Point
21. External lighting scheme's to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval before implementation.

## **101 P21/S3035/FUL - 21 St. Martins Street, Wallingford**

Application P21/S3035/FUL was deferred to the next meeting of the planning committee due to the meeting time expiring before this application could be considered.

The meeting closed at Time Not Specified

Chair

Date

--

This page is intentionally left blank