

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 8 JUNE 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, Tim Bearder, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Victoria Haval, Elizabeth Gillespie, Lorraine Hillier, Axel Macdonald, and Alan Thompson

Officers: Paul Bateman (Democratic Services Officer) and Paula Fox (Development Manager – Planning)

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Alexandrine Kantor

Officers: Sharon Crawford (Planning Team Leader), Michael Flowers (Democratic Services Officer), Kim Gould (Planning and Development Officer), Andy Heron (Planning and Development Officer), Paul Lucas (Senior Planning Officer), and Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer)

1 Chair's announcements

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

2 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ian Snowdon.

3 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 6 April 2022 as a correct record and agree that the chair signs them as such.

4 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

5 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

6 Proposals for site visits

There were no proposals for site visits.

7 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 which had been received from the public had been circulated to the committee prior to the meeting.

8 P20/S2504/FUL - 46 King James Way, Henley-on-Thames

The committee considered application P20/S2504/FUL for the change of use of ground floor of existing building from residential to a mixed use of residential and childcare purposes and addition of a temporary wooden structure to the garden to provide a covered area at 46 King James Way, 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 informed the committee that the garden room at the rear of the garden would result in a total loss of outdoor amenity space with some harm to the residential amenity of property number 46. In addition, the depth of the low roof would result in some loss of sight on property number 44, which detracted from the overall residential amenity. It was noted that there had been no objections to the application from the environmental health officer nor the highways officer. In assessing the application, the planning officer explained that whilst there was a moderate harm to the residential amenity due to conflicts with local planning policies DES5 and DES6, the harm had been outweighed by the community and employment benefits. The planning officer concluded that the conditions would be tied to childcare purposes, and limitations would allow a maximum number of children of seven to use the site, and the site's usage would be limited to working day times only. Subject to the proposed conditions as detailed in the planning officer's report and presentation, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Ken Arlett, representative of Henley-on-Thames Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

The committee asked whether the conditions would require the dismantling of the proposed development if the dwelling was to change to a fully residential unit. The planning officer in response read out the full condition which dealt with this question.

The committee asked if OFSTED had visited the site since the timber building had been built and if not, whether the business was lawful without an OFSTED review having taken place. The planning officer responded that this matter was not a planning matter but rather an issue that OFSTED would need to handle. The planning officer added that the committee's consideration should be tied to the application before them and whether they felt it was acceptable, based on planning considerations. The committee asked a follow-up question and asked if the environmental health or highways officers had visited the site before making no objection. The planning officer advised the committee that he was not aware of any details, but reassured the committee that these officers would have had access to the same information the committee had and that environmental health colleagues also had access to the complaints database, and so could have seen if any complaints had been made already. The planning officer was also asked if they knew how many of the neighbouring properties were held as rented property, to which they advised that this was not information the council would hold.

The committee raised concerns on the application's compliance with policy and guidance with an expression that the proposed development did not comply with criteria. The committee noted that the building did not keep in character to the surrounding area and failed to provide any mitigating enhancement to the surroundings. Additionally, the committee was concerned with the loss of amenity space, with no replacement space being provided, or existing land altered to provide replacement amenity space. In response to these concerns, the planning officer stated that in his view, the application would not detract from the surroundings and in that regard would not conflict with policy guidance.

In response to a series of questions from the committee relating to the type of use of the proposed application site and its acceptability in the area, the planning officer informed the committee that no objections had been raised locally and the type of use was acceptable for the particular location. The committee was also advised that planning policy DQS1 referred to 'all new development' and the planning officer considered this application as being a new development which could fall under that policy.

The committee asked for clarification for the materials of the roof and windows. The response from the planning officer was that the roof was made from perspex, but he did not have information regarding the window material. In response to this, the committee noted a concern on the safety of the unit for children due to the material trapping heat which could lead to a dangerous temperature for children in summer periods. Following a supplementary question on shading around the proposed unit, the planning officer added that the site faced southwards and there was currently a large tree which cast shade during the day, however it was mentioned that this tree could not be guaranteed for permanent retention. Finally, the committee sought clarification on whether any response had been received from house number 44 from the consultation regarding the application. The planning officer confirmed that they had been consulted, but they had not provided any comments in response.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P20/S2504/FUL due to:

1. Concerns on materials and the size of the outbuilding and the impact to the character of the area.
2. Harm to the amenity of the neighbouring resident (Number 44).
3. Loss of the whole garden, and the diminishing quality of the living environment for house number 46.

9 P21/S4522/FUL - Land Adjacent to 23 Haywards Close, Henley on Thames

The committee considered application P21/S4522 FUL for the erection of 4-bedroom detached dwelling (site location plan corrected, and biodiversity information submitted 20th February 2022 and updated energy statement and specification received 6th May 2022) on Land Adjacent to 23 Haywards Close, 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 committee was provided with the history of the site, and an explanation that the previous planning permission that had been granted in 2011 had lapsed. The planning officer provided the context of the site, informing the committee that the proposed development was acceptable when assessed against the local plans. The concerns that had been raised had all be deemed acceptable with mitigations through the proposed conditions. The level of separation to the adjoining dwellings also meant that the application complied with local planning policy DES6, with the outdoor amenity space complying with local planning policy DES5 and the design guide. The planning officer confirmed that there were also no objections from the highways officer. In relation to the public footpath, the committee were advised that a public path order had been made in August 2013 and whilst this was related to the previous application, the current application was identical to the previous permission, so that the proposed route still complied with this order and could be therefore certified. The planning officer confirmed that it is a condition of the public path order that the alternative footpath has to be constructed before the existing one was removed. The planning officer concluded by confirming that subject to conditions, the planning application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Ken Arlett, a representative of Henley-on-Thames Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Chris Keen and Caryn Meyer, the planning consultants, spoke in support of the application.

Louise Dodd, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Chris Keen and Caryn Meyer, the applicant and the agent respectively, spoke in support of the application. The committee asked the speakers about their intentions for the trees located towards the site boundary. The speakers confirmed that the trees would be retained as currently seen.

The committee asked whether any provision could be made for bicycle access on the existing steps by providing a ramp or other bicycle - friendly route. The planning officer explained that the route had already been established and was too steep for such a treatment and that the crime prevention design officer had not requested such changes, and therefore this could not be insisted upon as a condition at this stage of the application.

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/S4522/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development with three years.
2. Development to be in accordance with the approved plans
3. No change in levels
4. Schedule of Materials to be agreed
5. Obscure glazing to bathroom window
6. Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 2 Class A) – no walls, fences etc.)
7. Withdrawal of permitted development (extensions/outbuildings/hardstandings)
8. Energy Statement verification to be provided prior to occupation
9. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas retained in accordance with the approved plans
10. No Garage conversion into accommodation
11. Landscaping details (including hardstandings) to be agreed
12. Tree protection to be implemented in accordance with the submitted details

13. Boundary walls and fences to be agreed
14. Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy to be agreed
15. Biodiversity Offsetting details to be agreed
16. Contaminated Land investigation details to be agreed
17. Cessation of development if unsuspected contamination is found
18. Contaminated and investigation details to be agreed
19. External Lighting details to be agreed
20. Electric Vehicles Charging Point to be provided
21. Surface Water Drainage details to be agreed
22. Foul Water Drainage details to be agreed

10 P21/S0666/FUL - Southernwood, 70-72 Park Road, Didcot

The committee considered application P21/S0666/FUL for the removal of lettable cabins; erection of two new dwellings with associated parking, secure and covered bicycle storage, refuse and recycling storage and private amenity space (as amended plans to change size and design of dwellings received 9 March 2022 and 27 April 2022) at Southernwood, 70-72 Park Road, 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 introduced the application and confirmed that it had been referred to the planning committee as the planning officer's recommendation conflicted with the views of Didcot Town Council. The site formed part of an existing bed and breakfast business and the planning officer provided the geographical layout of the existing structures and their location on the application site. The new proposed dwellings would be set within spacious plots with private amenity space above the design guide requirements. The nearest existing dwellings were in the northwest and were sixty-seven metres away from the location of the proposed new dwellings. The planning officer confirmed that each property would have three car parking spaces available. In respect of design, the properties would be constructed using red bricks and would have a contemporary appearance. The officer concluded that the potential benefits of the application outweighed any harm, and so subject to conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Eleanor Hards, representative of Didcot Town Council, spoke in objection to the application.

Sandra Airey, local resident, spoke in objection to the application. In response to a question from the committee on the current layout of the site, the speaker responded by stating that the site currently had more outbuildings than stated in the report, and the cabins were all inter-connected.

A statement by Ms. Sophie Holmes, a local resident, had been sent to the committee prior to the meeting by the democratic services officer.

In response to a question on the amount of amenity space that would be available if the application was approved and constructed, the planning officer responded that the dwellings would have 221sqm and 220sqm for the first and second dwellings respectively. The committee also asked whether the new build properties would include garages. The planning officer confirmed that the new-build properties did not have any garages, but did have pre-allocated parking spaces and the site met the parking standard requirements. A

second question followed, seeking clarification on construction vehicle access and the perception that this would be tight for access by vehicles. The planning officer responded that Oxfordshire County Council's highways officer had not highlighted a concern regarding this matter.

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

RESOLVED: to defer application P21/S0666/FUL and for a site visit to take place.

11 P22/S1039/FUL - 13 Leyshon Road, Wheatley

The committee considered application P22/S1039/FUL for the erection of two storey side and rear extension. Subsequent subdivision to provide new two storey two bed dwelling. Provision of private amenity space with off street parking, utilising widened existing highway access to Leyshon Road. Provision of enclosed bin and bike stores. As amended by plan ref 21- 014-P-001 B which shows a set back and includes bat and bird box, at 13 Leyshon Road, Wheatley.

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 the application had been referred to the committee due to the recommendation differing from the local parish council, who objected to the application. Wheatley Parish Council had been concerned with the application not keeping to the character to the area, the site constituting overdevelopment, a lack of suitable parking, and being unneighbourly to the surrounding properties. The planning officer, alongside addressing these concerns, highlighted that there had been no objection from the highway authority. It was also noted that the site was in close proximity to a bus stop, which enabled good access to other towns and villages. Additionally, as it was in a built-up residential area, the traffic speed limit was low and therefore of minimal danger to public safety. The planning officer concluded by reminding the committee that government advice remained that a refusal on transport grounds should only be considered if the cumulative impact was severe. Subject to the officer's recommendations, the application was recommended for approval.

Councillor Alexandrine Kantor, local ward member, spoke to the application.

The committee asked the planning officer questions regarding the plan and elevation, and requested clarification on whether the extension had access to the back garden. The planning officer stated that it was unlikely that there was access to the rear for property 13, which was the host dwelling.

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 P22/S1039/FUL subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials (walls and roof)
4. New vehicular access
5. Vision splay protection

6. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas Retained
7. Energy Statement Verification
8. Electric Vehicles Charging Point (implementation)

12 P22/S0519/FUL - Bayswater Farm, Bayswater Farm Road, near Sandhills

The committee considered application P22/S0519/FUL for the erection of two apartments accessed from Bayswater Farm Road (as amended and amplified by revised site plan and vehicle swept path analysis and letter from Glanvilles received 24 March 2022, SAP calculations submitted on the 5 April 2022 and amended by site plan received 21 April 2022) at Bayswater Farm, Bayswater Farm Road, near Sandhills.

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 of a correction to the report, advising that the site was close to the green belt, but was not located within it. The committee was therefore informed that paragraphs 6.10-6.15 could be disregarded for the purposes of making a decision on this application. The planning officer reassured the committee that this alteration had no impact to the recommendation, with the application having been referred to the planning committee, as the recommendation conflicted with the view of the local parish council.

The planning officer explained that the site was not within an identified settlement within South Oxfordshire, and as a result could disregard conflict with local plan and housing policies, as there were material considerations which justified a departure. Thus, the site was located in an area that was attached to the built form of the Barton Estate and the location was sufficient justification to set aside the conflict with policy. The surrounding buildings were a mixture of styles, and the development would add beneficially to the local appearance.

The planning officer reported that the plans had been amended to provide sufficient vision for vehicle access and the amenity area was proportioned out to a more acceptable level. The height of the building in conjunction with the distance from the boundaries was such that there was not considered to be a materially harmful neighbourly impact, and the application was seen as being in accordance with the local plan. The planning officer concluded that subject to conditions, the application was recommended for approval.

Luca Perletta, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Nicky Brock and Tom Kennedy, the agent and the applicant respectively, spoke in support of the application. The committee asked whether the developers were considering the installation of air source heat pumps, and whether a verbal commitment could be given to their incorporation into the application. The speakers responded that they had already chosen an air source heat pump, and this would go into the design of the proposed application.

Councillor Tim Bearder, local ward member, spoke in support of the application.

The committee expressed concern with the site's minimum size standard being two square metres below the minimum requirements which could lead to cramping. The planning

officer accepted this concern but responded that for a previous appeal for a similar application, the planning inspector took the view that it was not justifiable to refuse an application on this ground if all the other aspects were acceptable.

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 P22/S0519/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard conditions

1. Commencement three years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved Plans

Prior to construction above slab level conditions

3. Schedule of Materials
4. Surface water drainage
5. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)

Prior to occupation conditions

6. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas Retained
7. Energy Statement Verification
8. Electric Vehicles Charing Point (implementation)
9. Tree protection (implementation as approved)

The meeting closed at 8.08 pm

Chair

Date

--	--