

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Wednesday, 7 June 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), Ken Arlett, Ali Gordon-Creed, Katherine Keats-Rohan, Jo Robb, and Ed Sadler

Officers: Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer), Cathie Scotting (Planning Officer), Nicola Smith (Planning Officer), and Paul Bowers (Planning Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer) and Sharon Crawford (Planning Officer)

## **20 Election of chair**

As the chair was present, there was no election for a chair.

## **21 Chair's announcements**

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

## **22 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Dragonetti, who was substituted for Councillor Jo Robb, and Councillors Tim Bearder, Axel Macdonald, Sam James-Lawrie, and Ben Manning.

## **23 Minutes of the previous meeting**

The committee agreed to defer approval of the minutes to the next meeting due to a lack of members present at the minuted meetings.

## **24 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **25 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **26 Proposals for site visits**

There were no proposals for site visits.

## **27 Public participation**

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

## **28 P22/S4155/FUL - H&C Pearce & Sons Ltd, Aylesbury Road, Thame, OX9 3AS**

The committee considered planning application P22/S4155/FUL for the full planning permission for the erection of 21 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping and open space (as amended by drawings and information received 1 March 2023), on land at H & C Pearce & Sons Ltd, Aylesbury Road, 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 brought to the committee due to the objection of Thame Town Council. The planning officer then informed the committee that the site was considered brownfield due to its past commercial use.

It was also noted that a previous application for a care home on the site was refused in 2022 for its unacceptable impact on the Thame Conservation Area and on the nearby listed buildings. In contrast, the planning officer informed members that the current application comprised a mixture of terraced, semi-detached, and detached dwellings which contained a policy compliant mix of affordable housing, and which would have a neutral impact on the conservation area and the listed buildings. The planning officer also highlighted that the access to the site would be from Aylesbury Road and was acceptable to the highway authority.

The planning officer then emphasised that, as the site was brownfield and in a sustainable location, the principle of development was supported by the Local Plan. Although the Local Plan protects employment land unless it is proven not to be viable, the planning officer was satisfied that the applicants had provided enough evidence to show the non-viability of the site to remain in employment use.

Although the proposal included a small open space onsite, and a small informal play area, it did not include all the open space required in the Local Plan and so the applicant had agreed to contribute funds for open spaces in other locations in Thame. This arrangement was considered acceptable by the planning officer.

The planning officer then covered the reason behind the Town Council's objection, primarily their concern about amenity space for the affordable housing – plots 20 and 21. However, the planning officer believed that, as the plots were hard up against the site boundary and close to the shared amenity space, it was an acceptable compromise for the retention of the buildings and the importance this would have on the conservation area. It was also noted that all the plots met or exceeded the garden size

requirements in the council's design guide. The planning officer also noted some concerns about the potential for overlooking from plots 1 and 2 on neighbouring properties. Due to the reduction in the elevation to plot 1 and the proposed condition on plot 2 for obscure glazing, the planning officer was satisfied that the impact on the neighbouring amenity would be acceptable.

Overall, as the application was supported by planning policy, would make a good contribution to the housing supply, would cause no unacceptable harm to the neighbouring amenity or the conservation area, and was acceptable in flood risk terms, the planning officer recommended the application be approved.

Councillor Helena Fickling spoke on behalf of Thame Town Council, objecting to the application.

Markham Hanson, the applicant, and Sophie Innes, the agent, spoke in support of the application.

Councillors Pieter-Paul Barker and Kate Gregory, local ward councillors, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee asked if there was a public footpath through the site, but the planning officer confirmed there was none and that the distance to walk around the site was not substantial. Members then inquired about the amount of open space provided in the application and if this could be increased. In response, the planning officer emphasised that the site was a brownfield site in a sustainable location and that the application was of a lower density than that required in the Local Plan. For these reasons, as well as the developer's financial contribution, the planning officer believed there to be an acceptable balance between the delivering of units to the provision of open space.

Members then raised some questions about the housing mix and expressed a desire to see more smaller, one and two bedroom dwellings than those provided, however, the committee ultimately accepted the officer's assessment that the scheme met the market mix. Members also questioned the number of affordable housing units provided by the application but were also content with the council's affordable housing teams assessment and their policy compliant recommendation for six affordable houses onsite and 0.85 dwellings offsite.

Overall, the committee were particularly satisfied to see the reuse of the brownfield site and although some members questioned the housing mix, they were ultimately satisfied with the officers' comments that it did meet planning policy. Finally, as there were no objections from the conservation officer, the committee agreed that the application should be approved, subject to conditions.

A motion, moved and seconded, to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the chair of the Planning Committee, to grant the application was carried on being put to the vote.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the head of planning, in consultation with the chair of the Planning Committee, to grant planning application P22/S4155/FUL, subject to:

- A) Completion of S106 a legal agreement to  
i) secure the affordable housing and  
ii) financial contributions and infrastructure as outlined in the report

B) The following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans \*

Prior to commencement:

3. Levels (details required)
4. Sample materials required (all)
5. Cycle Parking Facilities
6. Archaeology Submission of Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI)
7. Archaeology implementation
8. Tree Protection (Detailed)
9. Ecological compensation and enhancement measures
10. Construction Traffic Management (details required)
11. Construction Method Statement
12. Drainage scheme
13. Foul Drainage
14. Contaminated Land - Linked Conditions (1)
15. Children's Play Space

Prior to development above slab level:

16. Refuse & Recycling Storage (Details required)
17. Landscaping including hard surfaces and boundaries
18. Landscape Management Plan

Prior to occupation:

19. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
20. New vehicular access
21. Tree pits design
22. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) compliance report
23. Contaminated Land - Linked Conditions (2)
24. Energy Statement Verification
25. Electric Vehicle Charging Points

Compliance:

26. Obscure glazing
27. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc
28. Hours of work
29. Ecological Impact Assessment
30. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition
31. Vision splay protection

## **29 P22/S2788/FUL - Brimpton Grange Access To Hotel From A40 Milton Common, OX9 2JW**

The committee considered planning application P22/S2788/FUL for the erection of six detached dwellings, creation of vehicular and pedestrian access and associated

infrastructure and works (as amplified by additional energy information received 31 August 2022 and drainage information received 1 November 2022 and amended by revised site plan showing right of way received 6 January 2023 and amplified by ecological information submitted on the 23 January 2023), on land at Brimpton Grange, access to hotel from A40 Milton 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 was brought to the committee due to the objection of Tiddington with Albury Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application sought permission for six dwellings in land adjacent to the Belfry Hotel and that there was extensive planning history on the site. In summation, permission was previously granted for four dwellings on the site and the works had lawfully commenced. Although this was granted at a time where the council did not have a five-year housing supply, the planning officer emphasised that this permission was a material planning consideration for the current application. Another application for the site then came forward, for six houses, but this was refused and dismissed at appeal for its intensification of the site and on its transport impacts.

The planning officer then informed members that, more recently, a neighbourhood plan had come into force, and it did not allocate the site for development as it was beyond the village area. However, as the planning officer believed that the application made better use of the land than the previously approved scheme and that the development was of acceptable design, he stated that, on balance, he considered the application acceptable.

Councillors Chris Hill and Russ Chaplin spoke on behalf of Tiddington with Albury Parish Council, objecting to the application.

The committee asked the planning officer about the sites position in relation to the M40 and if he believed there would be traffic issues as a result of the application. In response, the planning officer clarified that the junction was relatively far away from the site and that highways had not objected on highways safety grounds. Members also noted that the current application, as opposed to the already approved one, had its own access directly onto the A40 which also raised concerns, but the planning officer clarified that highways also had no objection to that aspect of the scheme.

Members then asked the planning officer about how much weight was given to the neighbourhood plan which did not consider the site appropriate for development as it lay beyond the village, and he confirmed that the plan carried full weight in planning terms.

The committee also spoke about the reasons for refusal for the previous six dwelling application, noting the planning inspectorates reasoning that the increase from four to six dwellings would be an unacceptable intensification and lead to more travel by car due to its unsustainable location. Members then compared this to the current

application and agreed that the inspectorate's reasons for refusal could carry over, in addition to the fact that it conflicts with the neighbourhood plan.

Overall, as members felt that the site was outside the settlement boundary as shown in the neighbourhood plan, that the increased number of dwellings was an unacceptable intensification on the site, and that this would increase travel by car in an unsustainable location, they agreed that the application should be refused.

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

**RESOLVED:** to refuse planning application P22/S2788/FUL, for the following reasons:

The site is outside of the settlement as defined by Policy TwA2 of the Tiddington with Albury Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal for 6 dwellings will result in an unacceptable intensification of development in an unsustainable location which is not well served by facilities and amenities, and will lead to increased traffic movements by private vehicles. The development is therefore contrary to policies DES1 and TRANS2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and Policy TwA2 of the Tiddington with Albury Neighbourhood Plan.

### **30 P22/S1241/FUL - The Site Of Milton House, Gold Street, Little Milton**

The committee considered planning application P22/S1241/FUL for the demolition of existing dwelling and redevelopment of existing site to provide four dwellings with associated development including access works to Gold Street access (as amplified by; - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal received 29 March 2022 - Energy information received 25 July 2022 - Services Plan received 27 July 2022, - Drainage Information received 6 October 2022, - Ecological and landscape information received 21 November 2022, images received 29 November 2022 and information received 25 January 2025 and Nature Space information received 8 March 2023 - Email from agent dated 8 March 2023 and as amended by; - Drawings received 13 July 2022 reduction in height of houses, alteration in garage, materials and layout), on land at The Site Of Milton House, Gold Street, Little Milton.

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 the former local ward member, Councillor Caroline Newton. The planning officer also made a number of clarifications to the report; firstly, to paragraph 1.6 which should read '1 x 3 bedroom' rather than '1 x 4 bedroom', and secondly, to paragraph 6.61 where the distance should be 25 metres rather than 10 metres.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application site was within the Little Milton Conservation Area, where height levels move up the further in the site you go. He also informed the committee that he believed the principle of a housing development was acceptable as it constituted infill development. The planning officer

also noted that there was no heritage objection to the demolition of the existing building.

The planning officer did note that the development would have less than substantial harm on the conservation area, but that the National Planning Policy Framework stated that where this occurs it needs to be outweighed by the public benefit. As the application would provide south facing public seating, community infrastructure levies, and an increased village population to support the local communities and their facilities, the planning officer believed that these benefits would outweigh the less than substantial harm identified by the conservation officer.

In addition, the planning officer believed that the dwellings would not be significantly harmful to neighbouring amenity due to their height, distance between dwellings, and location and suggested that the removal of permitted development rights through a condition could help secure this.

Overall, as the proposal was in accordance with the development plan and the planning officer believed that the public benefit outweighed the less than substantial harm to the conservation area, he recommended that the application be approved.

Councillor David Wakeling spoke on behalf of Little Milton Parish Council objecting to the application.

Lucy Ireland and Barry Coward spoke objecting to the application.

Henry Venners, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Georgina Heritage, a local ward councillor, spoke objecting to the application.

The committee asked the planning officer about the area around the application being used for school pickup and drop-off and about the potential conditioning of a construction traffic management plan around school time. In response, the planning officer said highways did not request it, but it was noted that the developer had indicated that they would be agreeable to the condition should members be minded to approve the application.

Members queried the impact the development would have on the conservation area through the design of the houses but were satisfied that the conservation officer had no objection and with the suggested planning condition number eight requiring the building materials to be seen and approved before the main construction could begin.

The committee also inquired into the developments carbon reduction goals. In response, the planning officer noted that the Local Plan policy requirement was for new housing to provide carbon reduction of 40 per cent from a 2013 baseline or 9 per cent on a 2022 baseline and members were satisfied that the development would achieve this and with the proposed condition to require it.

On the ecology side of the application, the committee considered that the additional trees would be of benefit to the site although a point was made to the developer to try to plant more mature trees.

Finally, members considered the houses themselves and agreed that they were well suited to the site and did not consider the height of them to be grounds for refusing the application.

Overall, as the principle of development on the site was established and the committee agreed that there would be less than substantial harm to the conservation area that would be outweighed by the public benefit, they decided that the application should be approved, subject to the additional condition for a construction traffic management plan which would limit traffic around school drop-off and pickup times.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P22/S1241/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

Standard conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans \*

Prior to commencement conditions:

3. Construction traffic management plan
4. Implementation of Programme or Archaeological Work
5. Archaeology (Submission and implementation of Written Scheme of Investigation WSI)
6. Tree Protection (Detailed)
7. Surface water drainage works (details required)
8. District Licence certificate

Prior to development above slab level conditions:

9. Submission of sample materials

Prior to occupation conditions:

10. Landscaping implementation
11. Existing vehicular access
12. Vision splay protection
13. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
14. Landscape Management Plan
15. Energy Statement Verification
16. Electric Vehicles Charging Point (implementation)

Compliance conditions:

17. Compliance with District Licence
18. Wildlife protection (mitigation as approved)
19. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 2 Class A) - no walls, fences etc
20. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class E) - no buildings etc



### 31 P23/S1389/HH - Covert Cottage, Hill Bottom, Whitchurch Hill, RG8 7PT

The committee considered planning application P23/S1389/HH for the single storey rear extension, on land at Covert Cottage, Hill Bottom, Whitchurch Hill.

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 as the applicant is a district councillor.

The planning officer informed the committee that the extension was to create a garden room to the rear of property, which was a detached dwelling on spacious plot with no immediate neighbours. As the planning officer believed that this was a modest extension in keeping with dwelling, and as there were no objections from technical consultees, they recommended that the application be approved.

Overall, the committee were satisfied with the officer's report and could see no material planning reasons for refusal and so 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/S1389/HH, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement of development within 3 years
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
3. Materials to be used as shown on the approved plans

The meeting closed at 8.09 pm

---

This page is intentionally left blank