

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Planning Committee



held on Tuesday, 14 May 2024 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: Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair in the Chair), Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Katharine Keats-Rohan, James Norman, and Ed Sadler  
Officers: Paul Bowers (Senior Planning Officer), Katherine Pearce (Principal Planning Officer), Marc Pullen (Planning Officer), Cathie Scotting (Major Applications Team Leader), and Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer)

### **Remote attendance:**

Officers: Edward Church (Senior Countryside Officer), Sharon Crawford (Planning Team Leader, West), and Bertram Smith (Broadcasting Officer)

### **198 Chair's announcements**

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

### **199 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Bretherton, Ali Gordon-Creed, who was substituted for Councillor James Norman, Axel Macdonald, Ben Manning, and Sam James-Lawrie.

### **200 Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 and 16 April 2024 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

### **201 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **202 Urgent business**

There was no urgent business.

## **203 Public participation**

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

## **204 P23/S0582/FUL - Satwell House, Satwell, RG9 4RB**

The committee deliberated conducting a site visit for the application. As they could not determine the exact impact the development would have on the area and the national landscape, they agreed that a site visit should be held.

**RESOLVED:** that consideration of application P23/S0582/FUL be deferred in order to allow for a site visit to take place.

## **205 P22/S3126/FUL - Steven Orton Antiques, Shirburn Road, Watlington, OX49 5BZ**

The committee considered planning application P22/S3126/FUL for the redevelopment of part of the site at Shirburn Road, Watlington for the erection of 25 age restricted dwellings (for people aged 55 and over), including communal facilities, landscaping and parking, on land at Steven Orton Antiques, Shirburn Road, Watlington.

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 Pyrton Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the applicant had submitted a construction traffic management plan since the publication of the agenda and that it was accepted by the local highway's authority with minor additions. For this reason, the planning officer confirmed that suggested condition 10 on the approval of the application should be changed to a compliance condition referencing that plan.

The planning officer detailed the surroundings to the site, noting that Watlington was to the south, that the area to the west had been given resolution to grant outline permission for 100 dwellings, and the broader area of the site itself. The current application site had permission for a care home, but permission was being sought for the replacement of that facility with 25 age restricted units.

On the units themselves, the planning officer considered that they were in keeping with the design, scale, and layout of the existing age restricted units in the adjacent site and were acceptable. She also noted that a financial viability assessment had been submitted which indicated that affordable housing provision or contribution was not viable for the scheme, and that this was supported by the council's own independent viability assessment. The planning officer also demonstrated the need for accommodation for over 55's in the district.

In response to submitted comments on the application requesting that the care home should be retained, the planning officer clarified that having a preferred scheme was

not grounds on which to refuse another scheme, and that each should be judged on its own merits.

Overall, as the development was supported by both the local plan and the neighbourhood plan, and that there were no objections from technical consultees, she recommended that the application be approved.

Colin Ludlow spoke on behalf of Pyrton Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Matthew Parry, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked about the point raised by the parish council, that the application was not in conformity with the neighbourhood plan. In response, the planning officer noted that neighbourhood plan policy only had limits on housing density which adversely affected the character of the area, and that as she considered that this application would not do that, the neighbourhood plan would not be opposed to the development. In addition, she highlighted that the amount of housing suggested for the site from the neighbourhood plan was derived from a resident's survey and were not based on what the site could actually accommodate or on any basis of need. The planning officer also brought members' attention to the fact that the previously approved care home on the site was a material consideration.

On a question about footpaths, the planning officer confirmed that a safe footway would link the site to Watlington. She also clarified a point about the site and confirmed that it was actually a brownfield site and that the character of the area was influenced by the approved edge road and 100 unit housing development site near the proposed development.

Members discussed the Watlington neighbourhood plan and whether the development was in conformity with its policies. Overall, they felt that there were no material planning grounds in the plan to refuse the application as both the density and amenity space provided were policy compliant.

Members also indicated that they believed Oxfordshire to be oversubscribed with care homes and in need of assisted living housing, so they welcomed the developments.

As it was a brownfield site, with an already approved application for a care home on the site, they accepted that the principle of development was acceptable. Furthermore, as they could see no other material planning reasons to refuse the application, 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 P22/S3126/FUL, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement for the infrastructure contributions and obligations identified in the report and the following conditions:

1. Commencement within three years

2. Develop in accordance with approved plans
3. Sample materials to be submitted
4. Tree planting in hard surface areas
5. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
6. Landscape Management Plan to be submitted
7. Archaeology to be carried out in accordance with approved WSI
8. Noise mitigation to be submitted
9. Construction Method Statement to be submitted
10. Construction Traffic Management Plan compliance
11. Cycle parking
12. Tree Protection as approved
13. Biodiversity enhancements to be approved
14. Car parking provided as approved
15. Vehicle electric charging points to be submitted
16. Travel Plan and Travel Information Pack to be submitted
17. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) compliance
18. Development to be carried out in accordance with Remediation Strategy
19. Confirmation of any unsuspected contamination
20. Energy Statement and carbon reduction measures and Verification
21. Details of external lighting
22. Surface water drainage as approved
23. Foul water drainage as approved

Contaminated Land Informative  
CIL Informative  
S106 Informative

## **206 P24/S0925/S73 - Sandy Acre, Woodperry Road, Beckley, OX3 9UY**

The committee considered planning application P24/S0925/S73 for the variation of condition 14 of P20/S4112/FUL - to vary the point at which the existing bungalow is required to be demolished to be based upon completion of the second, rather than first, home permitted on site. Planning application for (phased) erection of two dwellinghouses with gardens, parking, and ancillary works in replacement of existing bungalow (alternative proposal to permitted house and garage P20/S1555/FUL), on land at Sandy Acre, Woodperry Road, Beckley.

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 committee by the objection of Beckley and Stowood Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application proposed a variation in the wording of a condition on the previously approved application for the site in order to change the trigger for the demolition of an existing bungalow. The existing decision notice linked the demolition to the occupation of the first dwelling built on the site, whereas the application intended to amend the wording to link the demolition to the completion of the second dwelling.

In response to this, the planning officer concluded that it could be possible to occupy the dwelling without it ever being considered completed. For this reason, he

recommended that the revised wording of the condition be that demolition would be required within a month of completion or occupation of the second dwelling, whichever came first.

As the planning officer was satisfied that the suggested wording would ensure that only two dwellings could ever be occupied or completed on the site, he recommended that the application be approved.

Councillor Ginette Camps-Walsh spoke on behalf of Beckley and Stowood Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Dom Hodsworth and Sian Jeffrey spoke objecting to the application.

David Burson, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked for clarification into the proposed wording, and the planning officer clarified the amendment to members, responding that demolition of the bungalow would be required within one month of either the completion or occupation of the second dwelling on the site, whichever was soonest. He also assured the committee that this would prevent use of all three dwellings on the site at one time, although noting that during construction three buildings would be on site.

The committee discussed the previous application on the site and noted the council's decision to require the bungalow to be demolished. They also highlighted that the end result of the approval of the application would be that the site would only contain two dwellings, just that demolition would be triggered by the occupation or completion of second house rather than the first.

Some members indicated that the wording of the condition on the previous approval was sufficient. However, the committee agreed that the applicant had a right to submit the application and that the council would seek to work constructively with all applicants, while maintaining the spirit of the initial condition. For this reason, they agreed that the application should be approved.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P24/S0925/S73, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. Materials in accordance with approved P21/S0823/DIS application
3. Surface water drainage works in accordance with approved P21/S0823/DIS application
4. Foul drainage works in accordance with approved P21/S0823/DIS application
5. Landscaping Scheme in accordance with approved P21/S0823/DIS application
6. Improvements to access
7. Reduce Gravel Spread onto Highway
8. Provide parking & Manoeuvring Areas

9. Gates/carriageway
10. Withdrawal of Permitted Development (Part 1 Class A and Class E) – no extensions/outbuildings etc
11. Wildlife Protection (mitigation as approved)
12. Archaeological Watching Brief
13. Demolish specified buildings before occupation or completion \*
14. Phasing as approved

## **207 P24/S0307/FUL - National Westminster Bank, 18 Market Place, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 2AP**

The committee considered planning application P24/S0307/FUL for the proposed reinstatement of residential entrance door to vestibule, retention of a retail unit on the ground floor, construction of a new extension to accommodate a stair and lift, six new residential flats on the ground, first and second floors, including associated rear terraces and conversion of existing attic space, and new in-line roof tile vents to the main roof, and new rooflights to the rear slope of the main roof, on land at National Westminster Bank, 18 Market Place, 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 access to proposed flat would be through an entrance at front and an additional staircase would be provided to access the upper stories and would be housed in the proposed extension.

Concerns about the development were noted as relating to the impact on the neighbours, the lack of refuse bins, lack of parking, poor amenity space, and that it was uncharacteristic with the area. However, the planning officer indicated that the principle of development was acceptable and that there were no detrimental impacts on character and appearance of the area.

The planning officer informed the committee that the local highways authority had no objection to the application, including on the amount of parking provided, nor did the waste team regarding the refuse aspects of the development. For these reasons, he recommended that planning permission be granted.

Tom Buckley spoke on behalf of Henley-on-Thames Town Council, objecting to the application.

Rhian Woods, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee asked about the design of the apartments and if there was additional ventilation required and the planning officer confirmed that there was a ventilation condition attached to the approval of the application. In addition, he noted that building regulations would cover the effectiveness of that condition.

In response to a question about if the building was of specific architectural merit, the planning officer confirmed that it was not listed but was considered a building of local note in the neighbourhood plan.

He also highlighted that the units conformed with national space standards, and that the local plan was not specific on the space needed for conversion of town centre units into residential accommodation.

In order to better understand the proposal and any implications it might have with overlooking the neighbouring properties, a site visit was proposed. However, members agreed that the officer's report provided sufficient information in order to determine the application.

A motion, moved and seconded, to defer the item for a site visit was not carried upon being put to the vote.

Members discussed the neighbourhood plan and noted that it referenced parking and the provision of cycle parking, something absent in the application. The committee also agreed that the plans for the collection and disposal of waste was a concern, despite the waste team having no objection. Some members also indicated that six flats in the building would be an overdevelopment of the site.

However, as the committee recognised the sustainable location of the development as it was in a town centre, that there was no objection from the waste team, and that the flats all met nationally prescribed space standards, they did not believe these to be sufficient grounds for refusal.

Although some members believed the development to be overlooking of the neighbouring property and potentially resulting in a loss of privacy, this was not agreed by the committee. Although the lack of cycle storage and concerns around waste remained, the committee agreed that overall, these factors were not sufficient grounds alone to refuse the application.

A motion, moved and seconded, to refuse the application was not carried on being put to the vote.

Overall, the committee could not see any material planning reasons to refuse the application as they did not believe the application to negatively impact neighbouring amenity by overlooking and due to the lack of objections from technical consultees.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P24/S0307/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Mechanical ventilation
5. Noise mitigation
6. Rooflights (flush fitting)

## **208 P24/S0433/FUL - Unit 8, Goodson Industrial Mews, Wellington Street, Thame, OX9 3BX**

The committee considered planning application P24/S0433/FUL for the change of use of existing storage/light industrial unit from B8 to E(D), on land at Unit 8, Goodson Industrial Mews, Wellington Street, 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 Thame Town Council had opposed the application as they considered it to result in a loss of employment on the site. However, through the granting of permission to turn the site into a gym, the planning officer believed that the site would remain an employment site and contribute a variety of services to the town.

As the planning officer considered there to be no adverse impacts of the development on the conservation area or neighbouring amenity, and that there had been no objection from the local highway's authority, he recommended that the application be approved.

The committee asked about the objection from Thame Town Council and the planning officer confirmed that the use of the site as a private gym with Class E use would create employment. In addition, on a point about if the granting of the change of use could be used to turn the site into another type of use, the planning officer responded that they had conditioned restricted use to a gym or internal leisure activity and that any other use would require an additional consent.

Overall, as the committee could see no material reasons to refuse the application, they agreed that it should be approved, subject to condition.

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

**RESOLVED:** to approve planning application P24/S0433/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
4. Specified use within Use Class
5. Cycle Parking Facilities
6. Travel Plan Statement
7. Noise Control-Sound insulation scheme-Noise from inside building

## **209 Appeals information**



The committee received the appeals information report, presented by the planning team leader. This report detailed the planning appeals started and decided for April 2024.

The committee were satisfied with the report and agreed to note the appeal information report.

The meeting closed at 8.23 pm

---

This page is intentionally left blank