

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee



held on Wednesday 17 July 2024 at
6.30 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, Ali Gordon-Creed, Katharine Keats-Rohan, Axel Macdonald and Ed Sadler
Officers: Paula Fox (Development Manager), Simon Kitson (Planning Officer), Caitlin Phillpotts (Planning Officer), and Darius Zarazel (Democratic Services Officer)
Guests: Councillor Kellie Hinton

Remote attendance:

Officers: Paul Lucas (Senior Planning Officer) and Susie Royce (Broadcasting Officer)

10 Chair's announcements

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

11 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Bearder, Jo Robb, and Zia Mohammed.

12 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2024 as a correct record and agree that the Chair sign these as such.

13 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

14 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

15 Public participation

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

16 P24/S0998/S73 - Stable Yard to East of Chinnor Road, Chinnor Road, Towersey, OX9 3QY

The committee considered planning application P24/S0998/S73 for the variation of conditions 2 (approved plans), 4 (Surface water drainage works (details required), 5 (Surface water management plan (details required) and 7 (Foul drainage works (details required) on application P23/S2754/FUL (as amended by plans and information received 29 April and 20 May 2024) (proposed demolition of existing equestrian buildings and erection of two detached three bedroom houses with associated parking and amenity space provision. Creation of new shared vehicular access), on land at Stable Yard to East of Chinnor Road, Chinnor Road, Towersey.

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 Towersey Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the site contained four single storey buildings sited near existing residential developments previously used in connection to private equestrian use. She also indicated that the site was within the village boundary and that permission existed on the site for the change of use into two dwellings, subject to drainage conditions.

The application sought to amend the existing permission with a revised plan to plot 1, including an increased gable height of 400mm and the creation of an additional gable to the rear, and an amendment to drainage conditions. The planning officer confirmed that she did not consider that the proposed change to the dwelling would significantly alter the form, scale, or massing of the scheme as a whole, including from when it was viewed from public vantage points. She also confirmed that the additional rear gable would be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

On the position of the dwellings, the planning officer indicated that the proposal would have some impact on the natural light to the neighbour to the north, at Croft Cottage. However, as the dwellings would be set back and at least 1.5 metres from the shared boundary, she considered that it would not cause significant harm. The planning officer also brought the committees attention to a light study which found that there would be no measurable increased impact on light outlook for the neighbour.

The planning officer also highlighted that a suggested condition on the approval of the application would be for the windows on the northwest elevation of plot 1 to be obscure glazed and fixed shut. She also noted that the drainage engineer had no objection to the revised drainage conditions subject to compliance conditions and that all other matters, such as highways, had not been changed since the approved application.

Overall, as there were no objections from technical consultees and the impact to the neighbours would be minimal, the planning officer recommended that the application be approved.

Tim Shreeve spoke on behalf of Towersey Parish Council, objecting to the application.

The committee discussed the proposed plots and compared them to the position of the plots across the street, noting that the proposed positioning of the dwellings was normal for the area. On a question about how much of an impact the proposals would have on light reaching the northern neighbour at Croft Cottage, the planning officer confirmed that she did not believe it would be significant.

Although some members were concerned about the impact that the proposal would have on the privacy of the resident of Croft Cottage and the light that they would receive, the committee did not believe that the shading was significant and so was not a reason to refuse the application. As both of the proposed dwellings were set back from Croft Cottage, and as the committee could see no material planning reasons to refuse the application, they agreed to approve the 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 P24/S0998/S73, subject to the following conditions:

1. Time Limit - Variation of Condition
2. Approved plans
3. Levels (details required)
4. Surface Water Drainage implementation
5. Foul Water drainage implementation
6. Ecology - Biodiversity Management Plan (details required)
7. Integrated Biodiversity Enhancements (prior to slab level)
8. Landscaping (including hardsurfacing and boundary treatment)
9. Energy Statement Verification
10. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
11. Wildlife Protection (construction phase as approved)
12. First floor windows and rooflights (specified cill level)
13. Materials as on plan
14. Natural stonework - traditional construction
15. Rooflights (flush fitting)
16. Cycle Parking Facilities
17. New vehicular access
18. Vision splay protection
19. Parking and Manoeuvring Areas Retained
20. Electric Vehicles Charging Point (implementation)
21. Domestic Solar panels
22. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition
23. INFORMATIVE - Drainage
24. INFORMATIVE - Works within the Highway
25. UNIQUE INFORMATIVE - Highways

26. EPS Licence Informative

27. INFORMATIVE - Towersey Neighbourhood Plan policies

17 P24/S0911/FUL - Land Adjoining Park House, Park View, Sydenham, OX39 4LQ

The committee considered planning application P24/S0911/FUL for the erection of a detached dwelling with parking and amenity space (additional photographs received 18th April 2024 and amended documents to revise the design received 28 May 2024), on land adjoining Park House, Park View, Sydenham.

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 Sydenham Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that, as the site was considered an infill development supported by the Local Plan and Sydenham Neighbourhood Plan, the principal of development was acceptable. He believed that the siting, scale, form, and detailing was sufficiently in keeping with the area.

The planning officer also highlighted that the access and parking for the site had not raised highways safety concerns and so the local highways authority had no objection. As matters such as ecology and drainage could be conditioned, the planning officer recommended that the application be approved.

Michael May spoke on behalf of Sydenham Parish Council, objecting to the application.

Iain Gray spoke objecting to the application.

Ian Slater, the agent representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee discussed the design and appearance of the proposed dwelling, noting its contemporary design and the use of vertical cedar external cladding. On a question about the cedar cladding and if similar examples existed in the area, the planning officer confirmed that it would be new to Sydenham. Members noted that the proposed development would be seen on the approach to Sydenham and that the choice of materials and design of the development would not only be out of keeping with the other properties in the area and negatively impact the character of the area, but would also be very visible from the public vantage points.

Although the committee accepted the principle of development on the site, they agreed that the design and materials of the proposal did not enhance or complement its surroundings and that it would be very prominent in the area. For these reasons the committee agreed that the proposal would not meet the design policies in the Local Plan or the Sydenham Neighbourhood Plan.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning application P24/S0911/FUL, for the following reasons:

The proposed development, in this edge of settlement location, would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of Sydenham East on account of its inappropriate design and materials and would thereby fail to sustain and enhance the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood area. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policies DES1 and DES2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and Policy SYD3 of the Sydenham Neighbourhood Plan 2034.

18 P24/S1731/HH - 5 Esther Carling Lane, Rotherfield Peppard, RG9 5PW

At this point in the meeting, Councillor Peter Dragonetti declared an interest in the application as he was close associates with an objector to the application. For this reason, he left the room when the item was discussed.

The committee considered planning application P24/S1731/HH for the conversion of existing garage into ancillary accommodation strictly for the use of the main dwellinghouse (amended plan received 3 July 2024 removing one first floor rooflight), on land at 5 Esther Carling Lane, Rotherfield Peppard.

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 local ward member, Councillor James Norman, and due to the objection of Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council.

The planning officer informed the committee that the application was for the conversion of a garage into ancillary living accommodation. Permission was sought to brick in the garage doors, with windows to the front and side, and he noted that permission was not needed for internal works. The planning officer highlighted that there would be no changes to the form of the garage and that it would continue to be visually subservient to the main dwelling, with space in the driveway that exceeded requirements.

The planning officer indicated that the front windows would be more than 10 metres from the nearest dwellings to the south and the roof light would be 15 metres to the nearest neighbouring garden. As these distances were acceptable, and as the planning officer considered that the proposed changes to the structure would also be acceptable, he recommended that the application be approved.

Graham Broadhurst spoke objecting to the application.

Simon Bower, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The committee enquired into the elevations of the design and the planning officer confirmed that the proposal was over two floors. On a question about the distance between the development and the nearest dwellings, the planning officer believed that it was a sufficient distance away and was still subservient to the main house through which it would be connected by the garden. The planning officer also clarified that, although the proposed ancillary dwelling was detached from the main dwelling, it was semi-detached to the neighbour's garage and that as long as it remained occupied by a family member it would be considered ancillary to the main dwelling.

Members discussed the impact on the character and appearance of the area that would result from the proposed development, and it was agreed that the proposal fundamentally changed the nature of the area through the garages conversion into a dwelling. The main issues identified by the committee included the bricking up of the garage door and the inclusion of windows on that elevation, and that these changes would result in a building fundamentally out of character with the area. In addition, despite being ancillary, members were concerned about the distance of the proposed development from the main property and that they believed this would result in it looking like a separate dwelling.

The covenant on the site was discussed but members accepted that this was not a material planning consideration.

The committee had regard to the semi-detached nature of the garage and the established character of the area, noting that no other garage conversions had been done on the estate. As the proposal would be out of keeping with the established character of the lane, the committee agreed to refuse the application.

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

RESOLVED: to refuse planning application P24/S1731/HH, for the following reasons:

The District Council considers that the extent of works to the existing building, which is separated from the main dwelling, would be tantamount to the creation of an independent unit of accommodation. The change to the function of the building and the external works creating new window openings on the front and side elevations, would result in a development fundamentally out of keeping with the prevailing character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies DES1 and DES2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035.

19 Appeals Information

The committee received the appeals information report from the head of planning. The development manager highlighted that the Council was performing well against the government performance measures.

In addition, she also noted that the Waterstock appeal would be decided by public inquiry on 15 October with the location to be confirmed.

Overall, the committee were satisfied with the council's appeal performance and agreed to note the report.

The meeting closed at 8.39 pm

This page is intentionally left blank