



MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 2nd OCTOBER 2018 AT 8PM IN THE WEST ROOM

Present

Councillors:

Andrew McAuley (AM) - Chairman
Rob Smith (RS) – Vice-Chairman
Matt Reid (MR)
Ian Hill (IH)
Fergus Lapage (FL)
Tom Bindoff (TB)
Terry Jackson (TJ)
Jeremy Bell (JB)

Co-opted Members:

Peter Richardson

Officer:

Rachel Gill

Members of the Public:

3

1. Apologies for Absence
Tony Powell (TP)
2. Minutes of the meetings held on 4th September and 18th September have not been agreed by the Committee
Resolved: That minutes be agreed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.
3. Declarations of Interest
None
4. Matters Arising
None
5. To consider the following applications :

P18/S27992/HH 24a High Street, Watlington

Front single storey extension, two storey side extension including removal of existing roof raising of pitch to create accommodation in newly created roof space and installation of dormer and roof light , removal of main house roof raising roof pitch and eaves level to create accommodation in newly created roof space and installation of dormers. Velux windows, PV/Thermal panels, conversion of part of existing double garage to studio.

Vote: 7 in favour, 1 abstention

NO OBJECTION

P18/S3123/HH Abbotts Farm, Greenfield, Christmas Common

Side two storey extension, with front single storey extensions, new porch and main entrance. Link to existing triple garage and single storey rear extension.

Vote: 8 in favour

NO OBJECTION

P18/S2868/HH Pemberley, Howe Hill, Watlington

Erection of single storey extension (Orangery) to the rear of the property.

Vote: 7 in favour, 1 abstention

NO OBJECTION

P18/S2879/LB The Old Brewery Tap, 3 Shirburn Street, Watlington

Proposed new fascia signage

P18/S2797/A The Old Brewery Tap, 3 Shirburn Street, Watlington

Proposed new fascia signage

Vote: 8 in favour

NO OBJECTION

P18/S2822/FUL Land to the south of Northend Road, Christmas Common

Change of use to the existing barn to a residential dwelling and modifications to facilities to change of use.

Judy Crockett asked to speak on this application.

She objected strongly to this application.

The field was originally used for farming and was split into 2 paddocks. This site was used for grazing of conservation breed sheep. At this time an existing polytunnel was replaced with a lambing shed for general agricultural purposes. The rare breed sheep failed and the lambing shed was never used. The paddock was then used for horses and the shed as stabling. A large lean to and fencing were added – contrary to the Chilterns Design Guide.

NPPF para79 is quoted and this implies a redundant building, however this building is still in use and will still be needed for any grazing animals using the land. This application will not enhance or conserve the site, will set a precedent and may add to light pollution. The field is isolated and not earmarked for housing, it also extends the limits of a settlement in the AONB. It will not be affordable and is contrary to policies.

AM invited questions on this application.

PR asked if the applicant was known? He added that it was not in a settlement and that NPPF para 79 really referred to small complexes of redundant farm buildings and it was difficult to see how it satisfies all that is needed. Highly speculative, modest but in the wrong place.

TB agreed that the application did not comply with para 79.

IH agreed and suspected that if built the house may increase in size.

RS asked about when the polytunnel was built (pre1991) and when the barn was built (2009). He felt that this confirmed that the building was neither traditional or long established.

MR asked about what the site could be used for? Judy Crockett said grazing.

JB added that this application was about change of use and felt that it was against all policy and there were no supporting arguments.

AM added 2 points of clarification :

1. The individual applying is not the same person who built the barn, it is a different owner.
2. There was no application for a change of use to equestrian so in theory the use as a lambing shed is redundant.

Vote: 7 against, 1 abstention.

OBJECTION.

This application does not comply with NPPF para 79, it is not a redundant building. It is neither traditional or long established. It extends the limits of a settlement in the AONB and does not enhance or protect the site. It also represents a change of use and it not supported by policy.

P18/S2922/LB 37 Brook Street, Watlington
Proposed rear Orangery

P18/S2921/HH37 Brook Street, Watlington
Proposed rear Orangery

There was some discussion over materials proposed for the orangery.
For both applications:

Vote: 5 in favour, 2 objections

NO OBJECTION with the Conditions that:

WPC endorses the comments of the conservation officer.

"I am not clear from the submitted floor and block plans how the proposed extension will sit in relation to the neighbouring properties. I note that No.39 has recently benefited from an extension. How will this proposal sit against this. The use of UPVC in the extension is not in my view acceptable. I recommend that traditionally profiled timber windows, doors and rooflights are used and metal rainwater goods. The roof material similarly should be upgraded to something more traditional such as standing seam zinc to imitate the appearance of a lead rolled roof. I think that the loss of the rear window and door is unlikely to be objectionable in heritage terms however I would like the age of the this part to be clarified and justified. I am also unsure whether the curtilage listed boundary wall would be affected by this proposal" Emily Karau Conservation and Design Officer

While we may be in support of this application WPC would welcome improvements to the design to create a less off-the-shelf solution to one more in sympathy with the Conservation Area and the Watlington Design Guide.

P18/S3180/HH Eastfield Farm, Shirburn Road, Watlington
Demolish existing two storey element and replacement with new two storey extension.

Vote: 7 in favour, 1 abstention

NO OBJECTION

Additional Application :

P18/S3220/D Demolition of Harewood House following Fire Damage

Vote: 7 in favour, 1 abstention

NO OBJECTION

6. To consider the following Amendments

P18/S1902/O The Bungalow, Shirburn Road, Watlington
Amendment No 3 – dated 6 September 2018

Demolition of existing house and erection of up to four starter units plus associated infrastructure. All matters reserved. (Trip report received 23 July 2018 & Contaminated Land Questionnaire received 28 August 2018).(Amended indicative site layout submitted for up to 4 dwellings and description changed to reflect that. A plan showing vision splays has also been submitted on 6 September 2018).

There was some discussion on this application.

Vote: 8 objections.

OBJECTION

The main concerns were :

- the trip report is still incorrect
- the contamination report is wrong
- it is isolated from the village
- access along the narrow footpath to the village is unsafe

- a design for the whole plot (with PYR1) would be preferable
- nothing has changed from the initial application

7. Decisions

<u>Application</u>	<u>SODC Decision</u>	<u>WPC Recommendation</u>
P18/S2608/HH 3 Davenport Place	Planning Permission is GRANTED	No Objection

8. Planning Committee Training Meeting

AM said that the aim of this training is to bring more detail on how the WNDP effects planning decisions. A detailed response was done for the Archstone application but it would be useful to look at more examples, including small sites.

He suggested that the NPAB (Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Board) give some advice on Key Policies and talk through/role play through some applications. TP/PR will have prepared their document on WNDP Policies. FP suggested inviting someone from SODC to attend to find out what our role is and how they can help. PR has spoken to Emma Bowerman and she likes the idea of cross-referencing against policies. FP also suggested whether the group would benefit from a wider look at the law and training.

AM suggested mid January as a date for this.

AM said he would also like to invite OCC Highways.

JB added that the designs for large sites were still disappointing and that attention to detail was important, especially if SODC will pass the designs – we have to up our game.

TB added that given JB’s comment could we get an SODC design person to attend ?

FP asked whether councillors not on planning should attend ? it was felt that this would be useful.

AM to work through the details of this and come up with a plan of topics and whether it would be 2 x half days or 1 day.

9. Correspondence There was no correspondence

8. Any Other Business

PR gave an update on the Edge Road. He added that SODC Cabinet are due to make a decision on whether Chalgrove will be included in the local plan or not on the 6th December. This would be ratified on the 20th December so it may go ahead in January if chosen.

THERE BEING NO OTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 9:27PM