

Minutes

OF A MEETING OF THE



Listening Learning Leading

Planning Committee

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 29 OCTOBER 2025 AT 6.00 PM
MEETING ROOM 1, ABBEY HOUSE, ABBEY CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 3JE

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: David Bretherton (Chair), Peter Dragonetti (Vice-Chair), Ken Arlett, Tim Bearder, Ali Gordon-Creed, Ben Higgins, Katherine Keats-Rohan, James Norman and Ed Sadler.

Officers: Adrian Duffield (Head of Planning), Andy Heron (Planning and Development Officer), Simon Kitson (Planning and Development Officer), Paul Lucas (Senior Planning Officer), Matthew Williams (Democratic Services Officer) and Tom Wyatt (Team Leader – Applications East)

Remote attendance:

Officers: Susie Royse (Broadcasting Officer)

182 Chair's announcements

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

183 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Axel Macdonald and Councillor Crispin Topping.

184 Minutes of the previous meeting (to follow)

The minutes of the meeting held on 08 October 2025 were not available and as such would be agreed at a future meeting.

185 Declarations of interest

The Head of Planning declared a personal interest in application P25/S0547/O and advised they would leave the room for that item

Councillor Arlett advised that he knew the objectors for application P24/S3947/FUL but advised that he had not discussed the application with them and was not predetermined.

186 Urgent business

There was no urgent business.

187 Public participation

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

188 P24/S1287/FUL - Land to the rear of The Paddock, Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor, OX39 4GR

The committee considered planning application P24/S1287/FUL.

Hybrid planning application seeking:

A) Full planning permission for the erection of two detached two-storey self/custom build dwellings with access, parking and amenity space (plots 2 and 4).

B) Outline planning permission for the erection of two detached two-storey self/custom build dwellings with access, parking and amenity space (Plots 1 and 3).

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The proposal was for a hybrid application seeking full planning permission for the erection of two self, custom build dwellings, and outline planning permission for a further two self, custom build dwellings with all matters reserved except for access.

The officer considered that the proposal would extend the existing built-up limit of the settlement in a north-westerly direction, therefore conflicting with the development plan housing distribution strategy. The officers further considered that the visual impact of the proposed development, on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, would be acceptable. The committee were advised that the outdoor amenity space was in line with the design guide recommended standards for dwellings of this size.

The local highway authority advised that the proposed access and parking arrangements would not give rise to conditions that would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety.

The committee were advised that as this was a self, custom build application, biodiversity net gain was not applicable. However, the ecological impact of the development could be mitigated through the imposition of planning conditions to ensure no net loss of biodiversity.

The officers considered that in this case it would not be reasonable to impose a specific housing mix, as self and custom build housing permissions would need to meet the requirements of the self, custom builders and therefore the market need would be distinct from typical market housing.

Matters related to drainage, landscaping and carbon reduction could be dealt with through the recommended conditions to the satisfaction of relevant specialist officers.

The members were reminded that the Council could not demonstrate a five-year deliverable supply of housing. The Council also had a shortfall in the provision of self-build or custom-build housing to meet the demand on the register.

The officer advised that the tilted balance would apply and having applied a balancing exercise, it was considered that the degree of conflict with the development plan and the

level of harm caused would be limited. The adverse impact of allowing development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and as such the presumption in favour of sustainable development would apply.

The officer recommended that the committee delegate the granting of full and outline planning permission to the Head of Planning, subject to the completion of the legal agreement to secure the construction and occupation of the self or custom build dwellings, subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Members were advised that representatives of Chinnor Parish Council had not been able to attend the meeting but had sent a statement which had been circulated to the committee.

Jake Collinge, JCPC (Agent) spoke in support of the application.

Members queried whether the lack of sufficient self-build plots was part of the reason why the application was recommended for approval and the officer confirmed that this was correct. Members countered that the Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan did not cite a need for self-build properties and were reminded that housing need is considered on a district wide basis.

Members asked for clarity as to what the conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan was and were advised that the development would extend the built limit of the settlement however it would still be within the development boundary.

Members queried what would happen if the two plots in outline were not built. The committee were advised that if the outline application would need to have the reserved matters considered, if this was not applied for then the permission would expire.

The committee considered that the application was against policy set out in the Chinnor Neighbourhood plan

The committee acknowledged the importance of the tilted balance and the lack of five-year housing land supply.

The committee also acknowledged that the conflict caused by this development was not great, however they further commented on the lack of infrastructure to support the number of new developments that have taken place in Chinnor over recent years. The lack of safe active travel routes was also highlighted.

The committee commented that while the proposed site was in the development boundary, it was not a site that had been designated for development.

A motion, moved and seconded to refuse planning permission for application P24/S1287/FUL, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to refuse planning permission for application P24/S1287/FUL as the proposed development was on a site not allocated for residential development and would extend the existing built-up limits of the settlement in a north-westerly direction. As such, the proposal would conflict with the development plan housing distribution strategy as set out by Policies STRAT1, H1, H12 and H16 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 and Policies CH H1 and CH H7 of the Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2035. Having regard to paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts

with the neighbourhood plan would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing four self-build or custom-build dwellings

189 P24/S3947/FUL - Land between 7 and 9 Cromwell Road, Henley-on-Thames, RG9 1JH

The committee considered planning application P24/S3947/FUL.

New self-build detached 2-bedroom dwelling house.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The application was for full planning permission for a two-bed dwelling within an area of sloping land between 7 and 9 Cromwell Road in Henley. The site was not within a designated conservation area or the National Landscape. The site was not within flood zone two or three but was in an area that had been identified as at risk of surface water flooding.

Existing and proposed site plans were shown, with the design intended to address the narrowness of the plot and the topographical variations across the site.

The site would have a reasonable amount of amenity space with approximately 75 square metres to the rear. Parking provision was considered acceptable in the location as confirmed by the Highway Authority.

Plans showing the proposed gap between the neighbouring properties were shown and it was stated that the proposed form and spacing between the dwellings was not out of keeping with the overall character of the area which included a range of property sizes and plot widths.

The proposed development would be tiered at the rear, with some excavation needed. The drainage design had involved extensive discussions and feedback from the Council's specialist drainage engineer. Multiple technical drainage reports had been submitted and included site specific percolation testing. The final drainage proposal was considered acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

Plans showing separation distances to the property to the rear were shown.

Impact of the proposed dwelling on the neighbours was deemed to be to secondary rooms rather than primary living spaces. The BRE report accompanying the application concluded that the light levels to all normal habitable rooms would be within acceptable levels.

The proposed property would have a privacy screen on the first-floor rear windows and additional boundary treatments were to be determined. A plan was shown detailing the distance between the proposed property and a window to the dwelling to the rear of the site. The distance on the plan was 21 metres but was at an angle looking across the garden of Number 7 Cromwell Road. The existing vegetation on the site would provide significant screening. The proposal also included tree planting in the proposed garden area which would provide further mitigation.

To prevent any loss of privacy a condition had been included to withdraw permitted development rights for any extension of outbuildings.

The officer summarized that the scheme was considered acceptable in terms of its visual relationship and built form and would not materially harm the surrounding properties. As such the proposal was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Steve Lambert spoke as representative of Henley-on-Thames Town Council.

Andrew Gadsby and Nick Waldon spoke against the application.

Sam Tisdall and Colin Braithwaite spoke in support of the application.

Members queried the 21 metre distance to the window to the dwelling to the rear of the site and asked why it was less than the 25 metres set out in the design guide. The committee were advised that the 25 metre guide was meant to apply to directly facing windows, whereas this one was at an angle looking across the garden of Number 7 Cromwell Road. The committee were also reminded that there would be planting added to the rear garden to aid with screening.

Members acknowledged that this was a challenging application but stated that there was not a planning reason to refuse it.

Members further acknowledged that it was important to have different types of dwellings for single individuals or those who need a smaller dwelling.

Members stated that they felt reassured by the work done by officers and the information provided, specifically relating to concerns raised over the soak-away.

A motion, moved and seconded to grant planning permission P24/S3947/FUL, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission P24/S3947/FUL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Commencement 3 years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Schedule of Materials
4. Energy Statement Verification
5. Landscaping (incl boundary treatment)
6. Integrated Biodiversity Enhancements (prior to slab level)
7. Parking & Manoeuvring Areas Retained
8. Drainage Scheme Implementation
9. Air Source Heat Pump MCS Certification
10. Privacy mitigation
11. Obscure glazing
12. Withdrawal of P.D. (Part 1 Class A) – no extensions etc
13. EV charging point

190 P25/S1415/FUL and P25/S1416/LB - Morland House, Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4QA

The committee considered planning application P25/S1415/FUL and P25/S1416/LB.

Change of use from commercial, business and service (UE class E) to dwellinghouses (use class C3) for the creation of three self-contained flats within Morland House.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The application was for full planning permission and listed building consent for the conversion of the office buildings into three flats. The listed building consent was sought for the associated works to part of the adjoining listed building.

The application was identical to a previous 2022 permission which had expired earlier this year. The application had been brought to committee due to the objection of Chinnor Parish Council.

Since the previous application it had been determined that planning permission was not required for the conversion of the main building into two residential flats and this had been confirmed by the prior approval process earlier in the year.

In contrast to the permitted development scheme, the proposed scheme would include communal amenity space in excess of the 40 square meters recommended by the design guide.

The Highway Authority were satisfied with the level of parking and raised no objection.

The committee were advised that there were no material changes in the relevant development plan requirements against which the previous application had been assessed. There were material planning considerations which outweighed the conflict with both the development plan and the neighbourhood plan covering loss of employment, as was the case with the previously approved scheme.

The conservation officer had considered the proposal and felt that the scheme would better respect the significance of the listed building which was originally for residential use and outwardly had the appearance of a dwelling.

Photos of the site were shown.

The site would be partially landscaped to accommodate the amenity area, bike storage and parking.

The application was recommended for approval.

Members commented that there was no viable public transport in the area, and the development would add to the number of cars traversing an already congested town.

Members acknowledged the objection of Chinnor Parish Council and the loss of employment but were also aware of the extant prior approval under permitted development which was supported by the Parish Council in 2022.

A motion, moved and seconded to grant planning permission P25/S1415/FUL and listed building consent P25/S1416/LB, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to grant planning permission P25/S1415/FUL and listed building consent P25/S1416/LB, subject to the following conditions:
Planning Permission:

1. Commencement 3 years – Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans
3. Materials as on plan
4. Parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained
5. Cycle parking details to be provided

Listed Building Consent:

1. Commencement 3 years – Listed Building Consent
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials as on plan

191 P25/S1091/FUL - 81 and land to the rear of 79-83 Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor, OX39 4EA

The committee considered planning application P25/S1091/FUL.

Demolition of 1 dwellinghouse and erection of 10 new dwellings.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The application was for full planning permission for the demolition of one dwelling and the erection of ten dwellings. Following publication of the report being published, the applicant had lodged an appeal with the planning inspectorate under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Acts 1990 for non-determination. As such the committee would be unable to determine the application and were instead requested to make a resolution stating what the decision would have been for the purposes of the appeal.

The committee were advised that it was a material planning consideration that there was an extant planning permission on the site for the erection of nine dwellings.

The extant planning permission was identical to the current application apart from the inclusion of plot ten in the form of a two-bedroom bungalow which would replace the approved wildflower area.

Planning permission had previously been refused for the erection of ten dwellings. A subsequent appeal was dismissed on the grounds that a two-storey dwelling on plot ten would be harmful to the living conditions of 85 Lower Icknield Way.

Due to the principle of development and the layout of the development having been established by the appeal decisions, the key issue for consideration was the addition of the bungalow on plot ten.”

Officers considered the visual impact on the character and appearance of the locality would be acceptable. While plot ten would have a poor relationship with the adjoining silver birch trees at 85 Lower Icknield Way, the Council’s tree officer considered that the trees were of insufficient quality to warrant a Tree Preservation Order.

Photos of the proposal site were shown.

The additional level of domestic vehicle activity associated with the proposed development would not be sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission, and parking and access arrangements for plot ten were considered acceptable by the Highway Authority.

The provision of a two-bedroom dwelling would add to the mixture of two- to four-bedroom dwellings in the development as a whole and would further contribute to the district wide housing need.

Matters related to access and parking, mandatory biodiversity net gain, ecology, tree protection, landscaping, flood risk and drainage, and climate change could all be dealt with through planning conditions.

The application, were it available for a decision, would have been recommended that planning permission be granted.

Members queried whether there would be any affordable houses on the development and were advised that as there would only be a net gain of nine dwellings it fell below the threshold for requiring affordable units.

Members requested clarification as to why the original appeal for ten properties on the site, was refused and were advised that it was purely down to the property on plot ten overlooking 85 Lower Icknield Way. As this application was for a bungalow on plot ten, that reason was no longer valid and it was the opinion of officers that this addressed the concerns of the planning inspector.

A motion, moved and seconded to recommend that planning permission P25/S1091/FUL would have been granted was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to recommend that planning permission P25/S1091/FUL would have been granted.

192 P25/S0547/O - 10 Queens Avenue, Wallingford, OX10 0NB

The committee considered planning application P25/S0547/O.

Outline application for the erection of nine dwellings (comprising three pairs of two-storey semi-detached dwellings (Plots 3 - 8) and three detached chalet-style dwellings (Plots 1, 2 & 9)) together with access, parking and amenity space (amended access and ecological information received 30 April 2025 and 20 May 2025).

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The committee were advised that an additional condition had been recommended by the Council's ecology officer to ensure that habitat monitoring and monitoring plan were submitted to ensure that development delivers on site biodiversity net gain.

The committee were further advised that there was a typographical error in the report at paragraph 7.6, which stated the Council's housing land supply was at 4.2 years, this should have read as 4.5 years.

The application had been referred to committee following objections from Wallingford Town Council relating to highway safety and access, biodiversity concerns, and over-development of the site.

The application was for outline planning permission for nine chalet style dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access and layout. An application was previously refused by officers and dismissed at appeal based on the amenity of future occupants, with the

inspector determining that the development was acceptable in terms of highway safety, access layout and drainage. The appeal decision would carry significant weight.

The committee were advised that all other issues beyond the amenity of future occupants should not be revisited.

To overcome the previous refusal reason, the proposed dwellings to the west of the site had been moved 1.4 metres further away from the eastern boundary. While only indicative at this stage, the chalet style of the proposed dwellings had been chosen to help reduce any impact in terms of privacy.

Indicative site plans were shown.

No objections had been received from specialist officers. The Council's tree officer had raised a concern in relation to soft landscaping and how this would be achieved but as landscaping would be a reserve matter it was not for consideration under the outline application.

Craig Wright spoke against the application.

Jake Collinge spoke in support of the application.

A motion, moved and seconded to have a site visit was carried on being put to the vote:

RESOLVED: to defer consideration of application P25/S0547/O to allow time for a site visit to be carried out.

193 Appeals information

The committee received the appeal information report from the head of planning.

The committee agreed to note the report.

The meeting closed at 8.18 pm

Chair

Date