

## THAME TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee held on 18 October 2016 at 6.30pm In the Upper Chamber, Thame Town Hall.

**Present:** Cllrs B Austin, D Bretherton, P Cowell, M Deacock, N Dixon (Deputy Mayor), H Fickling (Chairman), C Jones, A Midwinter (Deputy Chairman) and M Stiles  
**Officers**  
G Markland, Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer  
A Oughton, Committee Services Officer

### 1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Dodds (Holiday) and Emery (Council Business).

### 2 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

Cllr Austin declared an interest in planning application P16/S3158/HH as a neighbour who lived close to the proposed development. Cllr Bretherton declared an interest in planning applications P16/S3187/FUL and P16/S3188/LB as a trustee of Thame Museum.

The Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer reminded Members of the general dispensation in place which allowed Council to discuss planning applications P16/S1954/RM, P16/3187/FUL and P16/S3188/LB related to land and property directly owned by the Town Council.

### 3 Public Participation and Public Questions

Lynn Palmer, architect spoke for planning application P16/S3165/HH. The site was tucked away behind the shops and could not be seen from the High Street but was partially visible from the car park behind the Co-op. The building was L-shaped and the proposal was to convert the loft on the southern wing to a bedroom with ensuite and storage. The existing pitch was extremely low at 22 degrees and the proposal would increase the pitch to 35 degrees and raise the ridge and lift the eaves up by a metre to enabling the space to be re-proportioned.

In 2014 permission was granted for the erection of two 2xbedroom dwellings with access from the car park behind the co-op, for which building had not yet begun. During pre-application discussions the District Planning department were supportive of the scheme but asked that evidence be submitted with the application to show there would be no undue issues with regard to loss of light from the proposal on the two dwellings yet to be built. Several sun diagrams had been submitted with the application to evidence that the proposal would not cause any issues with regard to light.

Lynn Palmer, also spoke for planning application P16/S3158/HH. The dwelling was located on a bend in Fanshawe Road with a double garage and ample parking space. The proposal is a simple one to convert half of the double garage to a family room with a link to the main house with very little impact on the current parking arrangements.

Mr Spiliotis spoke for planning application P16/S3160/HH as the Son-in-Law of the applicant. The site sits across from Elms Park and has a large garden with an existing annexe built in the 1970s. The proposal was to demolish the existing annexe and build a new light weight construction annexe at the bottom of the garden for Mr Spiliotis and his family with the intention that when his wife's parents wished to down size to a single storey dwelling the two families would switch between the annexe to the main dwelling at 30 Park Street.

The existing annexe with a pitched roof was built in the 1970s and has no architectural merit. The possibility of extending it was explored but was not found to be viable. The demolition of the existing annexe and moving the site to the bottom of the garden would allow more light into neighbouring gardens and restore the integrity of the main house.

The new annexe would be built using light weight construction techniques and mounted on a lightweight raised post and beam timber foundation on ground-screws to protect the roots of the nearby trees.

Mr Wylie and Mr Ramsden, both local residents close to Thame Museum, spoke against planning application P16/S3187/FUL & P16S3188/LB. Mr Wylie thanked the Council for allowing him to speak at such short notice. He opposed the proposed plans to the Museum and had written directly to the District Council to explain his concerns. However, Mr Wylie did want to raise one point, not included in his letter to the District Council, that it was his opinion that part of the proposed area for demolition dated back to the Victorian era and was original to the building.

Mr Ramsden also thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak and stated that he had lived in the town for two years and thought the Museum was a great asset. Mr Ramsden raised two points: he accepted the need for increased space but questioned why one third of the proposed new extension would be used for a café and if the demand for increased space for storage was such, could a separate off site location be found for the storage of assets? Secondly the proposed location for the disabled ramp and railings detracted from the building and the Conservation Area and he wondered if an alternative method of access could be explored, perhaps using the original door?

#### **4 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **5 Planning Applications**

**9672 ELMS PARK, PARK STREET**  
**P16/S1954/RM Amendment No. 1**

Approval of reserved matters for improvement works to Elms Park including the provision of new paths and the relocation and replacement of the multi-use games area.

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ1, ESDQ6, ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ18, ESDQ20, ESDQ27

SODC Local Plan Policies: G5, G6, CON5, CON7

Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3

**9708 35 MARSTON ROAD**  
**P16/S2785/FUL Amendment No. 1**

To construct onto the end of an existing terraced row of houses two independent one bedroom studio flats in a two storey extension (As amended plans received 27 September 2016).

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- 1. Overdevelopment**
- 2. Poor design**

- 9723**  
**P16/S3156/HH** **59 PARK STREET**  
Render work to rear of property.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
**Subject to no objection from the District Conservation Officer**
- Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ17, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: CON7, D1  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3
- 9724**  
**P16/S3165/HH** **GARDEN HOUSE, 15C HIGH STREET**  
Raise roof and increase pitch over bedroom wing to accommodate additional habitable space. Raise pitch over lounge to match.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
**Subject to no objection from the District Conservation Officer**
- Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ17, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G5, G6, CON5, CON7, D1, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3
- 9725**  
**P16/S3158/HH** **10 FANSHAWE ROAD**  
Front and rear single storey extension.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**
- Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ19, ESDQ28, ESDQ29  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G6, D1, D2, D4, H13, T2  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3
- 9726**  
**P16/S3160/HH** **30 PARK STREET**  
Removal of the existing annexe and garden shed and build a new single storey annexe at the rear of the garden.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
**Subject to:**
- 1) The use of the new annexe remaining ancillary to the existing dwelling.**
  - 2) Vehicle access to the rear of the site be restricted to the duration of the construction period.**
  - 3) No objection from the District Conservation Officer**
- Neighbourhood Plan Policies: H5, H6, ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ18, ESDQ20, ESDQ26, ESDQ27, ESDQ28, ESDQ29, D1  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G5, G6, CON7, D1, D2, D4, D10, T2  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ2, CSQ3, CSEN3
- 9727**  
**P16/S3187/FUL** **THAME MUSEUM, 79 HIGH STREET**  
Demolition of 1980s extension to the former Magistrates Court (Thame Museum) building and single storey extension with some internal alterations to provide new entrance, foyer, library and storage accommodation. To include new steps and ramp externally to the street.  
**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**
- 1. Poor design of the disabled access**
  - 2. The canopy extending over the original building**

- 9727**  
**P16/S3188/LB** **THAME MUSEUM, 79 HIGH STREET**  
Demolition of 1980s extension to the former Magistrates Court (Thame Museum) building and single storey extension with some internal alterations to provide new entrance, foyer, library and storage accommodation. To include new steps and ramp externally to the street.  
**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**  
**1. Poor design of the disabled access**  
**2. The canopy extending over the original building**
- 9728**  
**P16/S3191/FUL** **90 HIGH STREET**  
Change of use from A1 (shops) to C3 (dwelling houses) and re-incorporation into existing residential unit.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
  
Neighbourhood Plan Policies: WS2, WS7, ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: CON7, D1, H13, TC8  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEM1, CSEM4, CST1, CSEN3
- 9729**  
**P16/S3230/HH** **26 QUEENS CLOSE**  
Two storey side extension to replace existing single storey outhouse buildings. Single storey side extension. Dormer to rear for loft conversion.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
  
Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ28, ESDQ29  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G6, D1, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3
- 9730**  
**P16/S3278/HH** **67 LUDSDEN GROVE**  
Two storey rear extension.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
  
Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ28  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G6, D1, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3
- 9731**  
**P16/S3216/HH** **46 CHINNOR ROAD**  
Dropped kerb outside front of property.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
  
Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ29  
SODC Local Plan Policies: D2, T1, T2  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3
- 9732**  
**P16/S3318/LB** **14 BUTTERMARKET**  
Change of paint colour to shop front and outside lights.  
**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**  
  
Neighbourhood Plan Policies: WS2, WS7, WS10, WS13, ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ17, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: CON3, CON4, CON5, CON7, CON8, D1, TC8, AD1  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEM1, CSEM4, CST1, CSEN3

## **6 Disabled Persons Parking Place**

The members wholeheartedly supported the proposal for a Disabled Persons Parking Place (DPPP) on the High Street, the only comment raised being the location of the proposed DPPP between two limited timed parking bays. It was felt that the DPPP would be better positioned at the end of the limited timed parking bays rather than between.

Discussion took place on how regularly the County Council reviewed DPPPs to ensure the spaces were still required.

## **7 Notification of Planning Appeal – Bull Lane APP/Q3115/W/16/3154774**

The notification of the planning appeal was noted with no further action.

## **8 Reports from Town Council Representatives**

a) Transport Representative – Cllr Stiles – nothing to report.

## **9 Notification of Planning Application – Land South of Wenman Road**

**Application No. – P16/S2874/FUL Removal of conditions 4 - Secured By Design and 22 - Code For Sustainable Homes on planning permission P14/S1619/O. Construction of 108 dwellings including affordable housing, hard and soft landscaping open space, parking provision and associated infrastructure.**

Members noted the above application and the action taken by the Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer (NPCO) in replying to the District Planning Officer by letter on 14 September that the standards are to be fully incorporated into Building Control regulations at some point in the future. In the interim, Government had given direction that any Plan containing a policy requiring build up to Code Level 4 must be respected pending the incorporation of the standards. The NPCO therefore recommended refusal of the proposed removal of condition 22. The NPCO recommended approval of the request to remove the need to document that the buildings would be built to Secure by Design standard, subject to certain conditions as these had already been incorporated into Building Regulations. These matters were reported to Full Council on 20 September 2016.

It was also noted that the case officer from SODC had subsequently contacted the NPCO agreeing that the Code Level 4 standard should be adhered to, but if Bellway Homes decided not to comply with the condition SODC would not take enforcement action. Other, similar applications have all been approved; as an application was made the view of SODC is therefore that the application to remove condition 4 should be approved.

Members disagreed with the view of the District Council and agreed that the NPCO would reply to SODC conveying in the strongest terms the Town Council's view that the Code Level 4 standard should be adhered to.

## **10 For Information**

The items for information were noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.45pm

Signed .....

Chairman, 8 November 2016