

## THAME TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee held on 10 January 2017 at 6.30pm In the Upper Chamber, Thame Town Hall.

**Present:** Cllrs B Austin, D Bretherton, P Cowell, M Deacock, N Dixon (Deputy Mayor), D Dodds, L Emery (Town Mayor), H Fickling (Chairman), C Jones and A Midwinter (Deputy Chairman)

**Officers:**

G Markland, Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer  
A Oughton, Committee Services Officer  
L Fuller, Community Project Support Officer

### 1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Stiles (Unwell).

### 2 Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

Cllr Bretherton and Cllr Dodds declared an interest in planning applications P16/S3187/FUL and P16/S3188/LB as a trustee of Thame Museum and as Chair of Thame Museum respectively and did not take part in the discussion or vote. Cllr Emery declared an interest in same two planning applications as the Town Council representative for Thame Museum.

The Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer reminded Members of the general dispensation in place which allowed Council to discuss planning applications P16S/3187/FUL and P16/S3188/LB related to land and property directly owned by the Town Council.

### 3 Public Participation and Public Questions

Mr House, a resident living in the High Street, spoke against planning applications P16/S3187/FUL and P16/S3188/LB. The Court building was given listed building status in 1988, some of the original windows and brickwork were used to form the lobby which contains Victorian elements. As the Museum does not have the consent of the neighbouring residents to carry out any building work on their land a better option would be to leave a three foot gap behind the boundary wall which would allow for a pathway, access, footings, roofing and scaffolding. Rather than the proposed option the east face could replicate the Victorian elevation giving room for a fire exit and thus retaining the integrity of the building. The Court building is a listed Victorian building whose characteristics should be retained.

Mr Moore, the owner of 5, The Old Maltings and representative of the Old Maltings Residents' Association (OMRA), spoke against the two planning applications for Thame Museum. The revised proposals had not responded in any way to the written objections OMRA expressed in a meeting with the architect some months ago. OMRA's main objections related to: a) the disturbance and loss of amenity both during and after the building work, b) possible loss of private off-street parking throughout the construction phase for the 10 dwellings in the Old Maltings, c) restricted access for emergency vehicles, deliveries, etc. d) overlooking across the narrow access road and e) light and noise pollution. These concerns appeared to have been ignored and as a result OMRA had agreed that no access to Old Maltings land would be permitted.

With regard to the design it was felt the need for additional storage space within the Museum had not been addressed and a far more economical solution other than a new build could be found. The proposed new entrance would appear rather dull and flat roofed and the barrel roof lights were set back and would not be seen as part of the geometry of the new façade. The 4,000

visitors a year equated to less than 20 per day so the new entrance should also be seen as a marketing exercise to increase footfall. By reinstating the main front door, centrally positioned in the original façade together with the appropriate signage it would encourage and welcome visitors to the Museum. Finally, if the ramp design could not be agreed up to the main door, the existing ramp and access could be used but through a landscaped area to enhance an alternative entrance.

Mr Swanson, resident of no. 2 Jubilee Gardens, spoke against planning application P16/S4237/HH. Mr Swanson wished to highlight a number of discrepancies and false claims made within the planning application and how the proposed build would impact on the amenity. The extension would be 6.3m in height and 7.8m in length along the ridge and would be viewed along the length of his garden. The proposed extension was only 1.5m away from his boundary and the size and bulk would look out of scale, create shadowing and have an overbearing impact on the amenities. All points which are raised in South Oxfordshire's latest Design Guide.

No precedent should be set by the planning permission granted at no. 5 Jubilee Gardens as none of the considerations applied to this application. Although registered as a single storey extension Mr Swanson challenged this as the height nearly reached 6.3m on his side of the boundary and was effectively a two storey building. Having read the tree report and the BSI 5837 2012 guidelines there were concerns with the proposed build being only 2.5m away from the tree lined approach to the leisure centre. The root protection area should only be entered for essential building work to be carried out. The application included the use of piling which was also not without risk to the root system and the tree report stated that more pruning and crowning would be required as part of the ongoing tree maintenance. Mr Swanson rejected the planning application on the District Planning Authority's own guidelines of overshadowing, oppressive, overbearing and boxing in. The tree lined approach to the leisure centre could not be put at risk at the expense of amenity value.

Mrs Palmer, spoke in favour of planning application P16/S4237/HH. As the agent for the applicant she was aware of the location and that the site backed onto the access road to the leisure centre. The proposal was for a single storey rear extension attached onto the back of the garages, the site did not sit within the Conservation Area and there were Tree Preservation Orders on the trees on the other side of the boundary.

Pre-application advice had been sought from the District Planning Authority who had come back with no objection in principle other than advising that an arboricultural report for the trees be undertaken. Advice was also sought from structural engineers and piling companies with regard to the foundations and the decision made to use mini piling and 'float' the foundation thus reducing the risk to the tree roots. The single storey extension would have the same size pitched roof as the existing garages and provide space for a utility room and larger storage. The proposals would also include the conversion of the existing loft over the garage with two dormer windows in line with those adjacent to it. The extension would be 1.5m away from the neighbouring boundary and 13m (as the crow flies) from the dwelling at no. 2 Jubilee Gardens.

To alleviate the concerns raised with regard to shadowing some sun tracked diagrams had been produced showing the shadowing at 2pm both in the winter and summer months. With the building to the south east as the sun rises the fence created more of a shadow than the building, the 60 degree angle being well inside the guidance of planning policy. Finally Lord Williams's School was aware of the planning application and was listed along with other neighbouring properties as a consultee on the District Planning Authority's website.

## 4 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## 5 Planning Applications

**9727**  
**P16/S3187/FUL**

**THAME MUSEUM, 79 HIGH STREET**  
**Amendment No. 1**

Demolition of 1980's 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. (As amended by plans received 13 December 2016 revising design of ramp, adding front wall and railings and altering design of extension by reducing front overhang of roof and amending window / louvre design).

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ17, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G6, CON2, CON3, CON5, CON7, D1, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3

**9727**  
**P16/S3188/LB**

**THAME MUSEUM, 79 HIGH STREET**  
**Amendment No. 1**

Demolition of 1980's 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. (As amended by plans received 13 December 2016 revising design of ramp, adding front wall and railings and altering design of extension by reducing front overhang of roof and amending window / louvre design).

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ17, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: G6, CON2, CON3, CON5, CON7, D1, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3

**9736**  
**P16/S3484/FUL**

**3 JEFFERSON WAY**  
**Amendment No. 1**

Change of use from B1 (light industry) to A1 (retail warehouse). As amplified by additional supporting information received 13 December 2016).

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- 1. Insufficient information on the intended retail use**
- 2. Potential adverse impact on retail trade in the town centre**
- 3. Potential loss of employment land and floor space**
- 4. Lack of public transport connecting the industrial area to the town centre**
- 5. Dependent on the type of retail use, potentially insufficient parking**
- 6. Insufficient evidence to show the commercial unit has been marketed.**

**9740**  
**P16/S3682/FUL**

**LAND ADJACENT TO 52 BROADWATERS**  
**Amendment No. 1**

Construction of a new attached dwelling house on land adjacent to 52 Broadwaters Avenue (as amended by revised site plan received 19 December 2016).

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

1. **Overdevelopment**
2. **Impact on neighbouring amenity**
3. **Impact on the character of the area**
4. **Loss of garage at No. 52 for its original purpose**
5. **Parking and access**
6. **Traffic generation**

**9755**  
**P16/S4154/LB**

**12A HIGH STREET**

1. Renewal of fire damaged first floor rear bay window on a like-for-like basis.
2. Renewal of water damaged lath and plaster ceilings to the following rooms on a like-for-like basis: ground floor lounge, first floor drawing room and second floor bedroom.

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ15, ESDQ16, ESDQ20  
SODC Local Plan Policies: CON3, CON7, D1, D4  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3, CSEN3

**9756**  
**P16/S3732/HH**

**30 CHINNOR ROAD**

To remove rear garage and construct a single storey building as an ancillary use to existing dwelling.

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

**Subject to:**

1. The use of the dwelling remaining ancillary to the existing dwelling in perpetuity.
2. The single storey dwelling is not let or sold as a separate dwelling.

**Comment:** The Committee regretted the loss of the garage for its original purpose and raised concern with regard to the lack of parking provision and the effect it would have on the street parking along Chinnor Road which was already congested.

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ26, ESDQ27, ESDQ28  
SODC Local Plan Policies: D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ2, CSQ3

**9757**  
**P16/S4218/HH**

**22 WHITTLE ROAD**

First floor extension.

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

Neighbourhood Plan Policies: ESDQ16, ESDQ28  
SODC Local Plan Policies: D1, D2, D4, H13  
Core Strategy Policies: CSQ3

**9758**  
**P16/S4237/HH**

**3 JUBILEE GARDENS**

Single storey rear extension.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

1. **Unneighbourly due to overshadowing of the garden**
2. **Bulk and scale**

**Comment:** To aid clarification regarding the shadowing it would have been helpful to have had access to the tracked sun diagrams produced at different times of the day.

**6 Courtyard Name – Beechcroft Development, Park Street**

After a short discussion Members agreed that Seymour Court be suggested to the District Council as the new name for the courtyard at the Beechcroft development in Park Street.

**7 Reports from Town Council Representatives**

- a) Transport Representative – Cllr Stiles had given her apologies. There was nothing to report.

**8 For Information**

The items for information were noted.

The meeting concluded at 7.34pm

Signed .....  
Chairman, 31 January 2017