

Contrary Planning Decisions from 19.5.21 – 10.5.22

No.	TTC No. SODC No.	Address & Description	Date & TTC Decision	Date SODC Contrary Decision / Reason	Application determined by committee? If yes, did TTC provide representation at the meeting?
1	1253 P20/S0928/FUL	LAND AT THE ELMS, UPPER HIGH STREET The erection of an extra care development (Use Class C2) of 66 units; 3 guest rooms; a communal residents centre with staff facilities; provision of car, cycle and mobility scooter parking; the creation of new public open space; the provision of new pedestrian/cycle links from Upper High Street to Elms Road and Elms Park; and associated infrastructure works and landscaping (Amended & Additional Information received 5, 11 & 24 June 2020).	02.06.20 and 14.07.20 OBJECTS 1. Contrary to TNP Policies H1, HA4, H8, H9, H10 2. Poor design 3. Does not conform to OCC's definition of Extra Care Housing 4. Strategic need for ECH not recognised by OCC 5. Heritage concerns are not outweighed by benefits	Planning Permission Granted – 8.6.21	Committee? Yes – automatically referred to committee. Representation? Yes – Officer and Councillor
2	1422 P21/S1722/HH	96 COTMORE CLOSE New dropped kerb and permeable paved parking space	25.05.21 OBJECTS 1. Impact on local car parking 2. Unsafe access 3. Unneighbourly	Planning Permission Granted – 11.6.21 Planning permission is granted for the proposed development. The proposed new access and associated hardstanding would not have a negative impact on the highway network and are permissible under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) . In conjunction with the attached conditions, the proposal accords with relevant planning policy.	Committee? No – call-in withdrawn.
3	1468 P21/S3260/HH	57 CORBETTS WAY Single Storey Rear Extension & Part Garage Conversion	17.8.21 OBJECTS 1. Inadequate parking provision	Planning Permission Granted – 14.9.21 Planning permission is granted as the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance. Subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area or the amenity of neighbours.	Committee? No – not called in. Representation? N/a

Contrary Planning Decisions from 19.5.21 – 10.5.22

4	1469 P21/S3168/HH	46 COTMORE GARDENS Construction of single storey rear/side extension to ground floor. Conversion of roof space including dropping of ceiling internally to create sufficient head height. Two dormers are to be constructed; one to both sides of the front roof section. (Amended block plan received to show additional parking spaces on 24 September 202).	17.8.21 OBJECTS 1. Overdevelopment 2. Out of character 3. Poor design	Planning Permission Granted – 21.10.21 The proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies and, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its relationship to the character of the existing building and the surrounding area. It is also acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity and highway safety.	Committee? No – not called in. Representation? N/a
5	1495 P21/S4151/HH	106 WELLINGTON STREET To extend the existing (originally a 'shared') dropped kerb in front of my property by approximately 5.08m (5.5 kerb stones) to improve access for parking on the drive.	19.10.21 OBJECTS 1. Loss of on-street parking	Planning Permission Granted – 11.11.21 The proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies and, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its relationship to the character of the existing dwelling, neighbouring amenity, its site and the wider area and highway safety.	Committee? No – not called in. Representation? N/a
6	1142 P19/S1596/FUL	PARK MEADOW COTTAGE, THAME PARK ROAD Erection of two 2-bed dwellings and four 3-bed dwellings (alterations to layout of development and rights of access information and additional drainage details provided as shown on plans and supporting documents received 25th September 2019 and additional updated tracking plan received 25th February 2020).	18.6.19 OBJECTS 1. Overdevelopment 2. Failure to provide affordable housing in line with recognised need 3. Failure to provide a Thame-specific Affordable Housing and Dwelling Mix Strategy 4. Out of character with the area and failure to identify bicycle parking	Planning Permission Granted – 1.12.21 The application proposal would comply with the relevant Development Plan Policies when taken as a whole and Government guidance and therefore would be acceptable in principle. It is considered that, subject to the attached conditions and Section 106 agreement, the proposed development would make an acceptable contribution towards affordable housing in the District, would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area or the residential amenity of nearby residents and result in satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the development. It would avoid conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety and would provide an appropriate mix of market housing.	Committee? No. Representation? N/a

Contrary Planning Decisions from 19.5.21 – 10.5.22

7	1503 P21/S4627/HH	23 AYLESBURY ROAD Summerhouse garden pod	30.11.21 OBJECTS 1. Contrary to TNP Policy ESDQ16 in not relating well to the site and surroundings.	<p>Planning Permission Granted – 17.12.21 Planning permission is granted as the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance. Subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area or the amenity of neighbours.</p> <p><i>Note: The case officer consulted the Conservation Officer who “agreed that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm to the setting of the listed building or the surrounding conservation area”</i></p>	<p>Committee? No – not called in.</p> <p>Representation? N/a</p>
8	1496 P21/S4226/HH	3 KINGS ROAD Single storey extension to rear of property and new boundary wall	19.10.21 OBJECTS 1. The proposed wall on the south-eastern elevation would represent overdevelopment and be contrary to Thame Neighbourhood Plan Policy ESDQ16.	<p>Planning Permission Granted – 14.1.22 Planning permission is granted as the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies, Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government Guidance. Subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area or the amenity of neighbours.</p>	<p>Committee? Yes</p> <p>Representation? No – a written response was sent.</p>
9	1343 P20/S4632/FUL	20 UPPER HIGH STREET Change of use and conversion of ground and first floor to number 20, to form a single dwelling and reinstate its historic residential use.	12.1.21 OBJECTS 1. Contrary to TNP Policy WS12 2. Inadequate internal living space 3. Contrary to TNP Policy WS9	<p>Appeal Allowed – 1.3.22 The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Change of use and conversion of ground and first floor to number 20, to form a single dwelling and reinstate its historic residential use at 20 Upper High Street, Thame OX9 2BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P20/S4632/FUL, dated 2 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision. 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 03 (Existing and Proposed Site Location and Block Plan) and 30 (Proposed Plans and Elevations). 3) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details specified in the letter dated 29 January 2021 (ref: RH/jlb/SODC/21/1) from Greenford Ltd detailing the relevant works, of upgrading to the partition wall between No 20 and No 20A and No 19 to provide acoustic and fire insulation. 	<p>Committee? N/a as SODC also objected.</p> <p>Representation? Officers supported SODC with written response to the appeal.</p>

Contrary Planning Decisions from 19.5.21 – 10.5.22

10	1543 P21/S4026/FUL	14 ROBIN GIBB ROAD Removal of the wall to the left of the rear garden to enable the exterior garden to become part of the rear garden. Plus construction of a wall (same height and construction as existing) near to the pavement with a return to the rear of the house, leaving a 60cm wide strip of land between the outside of the wall and the pavement for planting in accordance with other dwellings on the development (Landscaping plan received 28th February 2022).	1.2.22 OBJECTS 1. Loss of public amenity space. 2. Insufficient information on the proposed planting arrangements and impact on the bat roost.	Planning Permission Granted – 18.3.22 The proposed change of use of land to residential garden use is not considered to significantly harm the character and appearance of the area or harm the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal does not impact on highway safety or on protected species. Therefore, subject to the attached conditions, the proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies	Committee? No – not called in. Representation? N/a
11	1539 P21/S5361/HH	8 TOWERSEY DRIVE Demolition of existing side extension with garage, erection of 2 storey front & side extension, single storey rear extension & loft extension. Widen existing dropped kerb & installation of block paving to enlarged driveway, patio to rear garden (As per amended plans submitted 8 February 2022 and amended internal layout to remove annex element submitted 14 March 2022).	1.2.22, 22.2.22 and 5.4.22 OBJECTS 1. Poor design 2. Overdevelopment 3. Unneighbourly	Planning Permission Granted – 1.4.22 The proposal complies with the relevant Development Plan policies and, subject to the attached conditions, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its relationship to the character of the existing building, its site and the wider area. It is also acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity and highways safety.	Committee? No – call in withdrawn following amendment. Representation? N/a