

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held at the Council Chamber,
The Abbey House, Abingdon
on Wednesday 30 October 2013 at 6.30pm



Open to the public, including the press

Present:

Members: Councillors Robert Sharp (Chairman), Sandy Lovatt (Vice-Chairman), Eric Batts, Roger Cox, Anthony Hayward, Bob Johnston, Bill Jones, Jerry Patterson, Helen Pighills, Janet Shelley, Margaret Turner, Catherine Webber and John Woodford

Substitute Members: Councillor Richard Webber (In place of Sue Marchant)

Other Members: Councillors Gervase Duffield, Yvonne Constance, St John Dickson and Judy Roberts

Officers: Peter Brampton, Charlotte Brewerton, Steve Culliford, Martin Deans, Mark Doodles, Sandra Fryer, and Stuart Walker

Number of members of the public: 63

PI.420 Chairman's announcements

The chairman outlined the procedure for the meeting, asked attendees to switch off any mobile phones, and highlighted the emergency exit procedure.

PI.421 Urgent business

None

PI.422 Cumulative housing figures

The committee noted the latest cumulative housing figures.

PI.423 Notification of substitutes and apologies for absence

The committee received apologies for absence from Councillor Sue Marchant; Councillor Richard Webber attended as her substitute.

PI.424 Minutes

RESOLVED: to adopt as a correct record the minutes of the committee meeting held on 18 September 2013 and agree that the chairman signs them.

PI.425 Declarations of pecuniary interests and other declarations

No councillor declared any disclosable pecuniary interests. However, other interests were declared as follows:

Councillor	Planning application	Interest
Eric Batts	Land to the rear of 92 to 112 Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay	He knew the applicant's agent who was speaking at the meeting
Bob Johnston	157 Kennington Road, Kennington	He was a member of the parish council but had not been present when it considered this planning application
Bob Johnston	155 The Avenue, Kennington	He was a member of the parish council but had not been present when it considered this planning application
Bill Jones	Dropshort Farm, Stowhill, Childrey	The local ward councillor speaking at the meeting was related to him
Sandy Lovatt	Land at Abbey Meadow, Abingdon	He was a member of the town council but had not been present when it considered this planning application
Roger Cox	26 Coxwell Street, Faringdon	He was a member of the town council but had not been present when it considered this planning application

PI.426 Statements and petitions from the public on planning applications

The speakers' list was tabled at the meeting.

PI.427 Statements, petitions and questions from the public on other matters

None

PI.428 Materials

None

PI.429 Land adjoining north east and north west of Tilbury Lane, Botley. P13/V0817/RM

The officer presented the report on a reserved matters application for 150 dwellings and related works on land north-east and north-west of Tilbury Lane, Botley. The proposed housing mix was one, two, three and four bedroom units, 60 of which would be affordable homes, distributed across the site in three clusters. Consultations, representations, policy

and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Updates to the report

Amended plans had been received in response to consultation responses from the tree officer and landscape officer. This resulted in the re-positioning of the dwelling and garage at plot 144, together with the garden levels of plots 130 to 132 being reduced to protect trees along the site boundary. The cycle / footpath link to Hazel Road had been adjusted and there were new footpath links within the site along the southern end of Tilbury Lane. In response to representations regarding air pollution, the officer reported that council's environmental protection team had no objections to the application. A means of securing access along Tilbury Lane would be provided to prevent vehicular access to the housing site but would allow access to the farm to the north of the site. This was required under a planning condition imposed on the outline application.

Public speakers

The chairman reported that the parish boundary ran along Tilbury Lane, which crossed the proposed housing site, and therefore he had invited both Cumnor and North Hinksey Parish Councils to address the committee for three minutes each.

Harry Dickinson, from Cumnor Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application and requesting its deferral. His concerns included the following:

- Lack of communication by the developers with the parish council and local residents
- Adverse impact of the development on existing local residents
- Difficulties with the access to the site through Fogwell Road
- The need for a 20 miles per hour speed limit in Fogwell Road and into the site
- The need for a routing agreement for construction traffic to avoid Eynsham Road
- Difficulties with access arrangements to the farm
- Air quality needed to be within safe limits

Andrew Pritchard, from North Hinksey Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- He wanted the best for local residents, both new and existing
- Would local services be able to cope with increased demand?
- The drainage survey details were not available for the public to see
- There was no construction traffic method statement nor any traffic management plan
- Traffic would try to access through Tilbury Lane
- Fogwell Road was an inadequate access to the site
- The elderly residents in the bungalows needed more protection with additional planting along the boundary
- North Hinksey Parish Council did not support the transfer of the site to Cumnor parish
- The footpath to Hazel Road should be extended to Elms Road

Christine Herbert, a neighbouring resident, spoke objecting to the application; her concerns including:

- Increased traffic on Fogwell Road was unacceptable, both during construction and after completion
- Parking problems would get worse
- Emergency access would be compromised

- There would be additional pressure on local services
- There would be overlooking into existing residents' gardens and homes

David Hutchinson, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application; his points included:

- It was unlawful to revisit the principle of the development as this had been established by the outline permission
- The proposal addressed local concerns
- The layout and design were attractive
- Housing density was lower adjacent to the site boundaries
- Minimum separation distances to neighbouring properties had been adhered to
- Car parking standards had been met
- There were no objections from key consultees
- He would liaise with the parish councils over their concerns
- He would improve boundary treatment adjacent to the most vulnerable existing properties

Councillor Judy Roberts, the ward councillor, objected to the application, her concerns included:

- Drainage was still a problem; there were high levels of run-off water at the site
- Permeable surfaces were needed
- The applicants should increase landscaping along the boundaries of the most vulnerable neighbouring properties
- The site design was not good enough
- There would be no immediate restriction of vehicular use of Tilbury Lane
- The access road must be in place before construction commenced
- There must be a 20 miles per hour speed limit throughout the site
- Construction traffic to and from the site must be limited to 7am to 4.30pm weekdays only

Councillor John Woodford, another ward councillor, believed:

- It was the parish councils' responsibility to contact the applicants, not the other way around, and he hoped they could find solutions to their differences
- Enforcing the speed limit was a police matter
- There were no grounds to refuse this application

Councillor Eric Batts, another ward councillor, believed:

- Traffic must not be able to access the housing site from Tilbury Lane
- A footpath to Hazel Road was sensible but it should not be extended to Elms Road
- The affordable homes provision was welcomed
- Public open space in this part of Botley was welcomed
- He was content with this application

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The officers were asked to investigate including a 20 miles per hour limit as part of the traffic management plan
- There should be one communal television satellite dish on each of the large three storey buildings to avoid a plethora of dishes
- Care should be taken over the slab levels of the new homes nearest the existing neighbouring bungalows

- Contributions towards local services had been included in the planning agreement as part of the outline planning permission
- There should be improved boundary treatment along the western boundary and near the bungalows on the southern boundary

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : TL3 - time limit - reserved matters,
- 2 : approved plans
- 3 : HY6[I] - access, parking & turning in accordance with plans
- 4 : HY12 - new estate roads
- 5 : HY13[I] - estate roads prior to occupation
- 6 : HY20[I] - bicycle parking
- 7 : LS2[I] - landscaping scheme (implementation),
- 8 : MC2 - materials (samples)
- 9 : RE7[I] – boundary details in accordance with specified plan
- 10 : RE29 - refuse storage
- 11 : Boundary details for western side of site (Fogwell Road) to be submitted
- 12 : Permitted development restriction on satellite dishes on blocks of flats
- 13 : Slab levels in accordance with plans

**PI.430 Land to the rear of 92-112 Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay.
P13/V1543/O**

The officer presented the report on an outline application for the demolition of one dwelling, the erection of 34 new dwellings, together with roads, footpaths, parking areas, landscaping, amenity space, and open space, on land to the rear of 92 to 112 Milton Road, Sutton Courtenay. The committee had refused an application to develop this site in June 2013. The applicants had appealed against that decision, the outcome of which was awaited.

Consultations, representations on this latest planning application, and policy and guidance and this site's planning history were set out in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Updates to the report

The officer referred to changes to the report and additional information since its publication:

- Almost 40 per cent of the dwellings proposed would be one or two-bedroomed properties
- The layout of the site was not a matter for determination at this outline application stage
- The matters for consideration at this outline stage were the principle of development on this site, means of access, highways arrangements, and drainage
- Since the committee's refusal of the previous application on this site in June, there had been a drainage survey at the site. Three independent drainage engineers had given their opinion that the site was suitable for housing, subject to drainage conditions being attached to the permission
- Thames Water had presented two sewerage options to the applicant, which had accepted both options

- Contributions of nearly £0.25 million had been agreed by the applicant towards primary, secondary and sixth form education provision
- The county highways engineer was content with the traffic calming proposals on Milton Road to slow traffic at the entrance to the village, and was content with the proposed vision splays on leaving the site

Public speakers

David Hignell, from Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- There should be no further development at Sutton Courtenay
- The parish council questioned the officer's assessment of Sutton Courtenay being the fourth most sustainable location for housing development in the district
- The village was plagued by traffic and poor drainage
- Further development would deteriorate the character and ambiance of Sutton Courtenay village
- The council's lack of a five-year housing land supply was not Sutton Courtenay's fault so why should it suffer with new housing?
- The community should benefit from any new development. Therefore, the applicant should contribute towards sports provision in the village
- The committee should not approve this application in the fear of an award of costs from losing the planning appeal on the previous application

Harvey Rodder, a professional hydrologist, spoke on behalf of Keep Sutton Courtenay Rural objecting to the application; his concerns included:

- The drainage report, following a survey by the applicant, contained insufficient detail
- There were drainage problems at the site with seasonal waterlogging, making it unsuitable for housing development
- He questioned whether the proposed soak-aways would be sufficient
- The report had failed to consider the wider impact of displacing surface water to surrounding areas and neighbouring properties

John Ashton, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application; his points included:

- This outline application was to determine the principle of the development on this site and access arrangements
- In June, the committee had refused an earlier application, citing four reasons. He believed these were no longer applicable for the following reasons and therefore the application should be approved
- Sutton Courtenay was classified by the council as the fourth most sustainable location for new development in the district
- The site was close to the Milton Park employment site, and the village contained a number of services including a primary school, shops, bus stops, and cycle and footpaths
- As part of the application, £16,000 had been offered to the county council as a contribution towards local transport measures
- The applicant had contributed significant sums towards improving local services and infrastructure
- Further tests had been carried out on surface water drainage and a system had been designed to manage 1 in 100 years events
- As a result, there were no objections from the council's consultant drainage engineers

- Highway safety objections had been overcome with sight vision splays above the county council's standard and with traffic calming on Milton Road, resulting in no objection from the county council

Councillor Gervase Duffield, the ward councillor, objected to the application, his concerns included:

- drainage was still a problem; it had not been satisfactorily dealt with
- raising slab levels of the proposed dwellings would displace surface water to other properties
- the cumulative effect of all applications in Sutton Courtenay was too great for the village

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate. There was some concern at the cumulative effect of development on Sutton Courtenay and some concern at the drainage of the site.

It was moved that the application should be deferred to assess the objector's drainage evidence and to wait for the appeal decision on the previous application. However, this motion was lost by five votes to seven with two abstentions.

The committee considered that:

- the applicant had addressed the concerns raised by the committee at its meeting in June
- there were no technical objections to the application on drainage or highways grounds
- the proposed section 106 agreement mitigated the effects of the proposed development

RESOLVED (by 8 votes to nil with 6 abstentions)

To grant outline planning permission, subject to:

1. The completion of section 106 planning agreement with the Vale of White Horse District Council and with Oxfordshire County Council to provide: affordable housing and on-site public open space, and to obtain financial contributions towards off-site facilities and services including:

- education,
- waste collection and management,
- social and health care (inc local NHS provision),
- police equipment,
- recreation and health,
- transport (including Science Vale UK)
- street naming and numbering and
- public art.

2. The following conditions, including:

1 : TL1 - submission of reserved matters (RM) within 12 months and works to commence on site within 6 months of the final RM being approved.

2 : MC2 - materials

3 : LS4 - tree protection

4 : RE7 – boundary details

5 : RE17 – slab levels to be agreed

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

Wednesday, 30 October 2013

- 6 : MC29 – sustainable drainage scheme
- 7 : MC26 – off-site drainage details and implementation (foul water)
- 8 : HY2 – access in accordance with plan
- 9 : HY3 – visibility splays to be agreed
- 10 : CN11 - scheme of archaeological investigation
- 11 : MC32 – construction method statement
- 12: S278 off-site highways works (to improve highway safety)
- 13: Ecological mitigation strategies
- 14: Refuse bin storage
- 15: Distribution of affordable housing

PI.431 Blackberry Cottage, Westcot Lane, Sparsholt P13/V1751/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application for a new dwelling on land to the north of Blackberry Cottage, Westcot Lane, Sparsholt. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Updates to the report

The planning officer reported that further to her report, the proposed development would be visible from vantage points, and the council's drainage engineer had lodged a holding objection pending further investigation. As there were no special circumstances to justify this development outside the built up area of the village, the officer recommended that the application was refused but suggested alternative reasons for refusal to those set out in the report. These related to the unsuitability of the development in the open countryside, the impact on long-range views, and drainage and highway safety grounds.

Public speakers

Tim Comyn, from Sparsholt Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- There had been no pre-application discussions with the applicant
- The proposed development was in an unsustainable location for housing, outside of the village, and as such was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework
- There were no exceptional circumstances to approve this application
- It conflicted with the Sparsholt Parish Plan

Graham Williams, the applicant, spoke in favour of his application:

- There had been a dwelling on the site until the 1950s
- Sparsholt had a pattern of linear development; this application reflected that
- The proposal met policies H10 to H13 of the adopted local plan and would help the council meet its five-year housing land supply
- The access road served a further four homes north of the site
- There were no highway safety objections from the parish
- The proposal was designed to fit in with nearby properties
- The proposal had received widespread village support

Councillor Yvonne Constance, the ward councillor, supported to the application, her concerns included:

- The application had been supported at a village meeting
- The proposed dwelling would not impact on any views

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

- There had been a house on the site as shown on Ordnance Survey maps of 1877 and 1910

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- There was a highways objection
- The site was in the countryside, outside of the village
- It was ribbon development, not infill
- There were no special circumstances to approve this application
- Despite there being a house on the site up until the 1950s, the fact that there had not been a house there since was tantamount to abandonment of the site for housing; this was not a replacement dwelling

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

Refusal of planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1: In the opinion of the local planning authority, the proposed new dwelling would result in an unsustainable form of development in the open countryside without special or exceptional justification, where there is no alternative mode of transport other than the private motor vehicle. Furthermore, the development makes little contribution to addressing the five-year land supply to override the harm identified with this unsustainable location. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies H13, GS2, DC1 and DC5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2: In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposal would result in a new dwelling of a considerable size, within the open countryside which would harm the character and appearance of the long range views of the Lowland Vale contrary to Policy NE9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3: It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the proposed development can be adequately drained. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies DC8 and DC9 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan and to advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4: The proposed development would result in the intensification in use of a substandard road network to the detriment of highway safety. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy DC5 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan.

PI.432 Sudelna, Faringdon Road, Southmoor. P13/V2027/HH

The officer presented the report on an application for a replacement garage and workshop on land at Sudelna, Faringdon Road, Southmoor. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The planning officer had no updates to her report.

Public speakers

Roger Papworth, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

- The proposed replacement garage had a higher pitched roof that would be detrimental to the surrounding area, and would dominate the view from his property
- There should be a flat roof on the garage
- There would be a reduction in privacy as there was a window higher up on the gable end; this window should be of frosted glass
- The garage was too large and could be converted into a domestic property

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- The proposed garage complied with local plan policy
- The committee had to determine the proposal submitted and could not change its details to provide a flat roof
- The window in the gable was to provide light to the garage
- It was unnecessary to require frosted glass

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Commencement 3 years - full planning permission
- 2 : Approved plans
- 3 : Materials as on plan
- 4 : No garage conversion into accommodation

PI.433 Dropshort Farm, Stowhill, Childrey. P13/V0971/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to replace commercial buildings and the commercial use of the site with four dwellings on land at Dropshort Farm, Stowhill, Childrey. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting.

Updates to the report

The planning officer reported that further to his report, the sustainability of Childrey village had been downgraded following the loss of the local bus service. He also believed that the proposed development of four larger houses on the site was inefficient use of the land and the access road was unsuitable for pedestrians, requiring the residents to rely on a car. The county highways engineer had also objected as the access road was unsuitable for residential access and was not in the county council's ownership. The ownership of the access road was unknown.

Public speakers

Andrew Winterbourne, from Childrey Parish Council, supported the application.

Matthew Green, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application:

- No weight should be given to the emerging local plan. Only the existing local plan and the National Planning Policy Framework should be taken into account
- There was a demand for larger homes
- The proposal fitted in well with Childrey village
- The proposal would remove ugly industrial buildings

Councillor St. John Dickson, the ward councillor, supported the application:

- It would be unreasonable to reject this application
- Childrey was a sustainable location for such housing development
- It would help meet housing need
- The proposed density had been dictated by the developer's inability to build more than five dwellings off an unadopted road
- The site was close to the village centre with its shop, school, and village hall
- There were other village homes further away from the village centre than this site
- The proposal was welcomed locally due to loss of the hay business
- Around 176 vehicles used the access road each week, including lorries and cars

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- There was no justification to approve any application on the basis of removing ugly buildings
- The site was outside the village envelope and the proposal was against planning policy

RESOLVED (by 10 votes to 3, with 1 abstention)

To refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

1. That, having regard to the isolated nature of the application site, the proposed development would introduce new residential development into a rural location detached from Childrey. As such, the site is poorly located in terms of access to essential facilities and any new resident would rely heavily on the use of the private car. As such, the proposal represents an unsustainable form of development that is contrary to the provisions of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, in particular Policies GS2 and H11, and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. That, having regard to the size of the site, the proposed provision of four large dwellings represents an extremely low density of development that would constitute an inefficient use of the land. This is particularly the case as, in the council's opinion, if this site were acceptable for housing development; it could accommodate a sufficient number of dwellings to trigger the need for affordable housing provision. In this regard, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011, in particular Policies H15 and H17, and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. That, having regard to its width, current condition, and poor drainage, the proposed shared surface access road to the application site is of insufficient quality to serve the proposed residential development. Part of this road lies outside the application site and so the applicant does not have the ability to deliver the required upgrades to the road. As such, the proposal would result in an unacceptable risk to highway users, does not enhance to the sustainability of the site, or provide inclusive access. In this regard, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Vale of White Horse Local plan 2011, in particular Policy DC5, and advice contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

PI.434 157 Upper Road, Kennington. P13/V1997/HH

The officer presented the report on an application for a part single-storey, part two-storey front extension and a single-storey rear extension at 157 Upper Road, Kennington.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and this site's planning history were
Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The planning officer had no updates to the report.

Public speakers

Martin Feather, from Kennington Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed extension was large and domineering
- It breached the building line along the frontages of Upper Road and would adversely affect other properties

Stephen Livett, spoke objecting to the application on behalf of the occupiers of 155 and 159 Upper Road. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed development would dominate and overshadow the adjacent bungalow
- The design and scale of the proposed extension were not in keeping with neighbouring properties
- The rear extension was close to the boundary, resulting in a loss of light and outlook for the neighbour

Alisdair Rogers, the applicant, spoke in support of his application. He believed:

- There were larger properties in the vicinity
- The front extension did not extend beyond the building line and was further from the road than some dwellings
- The character of the area was variety, not uniformity

The committee considered this application, with advice from officers where appropriate; the discussion covered the following points:

- There was insufficient harm to justify refusing the application

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

- 1 : Commencement three years
- 2 : Approved plans
- 3 : Materials in accordance with application
- 4 : Car parking to be retained

PI.435 26 Coxwell Street, Faringdon. P09/V1950

The officer presented the report on a retrospective application for the replacement of concrete slabs with wooden decking, and the erection of a handrail on an existing flat roof terrace, to the rear of 26 Coxwell Street, Faringdon. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The planning officer reported that the applicant had also constructed a 2.5 metre high wicker fence to stop overlooking of neighbouring property.

There were no public speakers.

The committee supported the application.

RESOLVED (by 13 votes to nil, with one abstention)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following condition:

1 : Approved plans

PI.436 155 The Avenue, Kennington. P13/V1736/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to amend a previous permission to allow raised eaves and internal floor height to enable 1800mm internal height clearance, and the addition of two dormer windows, at 155 The Avenue, Kennington. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The planning officer had no updates to the report.

Public speakers

Martin Feather, from Kennington Parish Council, spoke objecting to the application. His concerns included the following:

- The proposed development was unneighbourly, overdominant and would result in overlooking of neighbouring gardens

The committee supported the application.

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1 : Commencement 3 yrs - full planning permission

2 : Approved plans

3 : MC3 – materials in accordance with approved details / drawings

PI.437 Land at Abbey Meadow, Abingdon. P13/V1315/FUL

The officer presented the report on an application to construct a 100 kilowatt hydroelectricity generating facility on the western end of the wier at the River Thames, near Abbey Meadows, Abingdon. Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and this site's planning history were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for this meeting. The planning officer reported that there were very special circumstances to approve the application due to the energy generation proposal complying with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Public speakers

Richard Riggs, spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant:

- The proposal was to build an archimedes screw to generate renewable energy
- The facility would be visible for all to see and would have educational value
- It might attract more visitors to the Abbey Meadows also
- Most investors were local
- The facility would belong to the local community

The committee supported the application, noting that the Environment Agency would need to licence the facility also.

RESOLVED (by 14 votes to nil)

To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:

1 : TL1 - time limit

2 : Approved plans

3 : MC2 – sample materials

4 : No development shall take place until detailed designs of the fish pass have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details before development takes place.

5 : Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall take place until detailed designs of the new foot bridges have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be completed in full prior to the first operation of the hydro facility hereby approved.

6 : Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall take place until detailed designs for all new foot paths have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be completed in full prior to the first operation of the hydro facility hereby approved.

7 : Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall take place until detailed designs of all cable routes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be completed in full prior to the first operation of the hydro facility hereby approved.

8 : Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved drawings, no development shall take place until detailed designs of all sheet piling and their cappings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be completed in full prior to the first operation of the hydro facility hereby approved.

9 : Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, including any demolition or site clearance, surveys for bats and water voles shall be completed to update the information on the species and the impact of development and a report of surveys together with an amended mitigation strategy as appropriate shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority, and shall be thereafter be implemented as agreed.

10 : No development shall take place until details for the provision of 4 bat boxes and 1 tawny owl box have been submitted to and approved by the Council. Details shall include the type of bat boxes/ nest boxes to be used and the proposed locations including height and orientation on retained trees. The approved works shall be implemented in full before the development is first brought into use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the council.

11 : No development shall take place until an arboricultural method statement, which must include a tree protection plan, to ensure the satisfactory protection of retained trees during
Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and then implemented on site prior to commencement of any site works. The matters to be encompassed within the arboricultural method statement shall include the following:

- (i) A specification, in accordance with BS3998:2010 tree work – recommendations, for the pruning of, or tree surgery to, trees to be retained in order to prevent accidental damage by construction activities.
- (ii) The specification of the location, materials and means of construction of temporary protective fencing and/or ground protection in the vicinity of trees to be retained, in accordance with the recommendations of the current edition of *BS 5837 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction"*, and details of the timing and duration of its erection;
- (iii) The definition of areas for the storage or stockpiling of materials, temporary on-site parking, site offices and huts, mixing of cement or concrete, and fuel storage;
- (iv) The specification of the routing and means of installation of the underground electricity cable in the vicinity of retained trees; consideration should be made to avoid the siting of the cable within the root protection area (RPA) of all trees to be retained. Only where it can be demonstrated that there is no alternative location for the cable, will encroachment into the RPA be considered. Methodology for any installation works within the RPA will be provided and must be in compliance with NJUG Volume 4, 2007 'Guidelines for the planning and installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees'.
- (v) The details of the materials and method of construction of the temporary roadway, which is to be of a 'no dig' construction method in accordance with the principles of Arboricultural Practice Note 12 "Through the Trees to Development", and in accordance with current industry best practice; and as appropriate for the type of roadway required in relation to its usage.
- (vi) Provision, prior to the commencement of construction, for the direct supervision by an appropriately qualified consultant, appointed at the developer's expense, of ANY works within the root protection areas of trees to be retained and for the monitoring of continuing compliance with the specified protective measures. The local planning authority are to be notified of the appointed consultant, provided with a timetable of intended site monitoring visits and included in the reporting structure for all monitoring results.
- (vii) Provision for the assessment of trees and preparation of a remedial tree works schedule at the post construction phase following removal of the temporary protective fencing is to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority and be implemented in accordance with the schedule.

12 : No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include hard surfacing materials, schedules of new trees and shrubs to be planted (noting species, plant sizes and numbers/densities), the identification of the existing trees and shrubs on the site to be retained (noting species, location and spread), any earth moving operations and finished levels/contours, and an implementation programme.

All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the details and programme approved under this condition. Thereafter, the landscaped areas shall be maintained for a period of five years. Any trees or shrubs which die or become seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Vale Of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee Minutes

13 : Prior to the commencement of any development a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved plan shall be complied with throughout the construction period, and shall provide details of the following:

1. routing protocol for vehicles entering the site from the nearest adoptable road
2. vehicle parking facilities for construction workers, other site operatives and visitors;
3. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
4. vehicle wheel washing facilities;
5. repair regime for access roads leading to the site
6. photographic condition survey of routes to be used from the nearest adoptable road to the site before and after works

14 : No development (including any demolition or site clearance groundworks) shall take place until a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the local planning authority undertakes an archaeological written scheme of investigation, relating to the application site area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Following the approval of the written scheme of investigation referred to above, no development shall commence on site without the appointed archaeologist being present. Once the watching brief has been completed its findings shall be reported to the local planning authority, as agreed in the approved written scheme of investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication.

15 : No materials, plant, temporary structures or excavations of any kind shall be deposited / undertaken on or adjacent to the public right of way that may obstruct or dissuade the public from using the public right of way whilst development takes place.

16 : No lighting shall be installed without the prior grant of planning permission.

17 : Prior to the first use of the hydro facility hereby approved, details of any visitor interpretation panels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Informatives:

All wild birds and their nests receive protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it illegal to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is use or being built. Therefore in order to avoid contravention of this legislation any site works likely to affect potential bird nesting habitat should be timed to avoid the main bird nesting season which runs from March to August. If this is not possible, a check should be carried out prior to any clearance works to ensure there are no active nests present.

Please note that Flood Defence Consent will be required for the proposed development. Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Thames Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank / foreshore of the River Thames designated a 'main river'. Please contact westthamesconsents@environment-agency.gov.uk

No changes to the public right of way direction, width, surface, signing or structures shall be made without prior permission approved by the Oxfordshire County Council Countryside Access Team or necessary legal process.

No construction / demolition vehicle access may be taken along or across a public right of way without prior permission and appropriate safety / mitigation measures approved by the Oxfordshire County Council Countryside Access Team. Any damage to the surface of the public right of way caused by such use will be the responsibility of the applicants or their contractors to put right / make good to a standard required by the Countryside Access Team.

Exempt information under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972

None

The meeting closed at 10.05pm