

DC.13

**MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL,
ABINGDON ON MONDAY, 12TH
JUNE, 2006 AT 6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Roger Cox, Tony de Vere, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Monica Lovatt, Jim Moley, Briony Newport, Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner and Pam Westwood.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Matthew Barber for Councillor Terry Cox and Eddy Goldsmith for Councillor Peter Saunders.

NON MEMBER: Councillor Gervase Duffield.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Carole Nicholl, Emma Phillips and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 35

DC.21 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The attendance of Substitute Members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with apologies for absence having been received from Councillors Terry Cox and Peter Saunders.

DC.22 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared interests in report 16/06 – Planning Applications as follow: -

<u>Member</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal & Prejudicial	WAN/8314/6	She was one of the objectors to the application.	DC.31
Jerry Patterson	Personal	WAN/8314/6	He was a Member of the Licensing Sub-Committee which had considered the Premises Licence application in respect of the premises.	DC.31
Monica Lovatt	Personal	ABG/10633/7	Her husband was an ex service man who paid a fee to the British Legion. However, neither she nor her husband frequented the Club.	DC.34

Jim Moley	Personal	ABG/10633/7	He was a Member of the British Legion.	DC.34
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	ABG/10633/7	She was the President of the Wantage Branch of the British Legion.	DC.34
Eddy Goldsmith	Personal	WAN/17860/2	He was a Member of Wantage Town Council's Planning Committee which had considered this application.	DC.37

DC.23 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair asked Councillors and members of the public to switch their mobile telephones off during the meeting and to listen to the debate in silence.

For the benefit of members of the public, the Chair advised that a local Member who was not a Member of the Committee or was not substituting for an absent Member, was able to address the Committee on applications in their ward only, but was not allowed to vote.

DC.24 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.25 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.26 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 14 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting.

DC.27 MATERIALS

None.

DC.28 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal lodged with the Planning Inspectorate for determination and two which had been dismissed.

Members welcomed the decisions in respect of the dismissed appeals, particularly in respect of WAN/18492/1, it being noted that the Inspector had considered that the Council's requirement of two car parking spaces for both the existing and the proposed dwellings was appropriate.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.29 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 16/06 of the Deputy Director detailing planning applications, the decisions of which are set out below. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.30 BOU/5703/21 – ERECTION OF A SINGLE DWELLING FOR OCCUPATION IN CONNECTION WITH PINWOOD SCHOOL. LAND ADJOINING 2 PINWOOD COTTAGE GARDENS, BOURTON

Mr C Bouwens the applicant, made a statement in support of the application advising that much of the development previously approved at the School had been completed and the Parish Council had now indicated its support for the car park. In respect of this proposal, he commented that the principle of boarding children was not an issue for consideration by Members. He referred to the School's commitment to 24 hour care to its boarders. To this end it was necessary to provide accommodation for staff and the current proposal would meet that need. He explained that a four bedroom house would provide suitable family accommodation. He reported that the Parish Council had been notified of the proposal and had been advised that the accommodation would be for School staff only, with parking being provided within the School grounds. He commented that the School employed local people. Finally, he reiterated that the development was necessary.

In response to a question raised it was confirmed that a condition could be imposed tying the house to the School. Furthermore, it was explained that permitted development rights could be withdrawn where this was reasonable. However, in this case it was considered that there was no reason to remove them.

One Member spoke in support of the application commenting that the development was acceptable and would be in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

On Member commented that such a large house could easily be converted into flats at a later date. However, the Committee was reminded that it needed to consider the application as presented.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application BOU/5703/21 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report with condition 6 being amended to read as follows: -

“6. The occupation of the dwelling hereby approved shall be restricted to a person solely or mainly employed by Pinewood School or his or her dependents (if any).”

DC.16

DC.31 WAN/8314/6 – VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF APPEAL DECISION APP/V3120/A/01/1075478 (WAN/8314/5) TO ALLOW TRADING AFTER 2300 HOURS. 24 WALLINGFORD STREET, WANTAGE

Councillor Jenny Hannaby had declared a Personal and Prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she left the meeting during its consideration. Councillor Jerry Patterson had declared a Personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

One of the local Members spoke against the application suggesting that the condition should not be varied and that the Council should seek to enforce the trading hours.

Another local Member agreed expressing concern regarding antisocial behaviour in the vicinity.

However, other Members spoke in support of the application noting that the application site formed part of a main shopping frontage in Wantage.

Reference was made to the new requirements under the Licensing Act 2003 and it was noted that additional training for Members was being organised.

By 12 votes to 1, with 1 abstention and 1 of the voting Members not being present during the consideration of this item it was

RESOLVED

that application WAN/8314/6 be approved subject to the following condition: -

“The premises shall only be open and customers shall only be allowed on the premises within the following hours: -

Sunday – Thursday 08:00 – 23:00

Friday – Saturday 08:00 – Midnight”

DC.32 EHE/9592/5 – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW. ERECTION OF THREE DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH CARPORTS. DUKES ORCHARD, ORCHARD LANE, EAST HENDRED

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application additional conditions should be added removing permitted development rights to plots 1 and 3 for out buildings and the means of enclosure to retain openness and defining the curtilage of plot 1 to prevent any extension of the curtilage into the open area which should be retained.

Ms R Sutton made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly commented that the site was adjacent to the Conservation Area and made an important contribution to it; the proposal was contrary to Local Plan policies HE1 and H5 in that the site contributed to the character of the settlement, a matter which was not fully addressed in the Officers report; concern regarding plot 3 explaining that this house would have a detrimental effect on the entrance to the village and High Street; the need for landscaping and concern regarding maintenance of the open space. Finally, she urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Chris Willis made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding the house on plot 3 and the impact this would have on views into the Conservation Area; the presence of a beech hedge which would be removed and replaced with fencing which would

be visually harmful; the proposal being contrary to policies in the Emerging Local Plan in that it was not like for like replacement; impact on wildlife; loss of fruit trees which in Spring time had beautiful blossoms; obscuring views of the Chapel and museum and the lack of benefit from this proposal to the village.

Mike Orr, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application explaining that care and consideration had been given to this proposal, which respected and complemented the existing houses in the area. He commented that attempts had been made to retain the open character and the centre of the site had been kept free from structures for this purpose. He explained that all parking would be hidden and contained within the site and that there was one access which assisted in this. He reported that at one time there had been a barn on the site and the proposal sought to reinstate that barn footprint. He commented that materials and details would complement the street scene and that the houses on plots 1 and 2 were in keeping with the local vernacular and style of development. Finally, he reiterated that the proposal would retain the open landscape character of the village and that the Conservation Officer and others supported the proposal.

The Committee was advised that Councillor Terry Fraser, the local Member had expressed concern regarding who would maintain the open area and the setting of a precedent for similar development on the site opposite.

The Officers explained that this application needed to be considered on its merits and that the open area would be in the ownership of plot 1 and maintained by the owners and they would not be permitted to use it in the same way as the rest of the land within their curtilage.

The Committee was advised that a landscaping condition could be imposed but the maintenance of any trees and shrubs planted would be enforceable for 5 years only.

Some concern was expressed regarding the loss of trees, although it was noted that it was not possible to place Tree Preservation Orders on fruit trees. However, it was considered reasonable to ask the Council's Arboricultural Officer to consider whether there were any other trees worthy of preservation on the site.

Some Members expressed support for the proposal suggesting that it would enhance the area. However, it was considered that the wall on the road frontage onto the High Street should be protected and that a wall on the southern boundary of plot 3 would be appropriate instead of a close boarded fence.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

- (a) *that application EHE/9592/5 be approved subject to: -*
- (1) *the conditions set out in the report;*
 - (2) *a standard landscaping condition to cover the maintenance of the open area adjacent to plot 1 for a period of 5 years;*
 - (3) *a boundary treatment condition to provide for a brick wall on the southern boundary of plot 3;*
 - (4) *a condition removing permitted development rights to plots 1 and 3 for out buildings and the means of enclosure to retain openness;*

DC.18

- (5) *a condition defining the curtilage of plot 1 to prevent any extension of the curtilage into the open area which should be retained.*
 - (6) *an informative regarding boundary treatments generally and specifically regarding the need to retain and protect the wall on the road frontage on the High Street.*
- (b) *that the Council's Arboricultural Officer be requested to consider whether there are any trees on the site worthy of preservation.*

DC.33 CHD/10442/10 AND CHD/10442/11-LB – DEMOLITION OF STORE/RETAIL UNIT. CONVERSION OF FARM BUILDINGS TO THREE RESIDENTIAL UNITS. POND FARM, HIGH STREET, CHILDREY

The Committee was advised that the plans had been amended to provide for dormers to the rear; a first floor rear dormer being replaced by a roof light and revised internal layout with a roof light now serving a bathroom and not a bedroom. Therefore, the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the applications a condition should be added to both to provide for the receipt of amended plans. Also, the Committee was advised that condition 9 set out in the report should be deleted.

It was noted that the Parish Council had not objected to the applications but had yet to receive the latest amended plans.

Mr John Freeth made a statement objecting to the applications commenting that he was unaware of the latest amended plans. He expressed concerns regarding the proposal particularly in relation to glazing heights which he suggested should be no less than 1.8 metres above finished floor level to underside of glazing height. He referred to correspondence he had sent to Members asking the Committee to have regard to his comments. Finally, he suggested that there should be an additional condition to provide that there should be no change to external features and therefore permitted development rights for those forms of development should be removed.

The Officers responded that it would be reasonable to add further conditions regarding window heights and removal of permitted development rights for extensions and alterations

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

- (a) *that application CHD/10442/10 be approved subject to: -*
- (1) *conditions 1 to 8 and 10 as set out in the report;*
 - (2) *further conditions to provide for the receipt of amended plans, a standard window height of 1.7m and the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and alterations; and*
 - (3) *an informative regarding the provision of water butts.*
- (b) *that application CHD/10442/11-LB be approved subject to: -*
- (1) *the conditions set out in the report; and*
 - (2) *a further condition to provide for the receipt of amended plans.*

DC.34 ABG/10633/7 – VARIATION OF CONDITIONS TO ALLOW CHANGED OPENING HOURS. THE ROYAL BRITISH LEGION CLUB, 25 SPRING ROAD, ABINGDON

Councillors Jenny Hannaby, Monica Lovatt and Jim Moley had each declared a Personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that there would be a net reduction in opening of 1 ½ hours per week and not 2 ½ hours as set out in the report

J Payne, a neighbouring resident made a statement objecting to the application. Speaking on behalf of those residents who had made representations to the Council and those residents who had not been able to write, she raised concerns regarding noise and disturbance; breaches of the existing condition in that the Club was often open beyond permitted times; the application site being in a densely populated residential area where there were family homes with young children, old age pensioners and people working from home who were disturbed by the existing noise levels; patrons of the Club being non local; further disturbance from vibration even if doors and windows of the Club remained closed; and disturbance from shouting, taxis running and slamming doors. She urged the Committee to reject the application commenting that approval of this application would lead to existing problems being exacerbated.

One of the local Members commented that the Club was in a residential area. She referred to recent residential development in the area commenting that there were even more residents living nearby. She commented on a complaint she had received regarding noise and indicated that to allow permission would worsen the noise and disturbance experienced by neighbours.

The Officers explained that a variation of a condition in 1999 to change the hours of opening had been approved which was a material consideration.

The other local Member reported that the Club caused a great deal of disturbance to local residents. He commented that Members were being advised that the main issue was noise impact. He suggested that the overall reduction in opening hours was misleading and gave a false impression that there would be improvement in the current noise and disturbance problems. He explained that the site was out of the town centre and had become more residential in recent years. Finally, he advised that on balance he did not support the application.

One Member commented that the Licensing Act 2003 was now in place and that the Club could apply for extended licensing hours. He commented that having regard to this new regime and the number of pubs in the area, this application was not unreasonable. Finally, he suggested that residents should contact the Council's Environmental Health Officer regarding any noise problems.

One Member questioned whether the proposal would adversely affect the amenity of the neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance. In response it was noted that the Environmental Health Officer had raised no objection, as there was other legislation to enforce any noise nuisance. The Member expressed concern at this, commenting that the Committee should not approve an application if it was likely that problems would result.

The Senior Legal Officer explained that the Club had been granted a Premises Licence under the licensing legislation and there was a mechanism for review of that licence. She advised that Members could take into account the comments made by the Member although the Committee had before it an opinion from the Environmental Health Officer giving his expert advice.

One Member suggested that the concerns raised regarding noise and disturbance received by the Planning Officers should be forwarded to the Environmental Health Officer for his action as necessary.

One Member commented that in such cases noise monitoring equipment could be installed. Whilst expressing some concerns, she considered that the Committee had no reason to refuse the application.

The Chair announced that it was open to members of the public to contact the Council's Environmental Health Service Area notifying it of the noise and disturbance concerns. By doing so a record would be kept of such incidents which would assist the Officers in taking any action to resolve the matter.

Councillor Richard Farrell as Executive Member with the portfolio for Environmental Health undertook to follow up the concerns raised in relation to the Club with the Environmental Health Officer.

By 9 votes to 6 it was

RESOLVED

(a) *that application ABG/10633/7 be approved subject to: -*

(1) *the condition set out in the report;*

(2) *an Informative stating that the hours of opening are amended and that the Club is expected to comply with them and that any breach of the hours may result in enforcement action.*

(b) *that the letters of objection received by the Planning Officers raising concerns regarding noise and disturbance be referred to the Council's Environmental Health Officer for his attention and action as necessary.*

DC.35 SUT/12094/4 – TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT AND REAR INCLUDING RENDERING OF WHOLE PROPERTY, 86 MILTON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application SUT/12094/4 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.36 GCO/17555/2 – CONSTRUCTION OF 6 TENNIS COURTS (2 FLOODLIT) WITH FENCING, CLUBHOUSE, CAR PARKING AND ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS, LAND WEST OF COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON

Two of the local Members spoke in support of the application commenting that the concerns raised by objectors would be safeguarded by conditions.

In response to a question raised it was clarified that there was pedestrian access to Coxwell Road at the northern end of the site and that the lighting would be identical in height, number and power to those previously approved.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application GCO/17555/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.37 WAN/17860/2 – ERECT 3-BEDROOM DETACHED DWELLING (REVISED SCHEME TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED APPLICATION WAN/17860/1). 18 FOLIAT DRIVE, WANTAGE

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application an additional condition should be added to provide for the receipt of amended plans.

Ms K Keyte made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding design in that there were predominantly semi detached houses in the area; the setting of a precedent in that there were other sites in the area where there could be similar extensions which cumulatively would have a harmful impact; and devaluation of properties.

In response to the statement made, the Officers clarified that the devaluation of property was not a material planning consideration.

One of the local Members commented that the proposal was out of character with the area and would set a precedent for similar development. However, in the light of the appeal decision to allow a property on this site there were no reasons to refuse this application which was not so significantly different.

Another local Member referred to the comments of the Town Council agreeing with the view expressed that this proposal amounted to overdevelopment of the site. He also expressed concern that access would be gained by crossing an existing passing bay, the loss of which would be detrimental. Furthermore, he expressed concern regarding materials commenting that the existing properties were constructed of cast concrete and that brick in this area would be out of keeping.

One Member expressed regret at the appeal decision commenting that in view of this, the Committee had no grounds to refuse permission. He commented that the proposal was not so significantly different from that approved to warrant refusal.

By 10 votes to 5 it was

RESOLVED

that application WAN/17860/2 be approved subject to: -

(1) the conditions set out in the report; and

(2) a further condition providing for the receipt of amended plans.

DC.38 WTT/18198/1 – NEW FOUR BEDROOM HOUSE. 46A CUMNOR ROAD, BOARS HILL, WOOTTON

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application WTT/18198/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.39 UPT/18307/1-X – ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING AND ALTERATION OF ACCESS TO HIGHWAY, LAND ADJACENT 1 BEECHING CLOSE, UPTON

Sarah Whatmore made a statement on behalf of Upton Parish Council raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly referred to the principle of a house on this site and whether the access was acceptable, advising that the Parish Council disagreed to both. With reference to the principle of a house she explained that this was a small plot and the proposal would result in a house at one end of the plot next to the tree line and close to the historic house. She referred to planning permission allowed on appeal for 3 dwellings in Beeching Close advising that the Inspector had made specific reference to trees and the historic building adjacent to this site. The Inspector had referred to the way houses should be located in relation to Station House and the need for additional tree planting. She commented that this proposal was contrary to Local Plan policies H5 and H11. Furthermore, she advised that the access was unacceptable in that visibility would be reduced due to the large verge proposed.

Lesley Shaw, representing other objectors made a statement objecting to the application also raising concerns relating to matters covered in the report. She explained that the recommendation for approval had been made on a fundamentally unsound basis. She reported that she was the freehold owner of the road and that she had not given permission for the proposed access. Furthermore, she explained that there were covenants on the land covering issues of liability for various matters such a drainage, which had not been addressed. She referred to there being no legal right of access and commented on Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. She commented that planning permission should be refused because of these matters. She referred to the setting of a precedent for similar developments should permission be granted. She commented that the site contributed positively to the village and that the bungalows in Beeching Close had been carefully considered. Finally, she reported that the proposal was contrary to Local Plan policies H5 and H11 and should be refused.

Mike Orr, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the proposal was in accordance with the Local Plan; there would be minimal impact in view of the lower level of the site and the mature tree screening; there would be improvements to the junction and the access would be safer for all the residents of Beeching Close. He referred to discussions with the County Engineer who raised no objection. He commented that Station House was not listed and its solitary setting had been lost when the application resulting in three bungalows in Beeching Close was approved. He explained that the proposed house would be no closer than the other properties in the area. Finally, he referred to the planning permission granted in respect of the neighbouring property "Ravello", advising that it would be inconsistent of the Council to now refuse this application.

The Council's Senior Legal Officer advised the Committee that the issues raised by the second speaker in relation to rights of access, land ownership and covenants on the land were private law matters and were not material planning considerations. She explained that should planning permission be granted these matters would need to be resolved between the private parties involved.

One Member spoke in support of the application commenting that there would no grounds to refuse the application, it being noted that the County Engineer had raised no objection to the proposal. He commented that in the context of the village, Station House was important, but it was not a listed building or within the Conservation Area. He expressed sympathy regarding the concerns raised regarding the loss of trees commenting that it was important that the screening of the site remained. To this end he suggested that an informative regarding the need for a landscaping scheme should be added to any permission.

Another Member suggested that there should an informative setting out the need to protect the verge and what was expected to achieve this.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application UPT/18307/1-X be approved subject to: -

- (1) the conditions set out in the report; and*
- (2) an Informative expressing the importance of the landscaping of the site and boundary treatments and advising that notwithstanding the illustrative layout plan these requirements may impact on the size and location of the dwelling which can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site.*

DC.40 WTT/18982/2 – DWELLING, GARAGE AND NEW ACCESS. ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT DOUBLE GARAGE. THE BUNGALOW, THE OLD POUND, WOOTTON

Mr Freeth, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application and referred to the concerns of the Parish Council. He explained that the size and siting of the proposed dwelling were commensurate with the local pattern of development. He drew the Committee's attention to condition 4 set out in the report commenting that many of the concerns raised were not material planning considerations. He explained that the trees were mostly fruit trees without any amenity value. He reported that the garage followed the pattern of development and that distances complied with standards and that there would be no overlooking. He reminded Members that they needed to consider the application as presented. Finally, he commented that the County Engineer had raised no objection to the proposal.

The Committee was advised that Councillor Tessa Ward as one of the local Members had raised some concerns, namely that the garage was too close to the road and this could result in an adverse visual impact on the street scene and proximity of the dwelling to the neighbouring property and therefore harmful impact on the amenity of the residents of that property.

The Officers commented that careful consideration had been given to the garage location and the proposed siting was considered the most favourable in terms of least impact.

One Member commented that there was an existing flat roof garage along the frontage and that in itself a garage along the front was not objectionable. He commented that the dwelling would not be out of keeping and would fit in with the street scene.

One Member commented on the unsightly appearance of the close boarded fence. However, the Officers reported that the fence would be away from the highway and behind the hedge and was nevertheless permitted development.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application WTT/18982/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.24

DC.41 SUT/19470 – MIXED USE RE-DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION, OFFICES, WORKSHOP/STORAGE, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING, APPLEFORD ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY

Further to the report the Committee was advised that the County Council was seeking a contribution of £25,576 towards the Didcot Integrated Transport Study. Furthermore, an amended flood risk assessment had been received which had been considered by the Environment Agency. The Agency had withdrawn its holding objection, subject to conditions which had yet to be received.

In additions to matters to be covered by conditions as set out in the report, the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application, authority to do so should be delegated to the Chief Executive and additional conditions should be added to address the comments of the Environment Agency; the provision of affordable housing; external lighting and boundary treatment. Furthermore, an informative referring to the significant traffic benefits of public use of the adjacent private road leading to the Hanson works should future circumstances permit and the applicant having regard to this.

Mr Harry Tout made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He advised that Abingdon Road was not wide enough to take traffic from the distribution centre. There was a narrow walk way and he expressed concern regarding pedestrian safety. He suggested that traffic should be directed away from this road and the 200 year old bridges should be protected. Finally, he suggested that there should be a weight restriction and he reiterated that the road was not suitable and neither were the bridges.

Mr Green representing the Green Group made a statement objecting to the application in terms of the amount of traffic and the use of the third access road adjacent to his premises. He explained that the Group employed approximately 900 people and was expanding. He reported that approximately 60 cars used the car park and there had been a number of incidents. He referred to vehicular movements and questioned why the access in the centre could not be used for common access.

Mr Hatcher made a statement in support of the application commenting that the site was a commercial site and the proposal was in accordance with planning policy. He referred to the level of consultation over the last 2 years explaining that the majority of the site would be used for employment purposes and would be used at a similar level to when Amey fully occupied the site. He reported that the housing would meet the needs of the village and would be affordable. He explained that the level of HGV traffic from the site could be controlled and HGV's would be prohibited from going into the village which was a benefit over the current use. He reported that there would be access improvements; landscaping; significant tree planting; building heights would be controlled; there would be retention of employment opportunities; a reduction in traffic and the proposal was a good use of a brown field site.

The local Member thanked the Officers and the applicant for keeping him informed of the application discussions from an early stage. He commented that the County Council recognised the three accesses but he asked the Committee to look more carefully at the flexibility along the access points. He suggested that the access to the west should be kept separate. Also, he commented that the private road to the Hanson Works was likely to become a public road at some point when the pit ceased to operate and that this should be taken into account now. Finally, he commented that it would not be wise to overload Culham Bridge.

One Member reminded the Committee that there was a certificate of lawful use and therefore without planning permission the commercial use of the site could be intensified without any

controls. He commented that the County Engineer supported the application and therefore an informative might be added to any permission drawing the applicant's attention to the comments raised.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Member be delegated authority to approve application SUT/19470 subject to: -

- (1) the application being referred to the Secretary of State and him raising no objection;*
- (2) a Section 106 obligation covering contributions to the improvement of the local highway network, education, library, fire and rescue, waste management, museum, social and health care and affordable housing;*
- (3) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (4) further conditions relating to the following: -*
 - (a) works to improve the visibility of existing accesses;*
 - (b) the provision of a footpath from the western (housing) access along the site frontage to join the footpath in front of the existing properties fronting Appleford Road;*
 - (c) the provision of on site cycle and disabled parking;*
 - (d) implementation of a water vole mitigation scheme;*
 - (e) details to be submitted regarding foul and surface water drainage;*
 - (f) the provision of a routing agreement;*
 - (g) no more than 15 dwellings to be provided on the housing site;*
 - (h) the new Class B8 buildings to be no more than 10 metres in height;*
 - (i) the size of the eight proposed storage and distribution units shall only be provided in accordance with the floor areas shown on approved drawing no. 02059:041 and shall not be amalgamated into one another without the prior written consent of the District Planning Authority.*
- (5) other conditions to address the following: -*
 - (a) external lighting;*
 - (b) the Environment Agency comments;*
 - (c) provision of affordable house;*
 - (d) boundary treatment;*
 - (e) reserved matters*
- (6) an informative referring to the significant traffic benefits of public use of the adjacent private road leading to the Hanson works should future circumstances permit and the applicant having regard to this.*

Exempt Information Under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972

None.

The meeting rose at 9.45 pm