

DC.26

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

HELD AT THE GUILDHALL,
ABINGDON ON MONDAY, 3RD JULY,
2006 AT 6.30PM

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Terry Cox, Tony de Vere, Richard Farrell, Jenny Hannaby, Monica Lovatt, Jim Moley, Jerry Patterson, Peter Saunders, Pam Westwood, Andrew Crawford, Gervase Duffield and Alison Thomson.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Matthew Barber (In place of Roger Cox), Mary de Vere (In place of Richard Gibson), Eddy Goldsmith (In place of Margaret Turner) and Tessa Ward (In place of Briony Newport)

NON MEMBERS: Councillors Andrew Crawford, Gervase Duffield and Alison Thomson

OFFICERS: Katie Barrett, Sarah Commins, Steve Culliford, Martin Deans, Rodger Hood, Geraldine Le Cointe and Katie Barrett.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 32

DC.42 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 Roger Cox, Richard Gibson, Briony Newport and Margaret Turner.

DC.43 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 8, 22 and 24 May 2006 were adopted and signed as correct records, subject to minute DC.344 regarding 'Demolition of Existing Garden Centre and Extension to Store and Car Park, on land at Tesco, Abingdon' in the minutes of 8 May 2006 being amended in the paragraph labelled (1) to read "...Department of the Community and Local Government...".

DC.44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Richard Farrell declared a personal interest in the Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Local Plan as he was a member of the Faringdon Area Project (minute DC.52 refers). Councillor Matthew Barber declared a personal interest in the Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Local Plan as he was involved with the Faringdon Community Bus (minute DC.52 refers). Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared a personal interest in the planning application for the former Dow site at Letcombe Regis as she was a member of the Letcombe Brook Steering Group (minute DC.53 refers). Councillor Jerry Patterson declared a personal interest with regard to the application at Sutton Mill, Sutton Courtenay as he knew Honorary Alderman Margaret MacKenzie who was speaking on behalf of the Parish Council (minute DC.56 refers). Councillor Tony de Vere declared a personal interest in the application at Sutton Mill, Sutton Courtenay as he knew Mr Eastwood, one of the public speakers (minute DC.56 refers).

DC.45 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.46 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

- (1) Anna Marlow made a statement on behalf of the Faringdon Area Project regarding the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the land between the A420 and Faringdon, to the north of Park Road. With regard to a performance venue, the Guidance had stated that a performance venue already existed. This was not the case. What existed was an old, small theatre in need of refurbishment and with no parking. Faringdon Area Project had identified the need for a multi-use performance venue, suitable for dance, drama, skating, cinema, concerts. There was not a suitable sized venue in the town. This was a prime opportunity for some money to be allocated that would enable grant funding to be sought.

Regarding a creche and car parking, the original supplementary planning guidance had included an extension to the gym at the Leisure Centre. This had now been replaced with the need for a crèche and parking. Neither facility had been identified as needed by the Faringdon Healthcheck. The inclusion of a car park pre-empted the findings of the parking study that had been referred to in the guidance. She suggested that both these items should be removed, pending investigation. These were of a lower priority than the facilities identified by Faringdon Area Project and the Town Council.

The need for a detailed parking study had been included covering 'on and off street parking in the town centre, car parks, leisure centre and local schools'. The work carried out by a member of Town Council and local people had been well documented. It was hoped that this would be used as a basis for the technical study.

The Faringdon Healthcheck had identified the need for better links to national transport services, hence the request to include a place for coaches to stop and turn on Park Road. The comment that it would be more appropriate for coaches to stop in the Market Place, took no account of the congestion often experienced in the town, or the fact that coach operators stopped coming into Faringdon for this very reason. She asked the Committee to reconsider this – a place where National Express coaches could stop would be of great advantage to existing and new residents. Now the town centre had been refurbished, it might be that tour operators would reconsider coming into the town centre.

Oxfordshire County Council would be seeking contributions from the developers to enhance the local bus service. This needed to be clarified. It seemed there was already a move to stop the Heyfordian service. A contribution to the community bus was included as a requirement in the Guidance. It was assumed that this was to support the existing service and therefore any contribution would go directly to the Faringdon bus group.

The Vale Council's Arts Strategy explained that the aim to use the arts to improve the physical environment would be developed and shared with planners, the private sector, artists and potential partners, including local people and communities.

Throughout history, towns had been enhanced by the use of decorative arts, crafts and design, from historic monuments and sculptures to innovative designs of clocks, signs, fencing, gateways and decorative paving. Given the need to include some form of art, the Faringdon Area Project requested that the community was involved in deciding what this might be.

It was unclear what the Council was suggesting in terms of location of the skate park. If additional land from the developers (other than the country park extension) was required, it seemed likely that this would jeopardise the possibility of getting some of the other facilities, so needed by the town. In such a large area of land that the country park would cover, there should be a suitable place for a Skate Park.

- (2) Gene Webb made a statement regarding the same Supplementary Planning Guidance referred to by Anna Marlow. It appeared that the Guidance was created some time ago. Government guidelines had suggested that Supplementary Planning Guidance should be produced in conjunction with the community, in Faringdon's case this would have been the Town Council, the Faringdon Area Project, the Chamber of Commerce, and others. Had this been done, the Guidance would have been more relevant and up to date, requiring less investigation and amendment. Given the importance of this development to Faringdon and the possible benefits that might arise, a more interactive consultation process was desirable.

She believed that her submission made in the consultation process appeared not to have been considered, as was her request that the Faringdon Area Project and other key groups could be involved with the development of the guidance. She had to ask for an acknowledgement of her submission and received one. She knew of at least one more submission from someone not mentioned in Appendix 11. She asked what the Committee intended to do about this.

She believed that the creche facilities and parking at the Leisure Centre should be removed in favour of a performance venue. The comment that Faringdon had a performance venue was erroneous. Faringdon had a small theatre at the rear of the Pump House. This was unsuitable as a multi function performance venue for the size of the town. The Community College was about to have a new science block with parking. Ideally this would be planned so that the car parking was available for wider use than just the school.

While the town bus service was useful to some people, in reality it was mostly used by older people, who did not have a car or no longer drove. It was unsuitable for some of those as they could not wait at bus stops, they needed to be picked up from their home. It was well known that the population needing dial-a-ride/in town bus services was diminishing as most people had cars. There did not appear to be a connection with the development and the community bus, unlike the Swan Lane development which was specifically for over 55s and had made a contribution to the community bus. While a modest contribution to the community bus might be appropriate, she thought it was a much lower priority than some of the other suggestions, especially those that would benefit the wider population.

A group of people in Faringdon had produced a map showing the cycle routes in the town, to encourage less car use. All households in Faringdon and the surrounding villages had been given a copy. The map had been annotated with suggestions for more cycle and dual purpose routes and had been passed to Oxfordshire County Council, which was currently reviewing cycleways. She urged that this information was taken into account when planning the housing development and in considering cycling needs.

The Chair thanked the two speakers for their statements and reported that the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance would be discussed later in the meeting (minute DC.52 refers).

DC.47 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None

DC.48 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that eight members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting, although one declined to do so.

DC.49 MATERIALS

None

DC.50 APPEALS

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

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.51 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.

DC.52 VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN TO 2011 - SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

(Councillors Richard Farrell and Matthew Barber declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.)

The Committee received and considered report 27/06 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy), which set out comments received on the revised draft Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Local Plan. The report recommended changes to parts of the Guidance as a result of the comments received. The Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group had given careful consideration to the comments and agreed with the majority of the recommendations. However, the Advisory Group had suggested several changes to the recommendations. These changes were set out in a briefing note tabled at the meeting. Also tabled was a draft version of the Guidance relating to Affordable Housing. This showed the text in its amended form, if all of the recommended changes were agreed.

The Development Control Committee had listened to two statements from members of the public, both representing the Faringdon Area Project, targeting their comments at Appendix 11 relating to the land between the A420 and Faringdon, to the north of Park Road. They had

suggested amendments to the Supplementary Planning Guidance as part of the statutory consultation and made further suggestions to Members at the Committee meeting. The Planning Officer responded to these as follows:

- There had been extensive consultation on the Supplementary Planning Guidance, including an exhibition in July 2004 and re-consultation in March/April 2006
- Faringdon Town Council and the Faringdon Area Project had responded, as well as many other community groups. As much as the officers would like to have met all consultees, there was not time to do this in the timescale available
- Gene Webb's response had been included in the schedule of comments received, under the name of Faringdon Area Project
- There was no specific proposal for a performance venue so the Council could not ask for funding towards it
- The requirement for contributions towards a crèche and car parking at the Leisure Centre were included following a request by the Council's Leisure Service
- The Community College could not be asked to provide car parking for the Faringdon area generally
- The Council would be seeking a contribution from developers towards the Faringdon Community Bus but could not demand specific pick up points
- The officers would look at the cycle routes identified in the Faringdon cycleway map to check whether appropriate linkages to them were shown in the Guidance
- A coach stop and turning point could not be required to be funded by the development. The town centre was thought to be the most appropriate location - the Town Council was understood to be discussing this further with National Express
- Community art on the site would be the subject of extensive community consultation in accordance with the Guidance on Planning and Public Art
- The location of the proposed skate park was considered to be better closer to some housing where there could be some casual supervision of the facility, rather than on an isolated site at the Folly Park

The local Member for Faringdon wanted it clarified that point 9 of the Advisory Group's recommendations should refer to the youth centre facilities on a different line to 'pump rooms' in paragraph 7.6 in Appendix 11 of the Guidance. He also suggested that the reference to the Pump Rooms should be preceded by the words "performance venue including the". The Committee agreed to these suggestions.

Some concern was expressed by the local Member for Grove at the description of the Grove Airfield site set out in the Guidance for the proposed development, and how the slope would affect the drainage of the site. She felt that as the majority of the area planned for housing sloped to the north, towards the railway line, where there would be no outflow. She believed that an expensive drainage scheme would be required, leaving less funding for infrastructure or resulting in higher house prices. It was agreed that the officer would check the description of the site as defined by the developers' recent detailed topographical study and, if necessary, amend the description in Appendix 12. The officers assured the Local Member that surface water drainage issues had been taken into account and the requirement for appropriate measures to be put in place to ensure that surface water run off was dealt with appropriately, was set out in section 5 of the Guidance.

RESOLVED

that the Executive be recommended to recommend the Council to:

- (i) *note the comments received on the revised draft Supplementary Planning Guidance;*

(ii) *adopt the Supplementary Planning Guidance with effect from 20 July 2006 for: (each by fifteen votes to nil)*

- *House Extensions Design Guide - Appendix 1*
- *Parking Standards - Appendix 2*
- *Timbmet Site, Cumnor Hill - Appendix 3*
- *Land West of Timbmet Timber Yard, Cumnor Hill - Appendix 4*
- *Grove Technology Park, Grove - Appendix 5*
- *Kingston Business Park, Kingston Bagpuize - Appendix 6*
- *White Horse Business Park, Stanford in the Vale - Appendix 7*
- *Curtis Industrial Estate and Hinksey Business Centre, Botley - Appendix 8*
- *Planning and Public Art - Appendix 9*
- *Flood Zone Maps and Flood Risk - Appendix 10*
- *Land between A420 and Faringdon, North of Park Road, Faringdon - Appendix 11*
- *Former Airfield West of Grove, Development Principles and Guidelines - Appendix 12*
- *Affordable Housing - Appendix 13*

subject to the changes proposed in each Appendix and to the following changes recommended by the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group:

1. *in Appendix 1 relating to permitted development rights being withdrawn to allow integral garages to be converted, change the second sentence of the response to read 'if on-street parking provision is tight, particularly in high density development, permitted development will be removed in appropriate circumstances';*
2. *in Appendix 3 relating to the Timbmet Site at Cumnor Hill, the Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended in para. 2.5 by adding 'in the Local Plan' to the end of the last sentence;*
3. *in Appendix 3 relating to the Timbmet Site at Cumnor Hill, the Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended in para. 2.29 by adding 'Any developer is advised to make early contact with Thames Water' to the end of the last sentence. The paragraph to be clarified to set out the responsibilities for funding works to provide water supply and waste water/sewage disposal. The guidance shall also refer to an energy strategy being submitted, similar to the guidance for housing at Faringdon;*
4. *in Appendix 5, the Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Grove Technology Park be amended in para. 5.1 to include a contribution being required from developers to the Wantage Relief Road, as referred to in the Local Plan;*
5. *in Appendix 9 relating to Planning and Public Art, para. 5.1 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended by deleting the last bullet point and replacing it with 'installation of stone sculptures at Letcombe Park, Wantage;*
6. *in Appendix 10 relating to Flood Zones Maps and Flood Risk, para. 5.3 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended in the first sentence to delete 'prevent' and insert 'present';*
7. *in Appendix 11 relating to land between the A420 and Faringdon, north of Park Road, explicit reference be made to no floodlights being allowed at the proposed location for the rugby ground at Folly Park;*
8. *in Appendix 11 relating to land between the A420 and Faringdon, north of Park Road, cycle tracks identified in the Faringdon cycleway map be included in the Guidance;*
9. *in Appendix 11, the Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Faringdon be amended in para. 7.6 to read "A performance venue, including the Pump Rooms - (disabled lift)" with "improvements to youth centre facilities" on a separate line;*

10. *in Appendix 11 relating to land between the A420 and Faringdon, north of Park Road, the proposed explanation of the requirements for infrastructure improvements to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005 be deleted from Appendix 11 but included in an introduction to all Supplementary Planning Guidance;*
 11. *in Appendix 12 relating to Grove Airfield, the description of the Grove Airfield site be amended, if necessary, to be consistent with the developers' recent detailed topographical study;*
 12. *in Appendix 12 relating to Grove Airfield, paragraphs 1.5 and 4.7 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance be amended to clarify that the Grove Development Forum will continue to operate until the development is complete and thereafter could take on a different form, such as a residents' association;*
 13. *in Appendix 12 relating to Grove Airfield, the Supplementary Planning Guidance to include the standard paragraph suggested by Thames Water about funding for foul and surface water drainage systems;*
 14. *in Appendix 12 relating to Grove Airfield, the Supplementary Planning Guidance, para. 6.4 be amended to read "...The Council may therefore require the developers...";*
 15. *in Appendix 12 relating to Grove Airfield, the Supplementary Planning Guidance, para. 6.8, the County Council's suggested wording on Special Education Needs be re-written;*
 16. *Annexe A and para 6.5 to Appendix 12 be amended to refer to shared ownership and intermediate housing;*
 17. *in Appendix 13 relating to Affordable Housing, the Supplementary Planning Guidance, the change proposed to para. 4.2 may need changing when legal advice on option arrangements is taken;*
 18. *in Appendix 13 relating to Affordable Housing, the addition to para. 6.4 be amended further to read "...the Housing Corporation through the social housing grant will secure additional affordable housing...";*
 19. *define Botley in the Supplementary Planning Guidance;*
 20. *throughout the Guidance, references to 'section 106 obligations' be replaced by 'legal agreements';*
- (iii) *make available a copy of the consultation undertaken, the representations received and the Council's response, along with the Supplementary Planning Guidance; and*
- (iv) *delegate authority to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) to make any minor editorial changes and any substantive changes to be made in consultation with the Chair of the Strategic and Local Planning Advisory Group.*

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 27/06 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.53 LRE/957/65-X – RE-DEVELOPMENT OF SITE. LRE/957/64-CA – DEMOLITION OF ALL BUILDINGS EXCEPT THE LODGE. LETCOMBE LABORATORY, LETCOMBE REGIS

(Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.)

The Committee was advised that:

- the development was a departure from the development plan

- it was class C2 and therefore there was no requirement to provide affordable housing as part of the scheme
- the Letcombe Brook Project Officer had raised several issues but these had since been resolved
- the County Ecologist and English Heritage were happy with the recommended conditions relating to ecological and archaeological issues
- negotiations on the Section 106 agreement had resulted in the applicants agreeing to provide all the items set out in the report with the exception of £75,000 contribution to the Wantage Independent Advice Centre
- an additional £40,000 had been requested by the County Council towards bus services if the applicants' minibus scheme did not come to fruition
- the applicants had agreed to pay the Parish Council £10,000 for the provision of additional burial ground
- the applicants had also agreed to pay the Parish Council an additional £25,000 for the construction of a new tennis court
- the paddock area on the eastern edge of the site was to be the subject of a covenant to protect it from development
- negotiations between the Parish Council and the applicants were believed to have overcome some of the objections
- a further ten letters of support had been received for the application
- a further four letters of objection had been received asking for a better balance of housing which should make provision for younger people
- two additional conditions were suggested:
 - (i) to control external lighting
 - (ii) to control the number of units on the site, limited to no more than indicated in the outline application unless agreed in writing with the local planning authority
- condition 21 should be amended to read "Notwithstanding the submitted plans, there should be no..."
- the recommendation (ii) in the report had been amended to delegate authority to approve the Conservation Area consent
- an informative should be attached to the permission stating that, when submitting the detailed application, the applicants should have regard to the scale and elevational treatment of the scheme as shown in the outline application as this had been influential in the Council's consideration of the application

Maurice Ginniff made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council. He commented that Letcombe Regis was a very small village with no amenities. The Parish Council had struggled with the problem of the large brownfield site at Letcombe Laboratory for many years, trying to ensure it was developed in harmony with the village setting. The Local Plan Inspector's decision to allocate 100 dwellings on this site meant the Parish Council had a distressing choice of 100 houses or a care village, both meaning a 50% increase in the population. Meetings between the managing director of the care village and the Parish Council had resulted in an application that the Parish could now support.

Mr Rowley, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application, promoting the care village as the best solution for this site. It brought about a reduction in the overall built up area and hard standing, it would result in less traffic, more green areas and a mini bus service for residents and staff. The design had met with approval and there would be on-going management of the ecology, and a shop, café and restaurant open to all, villagers included. With the Section 106 contributions he believed that the proposal would bring community benefits and was an excellent compromise for the site.

The local Member queried why there had been no Section 106 contribution towards the District Council's functions, such as recycling facilities. He asked that the bund or berm at the

site was protected from development and that the number of close care units was restricted to 52, not 72. He expressed concern at the potential for future development in the north-west corner of the site.

The Committee supported the development of the site as shown in the outline application. Members supported the addition of an informative to ensure the reserved matters application followed the scale and elevational treatment of the outline application. This was considered to be less harmful than the impact 100 dwellings might have on the village. Members also supported the local Members' suggestion that the development should include recycling facilities. It was noted that the Section 106 agreement was very close to completion. Condition (iii) in the report proposed that the agreement had to be signed by Thursday 6 July 2006 or permission would be refused. Some Members expressed concern at this tight deadline, believing that it was more important to allow further time for the agreement to be completed to achieve the best for the development. Some concern was also expressed at the amount of car parking being sought at the site. It was felt this was inadequate to deal with the demand from staff and visitors, whose numbers could escalate at weekends. There might be an adverse impact of the surrounding village streets if further parking was not provided.

RESOLVED

- (a) *that authority to approve application LRE/957/65-X be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee, subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the following: (by 15 votes to nil)*
- (1) *condition 20 being amended to specify that the key worker units are to be occupied by care village staff and no other occupants;*
 - (2) *condition 21 being amended to read "Notwithstanding the submitted plans, there should be no...";*
 - (3) *further conditions to regulate external lighting, limit the number of units on the site to no more than indicated in the outline application unless agreed in writing with the local planning authority, and to secure the provision of adequate recycling facilities; and*
 - (4) *an informative being added stating that, when submitting the detailed application, the applicants must have regard to the scale and elevational treatment of the scheme as shown in the outline application;*
- (b) *that authority to approve application LRE/957/66-CA be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee, subject to the conditions set out in the report (by 14 votes to 1); and*
- (c) *that in the event that the Section 106 agreement is not completed by 6 July 2006, the planning application be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee, for refusal on the grounds that the development has not secured the necessary measures required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development (by 9 votes to 5 with 1 abstention).*

DC.54 GFA/4905/7-D – ERECTION OF 9 HOUSES. THE WILLOW HOUSE, 18 COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON

The Committee was advised that:

- An amended plan had been received with some changes to reduce the impact of the development on neighbouring properties. The amended plan was still the subject of consultation
- A letter had been received from Southern Electric Power stating that it had no objection to the application

- A letter of support had been received from Councillor Alison Thomson, local Member
- A letter of objection had been received from the owner of 16 Coxwell Road regarding the plans to block the access to his property from the site's access road. The objector had commented that he might seek a judicial review and damages from the Council. The Planning Officer reported that this was a private matter between the objector and the developer. It was not a planning matter which the Committee needed to take account of

Mr Janata, made a statement objecting to the application. He lived at 16 Coxwell Road and objected to the planned blocking of the access to his property. He stated that he had a legal right of access. His letters to the developers had been ignored. He intended to pursue the matter through Human Rights legislation, in particular, his right to the peaceful enjoyment of his property. He believed that the Council was open to challenge under the Human Rights Act and could not claim that his case was not relevant.

The Committee asked for legal advice on Mr Janata's statement. The Council's Solicitor advised that this was not a planning matter. Individuals had the right to challenge this under judicial review but she considered that this was a matter for the objector to take up with the developer. The developer would not be able to implement the permission if it breached the objector's rights. Members agreed with the advice, believing that the Committee could not take this into account. It was a civil matter between the objector and the developer.

The Committee agreed with the local Member that the application was a well arranged plan, designed to cause minimum disturbance to surrounding properties. However, it was considered important for the hedges to be maintained and suggested this should be the subject of a condition.

RESOLVED (by 15 votes to nil)

that authority to approve application GFA/4905/7-D be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee, subject to reconsultation on the amended plans and conditions including materials, parking, boundary treatment (including a minimum and maximum hedge height), landscaping, and the removal of permitted development rights to insert windows in certain elevations on the proposed houses.

DC.55 KBA/16091/1 – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY. ERECTION OF REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. 19 LIME GROVE, SOUTHMOOR

Mrs Effer, the applicant, made a statement outlining the intention to improve this family dwelling, taking into account the comments made by neighbours and the local planning authority in its guidance. The intention was to reduce the impact on neighbours and to ensure the development was not detrimental to its surroundings.

The Committee supported the application.

RESOLVED (by 15 votes to nil)

that application KBA/16091/1 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.56 SUT/19506 AND SUT/19506/1-LB – DEMOLITION OF HOUSE AND OUTBUILDINGS, RESTORATION/CONVERSION OF SUTTON MILL TO FORM OFFICE/STUDIO/STORAGE, ERECTION OF DWELLINGS AND CAR PARKING. UPPER MILL, SUTTON MILL AND LAND ADJACENT TO TULLIS CLOSE, SUTTON COURTENAY

(Councillors Jerry Patterson and Tony de Vere both declared personal interests in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.)

The Committee was advised that:

- Two further letters of objection had been received, expressing concerns at two properties, rather than one, being planned to front onto Tullis Close
- A third letter from SPAB called for a condition to prohibit sandblasting of the wood on the Listed Building. The officers supported this

Honorary Alderman Margaret MacKenzie made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council. She believed that over the past few years, the Parish Council had been increasingly ignored by the District Council in its comments on planning applications and felt that it was paying lip service to the concept of consultation. On this occasion, the Parish Council supported the application, subject to two provisos. The Listed Building, Sutton Mill, should be protected from conversion to a residential property at a later date. There should also only be one dwelling fronting Tullis Close.

Mr Eastwood made a statement objecting to the application. He represented the views of twenty households in the area in believing that there should only be one dwelling fronting Tullis Close. Two houses in that position would dominate the street scene and be out of character with the surrounding area. One dwelling in this location, designed to fit in with the street scene, would be acceptable.

Mr Lyzba, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application. He believed that it had been well designed, respecting the setting of its surroundings in relation to the Mill and Tullis Close and complied with the Council's design standards. The Mill would be an ancillary building to one of the new dwellings on the site but would not be a separate residential property.

In response to the comments made by the Parish Council, the Chair reminded the meeting that the Committee always listened to and took into account views expressed by Town and Parish Councils but had to make its decisions based on planning law, the Local Plan and planning guidance. Members always took Parish Council comments into account but might not always agree.

The local Member did not oppose the application but expressed concern at two houses fronting Tullis Close. He believed this was too cramped and would destroy the street scene; it should be just one dwelling. He also felt these houses were shown too far forward on the plans, breaching the building line. He also expressed concern that two healthy trees had been removed from the site and he did not wish for more to be disturbed. He also asked whether the hedges adjacent to the site frontage on Tullis Close could be protected by a planning condition. Officers advised that the hedges and shrubs fronting Tullis Close were not worthy of preservation and would be likely to be removed to provide access to the dwellings. However, a landscaping scheme would be required by condition.

Some members supported the application but asked that the Listed Building, Sutton Mill, should be protected from conversion to a residential property at a later date. Others disagreed, believing that the two houses fronting Tullis Close would be too cramped, as shown on the plans submitted. It was suggested that two smaller dwellings would be better.

RESOLVED (by 9 votes to 6)

- (a) *that authority to approve application SUT/19506 be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control*

Committee, subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition requiring the retention of Sutton Mill as an ancillary building to one of the new dwellings; and

- (b) *that authority to approve application SUT/19506/1-LB be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee, subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to an additional condition preventing sandblasting to clean the wood.*

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

None

The meeting rose at 10.10 pm