

# DC.175

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON ON  
MONDAY, 23RD APRIL, 2007 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, Monica Lovatt, Jim Moley, Briony Newport, Jerry Patterson and Peter Saunders.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Mike Badcock (In place of Margaret Turner), Eddy Goldsmith (In place of Terry Cox), Joyce Hutchinson (In place of Jenny Hannaby) and Peter Jones (In place of Pam Westwood)

NON MEMBERS: Councillors Jane Hanna, Julie Mayhew-Archer, Janet Morgan and Derek Rawson.

OFFICERS: Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Carole Nicholl, George Reade and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 64

**DC.306 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, Jenny Hannaby, Margaret Turner and Pam Westwood.

**DC.307 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared interests in report 194/06 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Derek Rawson	Personal	CUM/19879/1	He lived in Cumnor Hill near the application site, but not so close as to be prejudicial.	DC.318
Tony de Vere	Personal and Prejudicial	KBA/6670/10	He was well acquainted with one of the objectors.	DC.321
Jerry Patterson	Personal	KEN/19763/1	He was a member of Kennington Parish Council which had objected to the application. However, he was not a member of the Parish Council's Planning Committee and he had taken no part in the consideration of the application.	DC.322
Richard	Personal	SUN/19936	He was acquainted with the	DC.324

Gibson			objectors but not to such an extent as to be prejudicial.	
Jim Moley	Personal and Prejudicial	WAN/18492/3	He was acquainted with some of the objectors.	DC.327
Joyce Hutchinson	Personal	WAN/18492/3	She was acquainted with some of the objectors but not to such an extent as to be prejudicial.	DC.327
Eddy Goldsmith	Personal	WAN/18492/3	He was a member of Wantage Town Council which had made representations on the application. He had previously been a member of the Town Council's Planning Committee, however, he had taken no part in the consideration of the revised plans.	DC.327

**DC.308 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

For the benefit of members of the public, the Chair announced that only Members of the Development Control Committee or their Substitutes could vote and that Wards Members whilst being allowed to address the Committee could not vote.

The Chair congratulated the planning staff and Councillors on achieving the following targets for determining planning applications: -

	Target	Achievement for 9 month period 1 July 2006 to 31 March 2007
Major Applications	60%	80%
Minor Applications	65%	83%
Other Applications	80%	90%

The Chair reminded Members that this was the last meeting of the Development Control Committee under the current administration. He took the opportunity to thank fellow Councillors for all their hard work and also thanked the Officers, particularly those in Planning for their support.

Finally the Chair advised that application SUN/2963/12 – X had been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore would not be considered later on the agenda.

**DC.309 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32**

None.

**DC.310 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32**

None.

**DC.311 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33**

It was noted that 17 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting. However, 5 members of the public declined to do so.

DC.312 MATERIALS

None.

DC.313 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a list of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings. In response to a comment made the Officers undertook to ensure that the list was updated.

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received.*

DC.314 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (SHRIVENHAM) NO. 12 2006

The Committee received and considered report 193/06 of the Landscape Officer (Arboriculture) which advised that following an enquiry from the R.M.C.S. at Shrivenham over the future of some trees on the site where they abutted Longcot Road it had been decided to protect a group of three birch trees and a yew tree with a Tree Preservation Order as these trees had the highest public amenity value and were in the best condition.

An objection had been received to the Order, specifically concerning the group of three birch trees details of which were set out in the report and explained fully at the meeting.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the Order be confirmed.*

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received and considered report 194/06 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) detailing planning applications, the decisions of which are set out below. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to make a statement were considered first.

DC.315 ABG/16258/1 - PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION. 80 HANSON ROAD, ABINGDON, OX14 1YL

Kelvin Sykes, a neighbour made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding the accuracy of the plans and photographs, commenting that they did not demonstrate the true impact of the proposal; loss of reflected light; the proposal be contrary to Planning Policy H24(3) in terms of dominance; size; and overlooking. He suggested that the extension should be reduced in size to minimise impact and that the extension should be subordinate to the main dwelling. He commented that any extension should preferably extend to the rear or into the loft area and that the current proposal was unacceptable. Finally, he invited Members of the Committee to view the site from his property to appreciate the concerns raised.

One of the local Members referred to the concerns raised locally regarding this proposal and expressed concern that the main living room windows and the main bedroom windows would have an outlook onto a blank wall. She questioned the distances commenting that the extension could have been designed better.

Another local Member commented that the proposed wall would be level with the existing garage and he suggested that a smaller extension stepped back from the house with a lower roof line would be preferable to address concerns regarding size, impact and dominance. However, it was noted that the Committee needed to consider the application as presented.

One Member spoke in support of the application commenting that guidelines were not rules. It was reported that the extension would be to the north and that there were similar extensions elsewhere in Abingdon.

Other Members considered that the Committee should adhere to the guidelines and refuse the application for not meeting them.

Other Members considered that on balance the proposal would be dominant and large but not sufficient to warrant refusal.

By 8 votes to 7 it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/16258/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.316 ABG/19126/2-D - DEMOLITION OF NOS. 75 & 77 NORTHCOURT ROAD. ERECTION OF 21 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. 75 & 77 NORTHCOURT ROAD, ABINGDON OX14 1NN

One of the local Members raised concern that the proposal would result in additional traffic. However, other Members supported the application.

By 11 votes to nil with 1 abstention and 3 members having already left the meeting it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/19126/2-D be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.317 ABG/19956/1- CANOPY, REFURBISHMENT, FENESTRATION ON UNITS 1-3, 37-39 BURY STREET & 13 MARKET PLACE, COMBINATION OF UNITS 31-32, ASSOCIATED STREET WORKS. ABG/19956-X - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO UNITS 1-3 & 9-12, COMBINATION OF UNITS, REPLACEMENT KIOSK WITH A TWO STOREY RETAIL UNIT & ASSOCIATED WORKS. THE PRECINCT, BURY STREET, ABINGDON

Amanda Prior had given notice that she wished to make a statement objecting to the application but she declined to do so.

The Officers drew attention to the steel canopy which was proposed overhead to allow maintenance.

The Committee was advised that a letter had been received from County and Town Councillor Lesley Legge stating that the detail should respect the historic character of Abingdon. She raised concern regarding signage which she suggested should be considered as a separate issue.

The Committee was advised that the applicants had asked that approval of the full application be delegated to enable final details to be resolved before the issue of planning permission. The Committee was therefore asked to consider delegating approval of both applications to

the Deputy Director in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee.

One of the local Members broadly welcomed the proposal commenting that the precinct was in need of improvement. She referred to the use of the car park by residents commenting that she hoped this arrangement would be safeguarded. She referred to the street furniture commenting that benches without arms were difficult for some people to use. She commented that it was regrettable that the applicant had not wanted to have sight of the plans for the Market Place as the Town Council had wanted to work together with the applicant on any proposal. She explained that the theme for the Market Place would be black painted galvanised steel and she suggested that this should be followed through into the precinct. Finally, she suggested that a financial contribution towards improvements in the Market Place should be sought.

Another local Member questioned whether there was any entitlement for Section 106 contributions. He expressed support for the proposal commenting that the appearance of the canopies was crucial and that specific regard should be given to their design. He suggested that the local Members should be consulted as part of any delegated authority. He referred to phase 2 commenting that the linkage to Bath Street was crucial. He explained that the through route was well used and he sought an assurance that the walk through would be adequate.

Other Members made the following comments:-

- The proposal would result in an improvement in the appearance of the precinct which would tie in with the Market Place enhancement scheme.
- An additional condition should be imposed requiring that once the poles are removed the pavement is made good using matching materials.
- Signage should be considered as a separate issue.
- A financial contribution of £15,000 towards the installation of CCTV should be sought.
- Furthermore, a financial contribution amounting to 10% of the cost should be sought towards the Market Place improvements. However, the Officers advised that if funding was already in place for a scheme, financial contributions could not be sought as part of a subsequent planning application.
- The open view to Bath Street from the precinct would be obscured and an alleyway created.
- The lighting of the alleyway should be considered.
- Discussions should be held with the local traders.
- A contribution should be sought towards the maintenance of the alleyway into Queens Street from the precinct. However, it was noted that the applicant was to take on this responsibility in the future.
- Consideration should be given to access to the shops for the disabled.
- The design of seating should be suitable for elderly people, preferably with some shelter.
- An improved scheme should be sought.
- Any scheme should not compromise the flower displays as part of Britain in Bloom.

## *RESOLVED*

(a) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Members be delegated authority to approve application ABG/19956/1 subject to: -*

- (1) *discussions with the applicant regarding the design of street furniture;*
- (2) *appropriate conditions including a condition that the pavement be made good with the use of matching materials; and*

(3) *the signage being considered as a separate issue*

*(agreed by 12 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions); and*

(b) *that the Deputy Director in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Members be delegated authority to approve application ABG/19956-X subject to: -*

(1) *discussions with the applicant concerning lighting;*

(2) *seeking financial contributions toward CCTV and towards the Market Place enhancements*

*(agreed by 9 votes to 6).*

DC.318 CUM/19879/1- DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING. ERECTION OF 6X2 BED APARTMENTS WITH CAR PARKING, COVERED CYCLE STORE AND REFUSE/RECYCLING STORE. 61 CUMNOR HILL OX2 9EY

Councillor Derek Rawson had declared a Personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report the Committee was advised that two further letters of objection had been received one of which had included an Independent Design Assessment which had been circulated to Members by the objector. The letters reiterated concerns relating to matters covered in the report and in addition raised concerns regarding the cross section drawing not going across the whole of the site and appearing to be inaccurate; the floor areas stated in the application forms being incorrect and the building being some 200% bigger in floor area. The Officers advised that the Independent Design Assessment was subjective and that it would be for the Committee to decide whether the scheme was acceptable or not in terms of the design, form and materials proposed.

The Officers advised that in terms of floor areas the proposed building had been calculated to have a floor area of 244.63 square metres occupying 17.5% of the site. Whilst the floor area would be double the existing it was not considered to be an over development of the site. Details of neighbouring plot ratios were outlined.

Finally, the Officers advised that should the Committee be minded to approve the application and in view of the allegations of discrepancies over levels and gradients in the section drawing, it was suggested that condition 6 set out in the report should be negatively worded to include a requirement for full details of the whole driveway in addition to the access point to be submitted to and approved prior to the commencement of works. An additional condition also needed to be added to ensure that the existing access was closed prior to the commencement of development.

Dr Phillip Hawtin made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically raised concerns regarding density, the sensitivity of the site, lack of car parking, size of the building on this plot, dominance, overlooking, the proposal being out of character and not in keeping with the area, the adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours and design.

Mark Sayers speaking on behalf of the neighbours also made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters covered in the report. He specifically raised concerns regarding the proposal being contrary to PPS3 in terms of the new build not being complementary to existing development; scale; height; proximity to neighbouring properties; size; inadequacy of screening; positioning on the site; dominance; loss of sunlight; out of

character; over development; lack of garden area; design; car parking layout and the proposal having a harmful impact.

Paul Southouse the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the proposal had been put forward after lengthy consultation with the Officers and that the design process had resulted in a tailored design suiting the site and location. He commented that the proposal was successful in terms of design, access and parking and that the drainage would be dealt with. In terms of loss of privacy he advised that the proposal met current guidelines and that in his view the proposal would enhance the character and the quality of the area.

Mr Douglas Riach also made a statement in support of the application commenting that he understood the objections raised but explained that the design had been carefully considered to have regard to those concerns. He commented that some inaccuracies had been raised by the objectors and he asked the Committee to have regard to the comments of the Consultant Architect and the Architects Panel in support of the proposal.

One of the local Members raised concern at the proposal commenting that an application had been submitted seeking to establish the area as a Conservation Area and he suggested that that was a material consideration. He referred to a recent publication by English Heritage commenting that the application was premature. He referred to a previous decision of the Committee to request a report from Thames Water on the impact of development in Cumnor Hill. He explained that to his knowledge this was still awaited and he noted that in a letter from Thames Water previously, it had been stated that any further applications should be treated with caution. He commented that he was worried that a significant problem could result in the future noting the geology of the area, the natural drainage, the undersized piping and the undersized sewerage system. Finally, he referred to access noting that planning permission had been granted for a number of dwellings in Dean Court and that there would be increased traffic on the access road.

Another local Member raised no objection to the principle of development on the site but raised concerns regarding design. He referred to the architectural integrity of the proposal and despite the views of the Architects Panel and the Consultant Architect he had reservations regarding the proposal. He suggested that the proposed materials were unsuitable in this area and that in his view the application should be refused on design grounds.

The Officers advised the Committee that the test was not whether an alternative design was preferable, but whether the proposal caused harm which was significant enough to justify refusal. Furthermore, in terms of the application for Conservation Area status, Members needed to have regard to the impact of the proposal on the character of the area as it was designated at the moment. The proposal for Conservation Area status had been put forward recently and was not a material planning consideration as it had not yet been given proper consideration.

Other Members spoke against the proposal in terms of design, impact on the character and appearance of the area, size, proximity and drainage. However, other Members spoke in support of the application welcoming the design and the carefully laid out parking. It was commented that whilst the building would be higher than the existing house it was set at a lower level because of the land gradients and there would be adequate screening.

By 9 votes to 5 with 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

that application CUM/19879/1 be approved subject to:-

- (1) the conditions set out in the report with condition 6 being amended to include a requirement for full details of the whole driveway in addition to the access point to be submitted to and approved prior to the commencement of works; and
- (2) an additional condition to ensure the existing access is closed prior to the commencement of development.

DC.319 DRA/11473/1- ERECTION OF EXTENSIONS TO FORM TWO STOREY DWELLING & ROOF SPACE ACCOMMODATION. 41 ABINGDON ROAD, DRAYTON, OX14 4HW

Peter Price, a neighbour, made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically expressed concern regarding size; eaves height; overshadowing; loss of light; an unlit alleyway; the boundary proposed being on the boundary line; impact; dominance; the change of direction of the roof pitch; and guttering etc overhanging his property and boundary. He considered that the application should be refused.

The Officers reported that issues such as guttering overhanging a neighbouring boundary and building over the boundary line were private legal matters and not relevant when considering planning applications. It was reported that normally any wall and guttering were usually set in to avoid overhanging.

One Member reported that many of the bungalows in this area had been extended with large extensions. He commented that whilst the proposal would result in some impact, this was not so harmful as to justify refusal.

By 13 votes to nil with 2 abstentions it was

*RESOLVED*

that application DRA/11473/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.320 GRO/13271/5 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND OUTBUILDINGS. ERECTION OF 7 DWELLINGS, NEW VEHICLE ACCESS AND ACCESS ROAD. WILLOWDENE, TOWNSEND, GROVE, OX12 0AZ

It was noted that there had been one further letter of objecting from one of the neighbours raising concerns regarding overlooking. However, the Officers reported that the proposal now included roof lights and therefore overlooking was no longer considered a concern.

By 12 votes to nil with 3 of the voting members having already left the meeting prior to the consideration of this item, it was

*RESOLVED*

that application GRO/13271/5 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.321 KBA/6670/10 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW. ERECTION OF 4 DETACHED DWELLINGS, GARAGES, PARKING AND ACCESS ROAD. STANAB, FARINGDON ROAD, KINGSTON BAGPUIZE, OX13 5BG

Councillor Tony de Vere had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he left the meeting during its consideration.



The Committee recalled that it had previously been agreed that this application be refused with the reasons for refusal being formally endorsed at a future meeting.

By 6 votes to 5 with 1 of the voting Members not being present and 3 of the voting Members having already left the meeting prior to the consideration of this item, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KBA/6670/10 be refused for the reasons set out in the report.*

DC.322 KEN/19763/1- ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY DWELLING AND ATTACHED GARAGE. 17 & 19 EDWARD ROAD, KENNINGTON, OX1 5LH

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.

Further to the report the Committee noted that the plans had been amended by reducing the rear wing of the proposed dwelling to ensure the 21 metre back to back distance was achieved. The plans had also been corrected as set out in the report.

In addition, the Committee was advised that a further amended site plan had been received correcting a further minor discrepancy with the garden boundary between the proposed dwelling and number 19 Edward Road. It was noted that the distances between the dwellings remained as stated in the report.

Furthermore, the Committee noted that two further letters of objection had been received raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. Concern was specifically raised regarding the configuration of the house which it was believed would prohibit a car from exiting the site in a forward gear; the access across the footpath being too steep; loss of privacy; loss of light; height; and the site plan not showing the boundary of adjoining houses accurately.

Simon Gregory had given notice that he wished to make a statement objecting to the application but he declined to do so.

Con Kellagher made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He reported that he was a neighbour and whilst noting the amended alterations he raised concern regarding the inaccuracies of the drawings; the inadequate rear garden and access; the fenestration facing the neighbouring windows; proximity; adverse impact in terms of height, scale and dominance; vehicle movements; change of levels; access; traffic safety; pedestrian safety; footprint; bulk and loss of privacy.

One of the local Members commented that the proposal was acceptable in planning terms but considered that condition 12 as set out in the report should be amended to provide that the access should be constructed to the required specification prior to commencement of construction and not prior to occupation of the dwelling as he had doubts that the access could be built. Furthermore, he considered that condition 8 set out in the report should be amended to include negative wording making it a requirement for full details of the access point to be submitted to and approved prior to the commencement of development. Finally, he suggested an amendment to condition 7 to provide that slab levels should be agreed, constructed and inspected before the commencement of construction of the dwelling above slab level.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KEN/19763/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report with the following amendments to those conditions:-*

- (1) Condition 7 being amended to provide that the slab level should be agreed prior to construction and inspected before the commencement of construction of the dwelling above slab level.*
- (2) Condition 8 being amended to provide for a negatively worded condition to include a requirement for full details of the access point to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development.*
- (3) Condition 12 being amended to provide that the access road should be constructed to the required specification before the commencement of construction of the dwelling.*

DC.323 MAR/19761/1 - PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 10 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS. TIMBER YARD, PACKHORSE LANE, MARCHAM OX13 6NT

Further to the report it was noted that the Planning Inspectorate decision letter regarding the appeal for the earlier refused scheme for four detached dwellings had now been received. The appeal had been dismissed and the Inspector had made particular comment that the rather precise layout, coupled with the size and design of the dwellings would be an incongruous modern development divorced from the main road and village centre lacking integration between the development and the village as a whole and that the proposed development would be unsympathetic to the formal yet well integrated pattern exhibited by surrounding buildings.

Furthermore, the Committee noted that additional comments had been received from the Conservation Officer stating that the success of the current proposal would depend on the detailing. The Conservation Officer had suggested that the front wall needed to be higher and constructed of natural stone and notwithstanding the submitted drawings, the railings should be omitted. Furthermore, windows should be white painted wood with chunky sills and recessed, materials should be natural stone, and detailed information on the construction of the dormers was required. As such it was therefore proposed that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, additional conditions requiring further details of these matters should be requested.

Dominic Harding, Sally Timberlake and H G Johnson had all given notice that they wished to make a statement objecting to the application but they declined to do so.

Mr D O'Higgins made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically raised concerns that the proposal was contrary to Policies DC1 and DC9; proximity to the highway; the height of the roof line; over dominance; the proposal being out of keeping; lack of availability of elevations; safety; access; traffic; vehicle movements; pedestrian safety; lack of visibility; road safety within the development; construction vehicles; lack of passing ability; lighting; the narrowness of the road; the proposal neither enhancing or preserving the character of the area; impact on the Conservation Area and damage to the Green during construction.

Mr T Falkner the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the scheme had evolved due to lengthy pre-application discussions. He suggested that the proposal was in keeping with the character and appearance of the area respecting its historic nature. He explained that a footway would be provided along the site's road frontage

which was a significant highway safety improvement, and the designs supported the traditional design locally. He advised that 10 units would be provided (being just over 30 dwellings per hectare), 4 of which would be affordable units. He explained that car parking was adequate and that access would be taken through the existing site at Mill Road. Finally he explained that financial contributions would be made towards local facilities by way of a Section 106 Agreement.

The local Member spoke against the application raising concerns regarding access to Packhorse Lane; pedestrian safety; car parking; reduced visibility; height; slab levels; vehicle movements and traffic. She suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred to enable the land to be given to the County Council towards a land bank for highway improvements in this area.

Some Members spoke against the application agreeing with the concerns raised regarding access and traffic. It was commented that any large vehicles might mount the footway to park and as such the kerb should be increased in height to prevent this.

Other Members spoke in support of the application welcoming the footway noting that this was regarded as a highway improvement and had been welcomed by the County Engineer.

It was proposed by Councillor Joyce Hutchinson and seconded by Councillor Mike Badcock that consideration of application MAR/19761/1 should be deferred to enable the Officers to seek an independent highway view on the traffic issues and in particular the provision the footway. However this was lost by 9 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.

It was proposed by the Chair and

## *RESOLVED*

- (a) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Member be delegated authority to approve application MAR/19761/1 subject to:-*
- (1) *the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required financial contribution for highways and social infrastructure;*
  - (2) *the conditions set out in the report;*
  - (3) *additional conditions to provide for the removal of the railings; further details of the windows and dormer detailing; the front wall needing to be higher and constructed of natural stone; the erection of a panel of materials on site and a requirement that the kerbing details of the footpath should be agreed to address the concerns raised regarding vehicles mounting the pavement.*
  - (4) *an informative to provide that notwithstanding the details proposed, porches should be provided to plots 1 to 4.*
- (agreed by 10 votes to 5)*
- (b) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Member be delegated authority to refused application MAR/19761/1 should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed within the 13 week period (which ends on 17 May 2007)*

*with the reason for refusal being based on the lack of necessary financial contributions towards improving local services and facilities (agreed by 15 votes to nil).*

DC.324 SUN/19936 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING WORKSHOP. ERECTION OF A DWELLING. 71 SUNNINGWELL ROAD, SUNNINGWELL, OX13 6RD

Councillor Richard Gibson had declared a Personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Mr Beirouti a neighbour made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. Whilst he welcomed that the property was being developed for residential use he expressed concern regarding the moving of the building forward by 2.8 metres to allow the conservatory at the rear. He commented that the conservatory would be less than 1 metre from the boundary with his property resulting in loss of privacy; overlooking and visual impact. Furthermore, he commented that the upper floor windows would overlook his rear garden. He suggested that the building should be retained on its existing footprint.

Miss N Green the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application advising that there would be no adverse impact on adjacent properties and that the changes to the proposal had been made to address the concerns raised. She advised that the building had been pushed back to avoid overshadowing and that the building had been handed to avoid overlooking. She commented that the conservatory was lightweight and made of glass and that the building line was forward to enable a private rear garden to be provided. Finally, she commented that there were no windows in the side elevation and that there would be no loss of light or overlooking.

Members supported the application.

By 15 to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application SUN/19936 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.325 SUN/2963/12 - X - REDEVELOPMENT TO CREATE A RETIREMENT COMMUNITY WITH NEW ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS. WARNBOROUGH COLLEGE, FOXCOMBE ROAD, BOARS HILL OX1 5DL

As referred to elsewhere in these minutes, the Chair reminded Members that this application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

DC.326 UPT/19316/2 - INTERNAL ALTERATIONS & ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS. FIELDSIDE COTTAGE, FIELDSIDE, UPTON, OX11 9HY

Further to the report the Committee was advised of the receipt of one additional letter of objection raising concerns regarding the access and the proximity of a telegraph pole. It was reported that the applicant was seeking to relocate the pole.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the description of the application should include reference to the boundary wall.

Finally, the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application an additional condition should be added regarding boundary treatment details

The Local Member raised no objection to the application subject to appropriate boundary treatment.

By 12 votes to nil with 3 of the voting members having left the meeting prior to the consideration of this application, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application UPT/19316/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition regarding boundary treatment details.*

DC.327 WAN/18492/3 - ERECTION OF A NEW DWELLING HOUSE AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOUSE. (RESUBMISSION) . LAND AT 5 BELMONT, WANTAGE OX12 9AS

Councillors Eddy Goldsmith and Joyce Hutchinson had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Jim Moley had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report the amendments to the scheme were outlined.

Shaun Whitfield made a statement on behalf of local residents objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically raised concerns regarding the proposal being contrary to planning policies and guidelines; proximity to the neighbouring property; proximity to the site boundary; possible damage and loss of a tree; ridge height; loss of light; the gable end and the two storey off-shoot being dominant; overlooking; the need for accurate manoeuvring tracking plans; and vehicle movements generally. He referred to an application elsewhere on the agenda being refused at Kingston Bagpuize and commented that this proposal was worse and should similarly be refused.

The Officers reminded the Committee that each application should be considered on its own merits.

Mr D Wolage made a statement in support of the application commenting that the new window could be regarded as a secondary window as there were two other windows to the main bedroom. He explained that previous concerns raised had been taken into account and the proposal had been amended accordingly. He advised that the level of parking met the required standards and that the proposal was acceptable in terms of design.

One of the local Members expressed concern at the proposal in terms of its harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area; proximity to the boundary, potential loss or damage to the trees; inadequate screening; vehicle manoeuvring; access; pedestrian safety and parking. She suggested that a tracking plan should be provided showing how vehicles would access the site.

Other Members spoke in support of the application noting that the County Engineer had raised no objection to the application subject to conditions.

By 13 votes to nil with 1 of the voting Members not being present during consideration of this item it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application WAN/18492/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 10.20 pm