

# DC.112

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 5TH NOVEMBER, 2007 AT  
6.30PM**

**Open to the Public, including the Press**

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Angela Lawrence, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Val Shaw and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Pat Lonergan for Councillor Tony de Vere.

NON MEMBERS: Councillors Gervase Duffield and Reg Waite.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER: Councillor Melinda Tilley – Leader of the Opposition.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Mike Gilbert, Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl, Stuart Walker, Emma Parkes and Grant Audley-Miller and David Weaver.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 24

DC.163 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The attendance of a Substitute Member who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with an apology for absence having been received from Councillor Tony De Vere.

DC.164 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared interests in report 97/07 as follows:

Name of Councillor	Type of Interest	Item	Reason	Minute reference
Matthew Barber Roger Cox Terry Cox Richard Farrell Richard Gibson Jenny Hannaby Angela Lawrence Sue Marchant Zoe Patrick Terry Quinlan Jerry Patterson Margaret Turner	Personal	Cumnor Hill Conservation Area – Proposal by Cumnor Parish Council	In so far as they knew Derek Rawson in his capacity as a former District Councillor	DC.171

John Woodford				
Richard Farrell Jenny Hannaby Angela Lawrence Jerry Patterson	Personal	Cumnor Hill Conservation Area – Proposal by Cumnor Parish Council	In so far as they were Members of the Executive	DC.171
Matthew Barber Roger Cox Terry Cox Richard Farrell Richard Gibson Jenny Hannaby Anthony Hayward Angela Lawrence Sue Marchant Zoe Patrick Terry Quinlan Jerry Patterson Val Shaw Margaret Turner John Woodford	Personal	SHR/8203/2	In so far as Councillor Peter Saunders, the applicant was known to them	DC.173
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/12963/7-A	In so far as she is a member of Abingdon Town Council	DC.175
Pat Lonergan	Personal and Prejudicial	ABG/12963/7-A	In so far as he was a Member of Abingdon Town Council' Planning Committee and as such he had already made his views known on the application	DC.175
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/20075	In so far as she is a member of Abingdon Town Council	DC.177
Pat Lonergan	Personal and prejudicial	ABG/20075	In so far as he was a Member of Abingdon Town Council' Planning Committee and	DC.177

			as such he had already made his views known on the application	
--	--	--	--	--

DC.165 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and in doing so he introduced Claire Litchfield the newly appointed Assistant Democratic Services Officer together with Emma Parkes the recently appointed Senior Planning Officer.

The Chair asked everyone present to ensure that their mobile telephones were switched off during the meeting and he also advised Councillors and members of the public of the emergency exists.

Furthermore, for the benefit of members of the public, the Chair explained that only Members of the Committee were able to vote. He reported that at the meeting one Ex-officio Member and two Ward Members were present. He clarified that whilst they were able to address the Committee they could not propose any recommendations or vote on any matters.

DC.166 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

The Committee was advised that two members of the public, Mr Derek Rawson and Mr John Rees had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting as follows:-

- (1) Mr Derek Rawson made a statement concerning report No 95/07 – Cumnor Hill Conservation Area - Proposal by Cumnor Parish Council.

Mr Rawson reported that he had been asked to speak on behalf of Cumnor Parish Council in view of his involvement with the preparation of the submission for the proposed Conservation Area in his former capacity as District Councillor. He considered that it was important that this application had come from residents of the Parish, rather than being instigated by the Parish or District Councils.

Mr Rawson advised that he had been asked by a group of local residents what could be done to prevent the change in the environment of Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise as a result of multiple planning applications to increase the density of development in the area. Mr Rawson commented that the low density of development was part of the special character that made this area so attractive to visitors and residents.

Mr Rawson referred to his surprise at the high response and majority of residents who were in favour of the application being submitted when surveyed.

Mr Rawson responded to the comments in paragraph 5.5 of report 95/07 that suggested the area at Cumnor Hill was not based around clearly defined groups of listed buildings by highlighting that at page 8 of the English Heritage advice in Appendix 1 it was suggested that clusters of housing might be more appropriate than listing individual homes.

Mr Rawson responded to the point made in paragraph 5.5 of the report that approval of this application would result in other areas seeking similar status, by stating that this ought to be welcomed by the Vale as it showed that residents were concerned about their environment. He suggested that the approval should send a message to residents elsewhere, that the District Council supports the protection of areas that represented a particular style of housing and environment.

In response to the statement at paragraph 5.6, that the boundaries had been arbitrarily drawn, Mr Rawson said that it had been felt that to include 70 properties was sufficient.

Mr Rawson advised that the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century was not fairly represented in the list of designated conservation areas. He referred to the fact that many of the properties had been built in the 1920s and 1930s.

Mr Rawson expressed concern that the Supplementary Planning Guidance route would not provide the protection required to deal with the urgent situation of multiple planning applications in this area. He urged the Committee to recommend that a Conservation Area be designated on the lower slopes of Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise as set out in Appendix 1 to report 95/07.

The Chair thanked Mr Rawson for his statement which he advised would be taken into account when the Committee considered report 95/07 later in the meeting.

- (2) Mr John Rees made a statement concerning Report No 95/07, Cumnor Hill Conservation Area – Proposal by Cumnor Parish Council.

Mr Rees commented that the analysis of the Parish Council's application by the District Council's Conservation Officer was helpful and perceptive. He agreed that the application described in considerable detail how the age, style and relative merits of the buildings, topography and open spaces contributed to the character of the area. Mr Rees advised that he therefore welcomed his analysis both as a local resident and as someone who was professionally involved day by day in the preservation and enhancement of this Country's heritage and its setting, in his capacity as the Registrar of the Church of England's system of control of its listed building, where he appreciated very much all the support and work that local planning authorities did to preserve and enhance distinctive areas through designation and special guidance. Mr Rees referred to paragraphs 4.2 and 5.5 of report 95/07 which identified maturity; spaciousness; low density and sylvan wooded character as features in the area of Lower Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise commenting that it seemed

there was agreement that this was an area with distinctive character and one which in one way or another needed to be protected.

Mr Rees commented that his understanding of the report was that the Committee was being asked to work towards production of supplementary planning guidance to come into effect the year after next (through the route of the wider "development framework" that would be being put together by the Council's consultants during the next year or so). He suggested that the matter could not wait that long commenting that residents in this area received tempting offers from developers nearly every week. He commented that most weekends residents listened to the sound of chain saws cutting into the sylvan setting and clearing sites in readiness for development often well ahead of making planning application. He reported that one garden in the centre of this area had been almost totally denuded of its mature trees in the last few weeks.

Mr Rees urged the Council at the very least to go further and issue a Supplementary Planning Guidance document for Lower Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise based on these reports now. He advised that the Council had the legal power to do this, albeit that the guidance would be informal until it was integrated into the new framework in 2009 and he asked for the Council's response in this regard. However, he pressed the Council to go further. He commented that the report seemed to suggest that the absence of clearly defined groups of listed buildings or other acknowledged features such as ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens was a reason not to support the application. He drew Members' attention to paragraph 4.2 of Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 15 which stated that it was the quality and interest of areas, rather than of individual buildings which should be the prime consideration in identifying conservation areas; the historic layout of property boundaries and thoroughfares on a particular mix of uses; on characteristics materials; on appropriate scaling; street furniture and hard and soft surfaces. He commented that the range was very wide, but the important point was that it was not confined to groups of listed buildings, ancient monuments and historic parks (each of which had its own form of separate protection). He commented that Conservation Areas were about areas which had some distinctive character overall. He referred to the report noting that it identified precisely the sort of features that made it a distinctive area of that sort. He explained that there was architecture which was highly unusual (even if not worthy of separate listing) and there was a mix of design typical of the Vernacular Revival with Arts and Crafts element and some between the wars International and Modernist style. He commented none on its own was of particular significant but that it was not what PPG 15 required. He advised that all taken together described the kind of area PPG 15 described as being worthy of preservation and enhancement commended by Section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Chair thanked Mr Rees for his statement which he explained would be taken into account when the Committee considered report 95/07 later in the meeting.

None.

DC.168 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING  
ORDER 33

The Committee noted that five members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting under this Standing Order.

DC.169 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials as follows:-

WAN/4581/9 Demolition of Existing Store and Erection of New Retail Class A1 Store  
With Associated Parking And Servicing

*RESOLVED (nem com)*

*that the use of the following materials be approved:-*

*Roof Profile – Goosewing Grey*

*Wall Cladding – Oyster*

*Main Brick – Hanson Buckland Multi-Red/Brown facing brick*

*Detail Brick – Ibstock staffs Blue Brindle*

*Plinth Brick – Ibstock staffs Blue Brindle*

*Standing seam metal to canopy – Goosewing grey*

DC.170 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a list of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings.

*RESOLVED*

*that the list be received.*

DC.171 CUMNOR HILL CONSERVATION AREA – PROPOSAL BY CUMNOR PARISH  
COUNCIL

Councillors Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Angela Lawrence, Sue Marchant, Zoe Patrick, Terry Quinlan, Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner and John Woodford had each 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 95/07 of the Section Head (Environmental Planning and Conservation) which advised that Cumnor Parish Council had requested this Council to consider designating part of Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise, Cumnor a Conservation Area. In considering the report the

Committee had regard to the statements made earlier in the meeting by the members of the public.

***The Committees' attention was drawn to the conclusions in the report which stated that it was agreed that whilst Cumnor Hill had a mature and spacious character, it was difficult to justify that it had a character which was of special architectural or historic interest. It was noted that the Officers considered that Vale Design Guide, as a Supplementary Planning Document was considered the more appropriate method for helping to control and guide development on Cumnor Hill and other suburbs in the Vale.***

Further to the report the Officer highlighted that the key point for Members to consider was whether this was an area of special character or appearance. It was explained that a survey had been undertaken of the whole area and the surrounding street and using a check list based on the advice in "Conservation Area Appraisals" by English Heritage, the Officers had concluded that having regard to many considerations such as building; materials and their qualities; archaeology; styles; contributions; street-scape; heritage aspects; street materials etc there was nothing to say that this area was special compared to surrounding areas and other suburbs of Oxford.

The Officer reported that he had had regard to the comments of the Parish Council and commented that there was modern paraphernalia street furniture, concrete and kerbing and whilst they were pleasant they were not special. Reference was made to the proposed designated area and Members were shown photographs looking into and out of the area. The Officer reported that he had had difficulty in identifying any difference between the proposed area and the surrounding streets and that when compared to suburbs of similar age and style in and around Oxford and the main settlements of the Vale, these areas did not have features or characteristics that gave them special interest.

One of the local Members commented that he agreed with the Officer's conclusions but welcomed looking into the possibility of producing earlier informal advice which could be used in the interim for this area pending the Local Development Framework.

In response to a question raised the Committee was advised that the Conservation Officer had been the Vale's Conservation Officer for at least 25 years and had been involved in the creation of about 10 of the current conservation areas.

One Member expressed concern at the length of time it was going to take to produce some planning guidance in this area and suggested that whilst the recommendations set out in the report were acceptable, an additional recommendation should be considered, namely to have some supplementary planning guidance produced in the interim.

Another Member suggested that any interim guidance should be for the benefit of all areas of the Vale, not just Cumnor Hill.

In response to a question raised as to the weight of such a document, the Committee was advised that this would depend on the level of consultation which had been

carried out. The Committee was advised that the preparation of such a document would require a significant time and resources.

One Member commented that he was not convinced that the Cumnor Area was significantly special although he had no objection to interim advice being drafted. However, he commented that in doing so residents could be restricted as to what they could do with their land and he asked whether this was reasonable and fair.

One Member asked the Committee whether it would be beneficial to ask the Executive to look into the possibility of some earlier guidance document being produced in the interim, before the production of the Local Development Framework.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

- (a) *that the Developmental Control Committee recommends the Executive to advise Cumnor Parish Council that a Conservation Area be not designated on the lower slopes of Cumnor Hill and Third Acre Rise;*
- (b) *that instead, efforts be concentrated on the Proposed Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document as the appropriate means of protecting areas of low density housing in the Vale such as Cumnor Hill; and*
- (c) *that the Executive be asked to look into the possibility of the production of some earlier document to provide guidance across the whole of the District for similar areas prior to the production of the Local Development Framework.*

DC.172      ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

The Committee received and considered the report 96/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which informed Members of the need for approval for enforcement action in one new case.

BY 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee to take enforcement action to secure the removal of residential caravans and non-agricultural items from Foxcombe Hill Farm, Lincombe Lane, Boars Hill, OX1 5DZ [SUN/16776/-] if in his judgement it is considered expedient to do so.*

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 97/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) detailing planning applications. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.



DC.173 SHR/8203/2 - ERECTION OF A NEW PORCH AND ADDITION OF FIRST FLOOR TO GRANNY ANNEXE. THE POUND, 67 HIGH STREET, SHRIVENHAM, SN6 8AW

Councillors Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Angela Lawrence, Sue Marchant, Zoe Patrick, Terry Quinlan, Jerry Patterson, Val Shaw, Margaret Turner and John Woodford had each declared personal interests in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application SHR/8230/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.174 SUT/11933/11 - ERECTION OF GARAGE BLOCK WITH ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION ABOVE. (RETROSPECTIVE). 6 ABINGDON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY, ABINGDON, OXON, OX14 4NF

Further to the report the Committee noted that the Parish Council had objected to the application raising concerns in so far as it questioned whether the building would be ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling. It was noted that there was planning permission for four terraced properties which was part implemented and that the extension which formed part of number four was part of that. The Committee also noted that amended plans had been received setting out proposed fenestration and doors. It was commented that there had been no restriction concerning windows on the application presented in 2004 and the Officers considered that there were no reasons to make restrictions now. However, as the proposal would be habitable it was considered reasonable to require obscure glazing to avoid overlooking. It was noted that planning permission was not required for internal walls and it was agreed that it was reasonable to restrict the ground floor to garage accommodation in view of the recent flooding.

Mr David Hignall made a statement on behalf of Sutton Courtney Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He specifically raised concern regarding development taking place and retrospective planning permission being granted; the proposal being out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area; the possibility that the building could easily become a separate dwelling; development onsite being not in accordance with the previous planning permission thus making it void; sill heights which were below eye level; over looking; loss of privacy; and doubt that the building lay within a recognised curtilage. He recommended that the Committee should defer consideration of the application pending a site visit by all Members of the Committee.

Jane Lister, the applicant made a statement in support of the application advising that contrary to the statement made by Mr Hignall there had been no retrospective planning applications in respect of this site. She commented that she had understood

that she only needed planning permission for windows and that she had received a letter advising her that no further planning permissions were required.

The local Member referred to the history of the site advising that there had been some enforcement issues. He advised the Committee that the main dwelling provided bed and breakfast accommodation and he was concerned that this ancillary accommodation would be used as part of that and he asked whether this could be prevented. He welcomed that the garage block should remain as a garage block but commented that an adequate turning space should be retained. He commented that subject to conditions to address the concerns raised he had no other objections to the application.

Further to the statements made the Council's Solicitor advised Members that the extant planning permission was not nil and void just because development had progressed allegedly not in accordance with the plans.

The Officers reported that they were aware of the Bed and Breakfast use at the premises and enforcement action was being considered. In response to a question raised, the Officers clarified that planning permission was not necessary for all bed and breakfast accommodation. Permission was dependent upon the proportion of the building being used in such a way and whether this altered the building's primary use and that each case needed to be considered on its merits.

One Member expressed concern that allowing this application would open the floodgates for other applications to build dwelling space above their garages. Another Member asked the Officers to confirm that as this development had no kitchen it would remain as ancillary accommodation. It was confirmed that should a kitchen be added further permission would be required.

The Members discussed whether it would be possible to prevent the accommodation being used for bed and breakfast purposes or as a separate dwelling place. To this end it was considered that an informative be added to the permission acknowledging that the proposal would provide ancillary accommodation for the main dwelling but this did not convey planning permission for its use for Bed and Breakfast accommodation.

One Member suggested the removal of permitted development rights but this was not considered reasonable as such rights had not been removed as part of the permission granted in 2004.

By 12 votes to 2 with 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application SUT/11933/11 be approved subject to:-*

- (1) the conditions set out in the report*
- (2) an informative to the provide that this permission does not allow the accommodation to be used as a separate dwelling or to be used as bed and breakfast accommodation.*

DC.175 ABG/12963/7- A - ERECTION OF ILLUMINATED SIGNAGE. 11 OCK STREET, ABINGDON, OX14 5AL

Councillor Pat Lonergan 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.

Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee considered that the sign would acceptable given its size and location.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/12963/7-A be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.176 HAR/19966/1 - DEMOLITION OF SHED AND ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING ACCESS AND PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES FOR BLENHEIM TERRACE AND BURR COTTAGE AND TO REAR OF BLENHEIM TERRACE, BURR STREET, HARWELL OX11 0DU

Further to the report the Committee noted that the plans had been amended. The Parish Council had commented on the amended plans and had maintained its objection to the application raising concerns regarding increased vehicle usage of the road; access difficulties for emergency and other large vehicles; land ownership (which it was noted was not a material planning consideration); the new owner of Tudor Orchard being unaware of the application which would impact on his land; and the setting of a precedent for similar applications which cumulatively would have a harmful impact on the character of the area.

The Committee was advised of the comments of the owner of Tudor Orchard who had raised concerns regarding the proposed access in terms of the impact on his land and his lack of knowledge of the application.

It was reported that further comments had been received from the County Council as Highway Authority raising no objection to the application commenting that the proposed access would provide improve visibility for pedestrians and drivers and two cars would be able to pass at the access point. It was noted that the development would also include the provision of four further car parking spaces for the resident of Blenheim Terrace.

One of the local Members speaking on behalf of local residents objected to the application raising concerns regarding the proposal being misleading in that there would not be additional car parking for residents of Blenheim Terrace and Burr

Cottage as only 4 spaces were proposed; the application site shown on the plans was misleading in that it incorrectly included the whole of the front garden and drive of Tudor Orchard; Tudor Orchard had undergone some underpinning in the past and there was concern that the corner of the dwelling was so close to the pinch point in the access road that damage could be caused to the property; the proposal was contrary to the Local Plan in that the site was not previously developed but was an historic orchard which was an important part of the Conservation Area; the proposal was also contrary to Policies GS1, GS5, H11, H12 and H13 in that it would be harmful to the open land within the Conservation Area and the fabric of a listed building; and concerns regarding the lack of a right of way. He suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred to enable the Officers to investigate these matters.

One Member expressed surprise that the County Council had raised no objection regarding the access road given the obvious pinch point on the road which did not look as if two cars could pass through. Another Member commented that having visited the site, in his opinion it would not be possible for two cars to pass at that point. Furthermore, he asked whether notice had been served on the owners of the adjoining property advising of the application or whether the owners had bought this property after the application had been made. He believed that this access road was a problem as it appeared that it would encompass a large portion of the adjoining property's garden.

The Officer confirmed that there was a pinch point on this access road but that the County Council as Highway Authority had raised no objection to the proposal. Furthermore, it was confirmed that notices had been served on the adjoining owner.

One Member commented that ownership did seem uncertain, although it was noted that this was not a material planning consideration. He agreed that the bathroom window should be obscure glazed. Furthermore, he asked whether if permission was granted the developers could be required to create the car parking for the Blenheim Terrace residents. To this end it was considered that a Section 106 Agreement to secure the use of the car parking by the residents of Blenheim Terrace would be appropriate.

One Member expressed concern regarding the extent of the proposed works to the bank of the neighbouring land to provide the access. The Officers clarified that the proposal included the removal of the wall and the setting back of the boundary. It was explained that elevation details of what was proposed had yet to be provided,

It was proposed by Councillor Matthew Barber and seconded by Councillor Terry Cox that consideration of application HAR/19966/1 be deferred pending an agreement being entered into regarding the car parking spaces and clarification regarding the application site. On being put to the vote, this was lost by 8 votes to 4 with 3 abstentions.

One Member referred to a window on the first floor of the west elevation which he considered should be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking. He suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application an additional condition be added requiring this.

It was proposed by the Councillor Jerry Patterson, seconded by Councillor Jenny Hannaby and by 12 votes to 2 with 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Development Control Committee and the local Members be delegated authority to approve application HAR/19966/1 subject to the following:-*

- (1) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (2) an additional condition to require that the west facing bathroom window on the first floor be obscure glazed;*
- (3) a further condition requiring details of boundary treatments to include elevations showing how the frontage will be treated by the driveway; and*
- (4) the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the use of the proposed four parking spaces for residents of Blenheim Terrace.*

DC.177 ABG/20075 - ERECTION OF A FOOTBRIDGE. THAMES VIEW, ABINGDON, OX14 3UJ

Councillor Pat Lonergan 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.

Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

One Member questioned who was to be responsible for the maintenance of the footbridge following its construction. The Officers confirmed that the bridge would either be adopted by the County Council or the developer would have the responsibility to ensure it was safe and in a good state of repair compliant with Health and Safety Regulations.

One Member supported the application subject to no gates being erected.

Members considered that a condition should be added to ensure that there was clarity with regards to the future maintenance of the bridge.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/20075 be approved subject to: -*

- (1) the conditions set out in the report:*

- (2) *a further condition requiring that prior to the commencement of construction a scheme of arrangements for the future maintenance of the bridge be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning authority.*

DC.178 SUT/20088/2 & SUT/20088/3-LB - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION. (RE-SUBMISSION). 39 HIGH STREET, SUTTON COURTENAY

The Committee heard representations on this matter from Mr Hignall of Sutton Courtney Parish Council, Councillor Gervase Duffield speaking in his capacity as Ward Member and Mr Bampton who wished to raise objections to the application.

Mr David Hignall made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He commented that the development would dominate the property and would have an adverse affect on the character and setting of the listed building. He particularly raised concern regarding size; adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area; increased on street parking; loss of visibility; visual harm; access and un-neighbourliness. He considered that the lack of on street parking was a cause for concern as too many cars parked on pavements in the area were damaging to the Conservation Area.

Mr A Bampton, a neighbour made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding adverse impact on his property; loss of light; loss of privacy; overlooking; the lack of provision of off road parking for the development, which he considered would impact on the safety of pedestrians; overdevelopment and the development being for financial gain only.

The Officers clarified that the financial gain of the applicant as a result of planning permission was not a material planning consideration.

The local Member commented that the development would have the effect of filling in the gap between the neighbouring property which he considered was harmful and would destroy the proportions of the property and change the character of the area.

Whilst some Members spoke in support of the application, it was commented that it would be regrettable to lose sight of the chimney which was an attractive feature in this locality.

Members supported the application subject to an additional condition to ensure that the proposed bathroom windows were obscure glazed and an informative to provide that reclaimed hand made tiles in keeping with the rest of the property should be used.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

- (a) *that application SUT/20088/2 be approved subject to: -*

- (1) *the conditions set out in the report;*
  - (2) *a further condition requiring that the bathroom windows on the first floor be obscure glazed;*
  - (3) *an informative to provide that reclaimed hand made tiles in keeping with the rest of the property should be used.*
- (b) *that application SUT/20088/3-LB be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.179 KBA/20269 - ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION. 13 LIME GROVE, SOUTHMOOR, ABINGDON, OX13 5DN

The Committee was advised that the Parish Council had objected to this application on the grounds that the proposal came too close to the existing garage block.

Claire Marks, the owner of the neighbouring property speaking on behalf of herself and other neighbours made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly raised concern regarding the adverse affect that she felt the proposal would have as she considered that the space was too small to encompass the proposal and that it would have a detrimental affect on the surrounding properties. She raised concern regarding size; loss of light; loss of privacy; overlooking; un-neighbourliness; disturbance to the neighbour and possible damage to the drive during construction; lack of parking; the setting of a precedent for similar applications which cumulatively would be visually harmful to the area and devaluation of neighbouring properties.

The Local Member spoke against the application commenting on the detrimental affect the development would have on the street scene and the neighbouring property. She believed that this development would lead to the loss of light to the neighbouring property and that the proportions of the proposed extension were too large bearing in mind the small space available. She raised concerns that there was inadequate room to erect scaffolding and that any scaffolding was likely to encroach onto the neighbouring property causing further disturbance.

One Member commented that the proposal was unsightly and out of keeping with the other properties in the cul-de-sac. It was suggested that approval of the application would lead to an unreasonable loss of light which was unacceptable and harmful to the amenity of the neighbour.

It was proposed by the Chair that application KBA/20269 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report. This was lost by 9 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.

It was thereupon proposed by Councillor Terry Cox, seconded by Jerry Patterson and by 12 vote to 3 it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KBA/20269 be refused with the reasons for refusal to be formally endorsed at a future meeting of the Committee such reasons to include the proposal having a harmful impact on the street scene; a harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of dominance and loss of light and the design being out of character.*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 9.30 pm