

# DC.165

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 7TH JANUARY, 2008 AT  
6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Tim Smith for Councillor Val Shaw.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Martin Deans, Rodger Hood, Carole Nicholl and Geraldine Le Cointe.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 33

DC.221 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) the attendance of a Substitute Member was recorded as referred to above with an apology for absence having been received from Councillor Val Shaw. An apology for absence was also recorded from Councillor Terry Quinlan.

In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair Councillor John Woodford was in the Chair for the meeting.

DC.222 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 5 November 2007 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.223 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were declared in report 130/07 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Member</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	CHD/713/9 and CHD/713/10- CA	In so far as she knew the applicant.	DC.230

Judy Roberts	Personal	CUM/NHI/201 07-X	In so far as she had an allotment near the site. She explained that she also lived in the area but was not so neighbourly as to have been consulted by the Planning Authority on the application.	DC.232
Matthew Barber Roger Cox Terry Cox Tony de Vere Richard Farrell Richard Gibson Jenny Hannaby Angela Lawrence Sue Marchant Jerry Patterson Margaret Turner John Woodford	Personal	CUM/NHI/201 07-X	In so far as they knew Briony Newport as a former District Councillor and now an Honorary Alderman.	DC.232

DC.224 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor John Woodford who was the Vice-Chair of the Committee chairing this meeting in the absence of the Chair advised that he was recovering from a stroke and therefore sometimes had difficulty in finding his words.

The Chair asked everyone present to switch off their mobile telephones during the meeting.

The Chair explained that the Officers were present to give advice to the Committee. For the benefit of members of the public he explained that only Members of the Committee or their substitutes could vote and that Ward Members attended the meeting to speak on an application in their area only and were not entitled to vote.

DC.225 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING  
ORDER 32

None.

DC.226 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

Les Clyne a resident of Abingdon asked Councillor Jerry Patterson, Leader of the Council the following question: -

“What progress (in terms of numbers) had been made in meeting the “dwellings on new allocations not permitted as at 01.04.05” as given in Table 8.2 of the Vale Adopted Local Plan 2011 (July 2006).(extract below); the numbers of dwellings which had had development/planning approval (rather than completions) up to 31st December 2007 and the numbers of new dwellings with development/planning approval in each of the 7 categories which were proposed to be affordable.

“Dwellings on new allocations not permitted as at 01.04.05” (Vale Local Plan to 2011):

-

Abingdon - 24

Botley - 490

Faringdon - 437

Grove - 500

Didcot - 500

The smaller villages - 100

Elsewhere - 75

TOTAL – 2126”

In response, Councillor Jerry Patterson undertook to reply to Mr Clyne in writing within 10 working days of the meeting.

DC.227 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 7 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting. However, 2 members of the public declined to do so.

DC.228 MATERIALS

None.

DC.229 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

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

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received.*

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 130/07 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.230 CHD/713/9 & CHD/713/10-CA - MR G CHAMBERS MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE RECONSTRUCTION AND REMODELLING OF PENN HOUSE AND ERECTION OF A CAR PORT. DEMOLITION OF NORTH END WALL. PENN HOUSE, HIGH STREET, CHILDREY, WANTAGE

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

Further to the report the Committee was advised of two additional letters received from the neighbour raising concerns regarding the continued delays of building works at Penn House; expressing support for the proposed bricks but raising concerns regarding a belief that the Council would require the green staining of the timber. The Officers confirmed that this was not intended.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the concerns raised by the Parish Council and it was noted that the Parish Council had reiterated its comments and had stressed the importance of using good quality materials on this site.

It was noted that concern had been raised previously regarding the proposed brick and the Committee was urged to consider another material namely reclaimed brick. However, it was noted that the Officers were content with the proposal in all respects subject to conditions. It was noted that in respect of the use of reclaimed bricks, the Council's Conservation Officer had advised that reclaimed bricks might be appropriate in some places, but that a good quality handmade brick would be appropriate on this site. It was noted that there could be difficulty in acquiring reclaimed bricks not only in terms of quantity but also quality.

Having regard to the comments made by the Conservation Officer, one Member commented that he supported the use of handmade bricks. Furthermore, he welcomed the use of metal railings but asked that any new railings should match those existing. The Officers explained that this would be covered by the proposed condition set out in the report concerning submission of materials.

By 14 votes to nil, it was

### *RESOLVED*

- (a) *that application CHD/713/9 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and the following informative: -*

*Informative – The District Planning Authority expects the development to be completed in the highest quality materials including handmade bricks and tiles, with no render to be used.*

(b) *that application CHD/713/10 – CA be approved subject to the condition set out in the report.*

DC.231 HIN/19721/2 - ERECTION OF A PAIR OF SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS. (RE-SUBMISSION). LAND ADJOINING 1 HIGH STREET, HINTON WALDRIST

Further to the report the Committee was advised of the receipt of an addition letter objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report and concerns regarding overlooking and impact on the character of the area.

The Committee was advised that the loss of land currently used by neighbours for parking was not a relevant planning consideration as the land was part of the street and was in private ownership.

The local Member commented that he believed that most of the objections raised had been addressed and that he considered the proposal acceptable.

One Member referred to materials and asked the Officers to ensure that the stone wall to the front should be constructed of the same or a similar stone to match the existing and that a suitable mortar should be used.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application HIN/19721/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.232 CUM/NHI/20107-X -OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR 150 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PUBLIC OPEN SPACE. LAND OFF FOGWELL ROAD AND ADJOINING TILBURY LANE, DEAN COURT, CUMNOR/NORTH HINKSEY.

(Councillors Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Tony de Vere, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Angela Lawrence, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Judy Roberts, 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).

Further to the report the Officers explained that most, but not all, of the open space was to be provided between the application site and the A420. It was confirmed that access was a detail under consideration as part of this application.

Details of the application were outlined and the following points highlighted: -

- Vision splays were to be retained and with footpaths retained behind the vision splays.
- The proposed modifications to the function of Eynesham Road and Fogwell Road had passed an Independent Safety Audit.
- There was no technical justification for either a roundabout or traffic lights at the junction.
- The right turn lane was explained.
- Fogwell Road was 6 metres wide which was quite generous by modern design standards.
- The character of the road through the estate was explained and the proposed access was shown.
- Officers had visited the site at various times of the day and there had been on street parking. Members were advised that they needed to consider whether the level of on street parking observed could cause a danger. Officers did not consider that this was the case.
- There had been instances when refuse vehicles had obstructed the highway but this had been in the side roads and not along the spine road.
- The intentions regarding Tilbury Lane were explained. There would be a controlled gate for people with rights of way.
- There would be a pedestrian/cycle link from the site to Hazel Road.
- The character of Tilbury Lane was explained. There was concern regarding additional traffic using Tilbury Lane and therefore this was why a controlled gate was proposed.
- A new access to the farm was being discussed along the north side of the A420 which would result in farm traffic not using Tilbury Lane. The new access would be constructed under agricultural permitted development rights. However it was noted that this could not be required as part of this application.
- There was to be a footpath/cycle link into Hazel Road. The character of that road was explained with photographs of the area shown at the meeting.
- View across the fields were displayed showing the link which had been shortened to reduce the impact of lighting required by the Council Council as part of any adoption.
- An illustrative layout was shown including heights of buildings. It was noted that this included some 3 storey flats. The distances between dwellings met the Council's standards for privacy. Some illustrative drawings of design were shown. There were 3 small town squares within the scheme. A suggested design motive for the site had evolved.
- Photographs of the site were shown.
- In terms of public open space it was highlighted that more than the required area was to be provided but it was to be mostly outside the site. In seeking a view on this, Members considered this acceptable.
- North Hinksey and Cumnor Parish Councils had both set out their expectations regarding offsite improvements, details of which were set out in the report with the applicant's response. It was reported that Cumnor Parish Council was meeting later the same evening but was not content with the offer from the applicant.

- There was an existing play area on the estate. The scheme involved putting two play areas within the site but would they would be unequipped play areas. In response to North Hinksey Parish Council's requirement for improvements, the applicant had offered that the east play area within the site would be equipped. However, North Hinksey Parish Council was not content with this.
- A drainage strategy had been submitted with the application.
- The Environment Agency had removed its objection and was content with the proposal subject to conditions.
- Permeable paving and surfacing with a storage area underneath those areas to control runoff was proposed, which it was considered would be an improvement, when compared to the existing "Greenfield" site.
- Two swales were proposed to retain additional water at during extreme weather events.
- With reference to the electro magnetic field, Members' attention was drawn to the comments of the Health Protection Agency set out in the report. There were some concerns about the equipment used by the applicant's consultants to measure EMF, but given the 74 metre separation, the Health Protection Agency was content that the impact the housing development would be within acceptable limits. A drawing in this regard was shown at the meeting.
  
- Natural England had raised no objection subject to conditions. It was noted that the nearest badger set was 200 metres away and there were no protected reptile habitats on the site.
- An Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) in Botley was being proposed in the vicinity of the A34. A map showing measured levels of nitrogen dioxide was shown. It was explained that Nitrogen Dioxide levels were exceeded close to the road. It was commented that some areas were above and below target along the A34, but given the distance from the site to the A34 this was considered that levels on the site would be acceptable.
- Impact on services was addressed in the report. The primary Care Trust was due to advise on the level of funding required to improve the local Health Care Centre. The applicant was willing to make a contribution towards this.
  
- The District Council had financial requirements as part of the Section 106 agreement to address the provision of recycling boxes and composters. The applicant had agreed to make a financial contribution towards this.

Further to the report one additional letter had been received from a neighbour reiterating concerns relating to matters already covered in the report.

Wytham Parish Meeting had raised no objection but was concerned regarding the impact on facilities for people from Wytham who used those facilities.

Mr P Hawtin made a statement on behalf of Cumnor Parish Council commenting that the proposed development at Tilbury Lane posed a range of hazards. He explained that the Parish Council's overall objective was to see the development go ahead but without residents being subjected to avoidable risks and with the District Council

taking its decision in a transparent manner, having regard to the facts and in the light of a properly assessed technical justification.

Mr Hawtin raised a number of concerns regarding what the Parish Council considered to be inadequacies in the report, namely a misunderstanding as to what was meant by "content with"; failure to take appropriate independent advice; the responsibility of the District Council in terms of determining an application and accurate consultation; whether advice from HPA was independent when the applicant had relied on guidance to which that Agency was a party; the advice being dated; and underestimating the risk; the questionability that the Environment Agency would have been content with the proposals if it had been informed that every time it rained, a large strip of the development area flooded and that there were major flows of water along Tilbury Lane; He suggested that the number of dwellings using the access was greater than stated and queried whether the County Council would have maintained its comments had it reached similar conclusions regarding house numbers with the possibility of even more houses. He raised concerns regarding the reliability of the assessment of risk of particulates; and the possibility of interactive effects between particles and the electric magnetic field from the pylons. He commented that it would take time for the applicant to resolve the foul water drainage and therefore he urged the Committee to defer consideration of the application to enable the Officers to carry out a proper assessment of the technical issues. He commented that he did not believe that the Council could credibly argue that it had taken its decision having regard to all reasonable precautions. He asked that it be recorded that with the Parish Council's support, he had tendered this opinion to a Chartered Engineer who had spent some 10 years writing documents justifying the execution of hazardous tasks.

Briony Newport made a statement on behalf of North Hinksey Parish Council raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She explained that the Parish Council broadly welcomed the development but had reservations regarding the access arrangements and what they saw as the unfair leisure settlement by the developer in terms of Section 106 contributions. She referred to a development of 35 units on the Elms Road Nursery Site when a contribution of £25,000 towards play services had been secured and commented that using the same equation, a financial contribution for play provision in the sum of £175,000 would result. She commented that the developer had encouraged play equipment bids on both sides of Tilbury Lane and there was thought of the Parish Council donating land for leisure. She explained that this would have provided a play area for children from Seacourt Road and Botley School areas. However, the Parish Council was not successful in securing any contributions, with monies instead going to Cumnor Parish Council for older children's play equipment at the end of Fogwell Road. She reported that the Parish Council was not aware of this and had not had the chance to comment to the developer on Sports England's dismal view of the play provision. She reported that Fogwell Road was too far away from this site. She explained that older children's equipment was necessary at the new site to link the older and new developments together. She commented that North Hinksey Parish Council should receive a financial contribution towards much need play provision.



Mark Maloney made a statement on behalf of residents objecting to the application raising concerns regarding infrastructure; design and health and safety. He commented that in terms of infrastructure, the Local Plan Inspector's assessment had been shown to be fundamentally flawed since Thames Water had requested a Grampian condition prohibiting the occupation of new dwellings in the Cumnor area until improvements were made to the local sewer system; the Environment Agency had made an initial holding objection which he considered justified in view of the large scale flooding in July 2007 and other more frequent flooding; and an additional GP would be required for the local surgery as well as an extension to that surgery. He advised that the Inspector's assessment had had no regard for other large scale development planned for the area, which in total would lead to a substantial increase in population density and cause infrastructure capacity to be exceeded. In terms of design, he expressed concerns regarding advice on the extent of future development, namely 100 houses and the containment of development to the Cumnor side of Tilbury Lane; locked gates along Tilbury Lane; he expressed a preference for two developments on either side of the Lane with two separate entrances. He considered that the outline plan did not conform to local vernacular and suggested the proposed inclusion of three storey buildings would be out of keeping. He raised further concerns regarding car parking; traffic; road capacity; congestion; access; inability of vehicles to pass; on street parking; parking difficulties; traffic speed; poor sight lines; the need for a roundabout and alternative traffic flow measures; loss of existing hedgerows and ecological impact. In terms of health and safety, he explained his concerns regarding construction traffic and its use of Fogwell Road being unreasonable; electromagnetic field (emf) levels; the Health Protection Agency's questionability of the validity of measures of emf; pollution; noise from the A34 and A420; and air quality. Finally, he questioned whether there had been procedural inaccuracies in dealing with the application and suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred to enable further thought to be given to the areas of concern.

Mr B Roberts and Mr J O Kelly had both given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting objecting to the application, but they declined to do so.

Mr S W Jones speaking on behalf of residents of Tilbury Lane raised concerns regarding drainage commenting on the holding objection of the Environment Agency, the Grampian condition requested by Thames Water and sewage problems affecting his garden and the impact on the development would have already poor situation and consequently on his hotel business. He urged the Committee to examine all the issues raised and to consider all the relevant information.

Mr Flockton made a statement objecting to the application regarding the need for interested parties to secure maximum financial contributions from the developer to mitigate against any harm.

Mr N Patterson-Neild the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the proposal was for a sustainable development on an allocated site with the appropriate level of affordable housing. He advised that 10% of energy would be provided from renewal energy sources; the site was in a sustainable location; a transport assessment had been prepared and submitted; the Environment Agency had withdrawn its objection; there was a sustainable drainage water scheme

the details of which were explained; a Grampian condition was proposed; trees were to be protected; recreational needs would be met with open space provision which exceeded requirements. He commented that just because a financial contribution was not being offered to North Hinksey Parish Council toward play provision did not mean that play provision was not being provided. He explained that this would be achieved. He commented that there was bio diversity on the site and there was a variety of designs of high quality. He explained that calibrated equipment had been used to measure the magnetic fields associated with the nearby pylons and that the distances were supported by the Government guidance. Finally, in terms of the s106 agreement he confirmed this would provide for a wide range of measures.

Nick Roberts made a statement in support of the application commenting that a transport assessment had been submitted; there were good travel connections; short and direct routes to local facilities by foot and cycle rather than by car would be achieved; there would be improvements to the Fogwell Road junction; Tilbury Lane would be used by Tilbury Farm (although an alternative access was being sought) and for emergency access and pedestrians only and would be gated; and the proposal accorded with planning policy.

Judy Roberts one of the local Members made a statement objecting to the application, raising concerns regarding access; the need to minimise the negative impact of the proposal on existing residents; flooding; drainage; sewage disposal; the inappropriateness of the proposed gate on Tilbury Lane and doubt as to whether it would be functional; traffic problems; agreement of this access road resulting in the other development not proceeding; the need to examine the possibility of other access routes; noise; pollution at the northern boundary and safety in this regard; and the need for the Grampian condition. Finally she commented that any proposal should be safe and as such she suggested that other options should be considered in this case. She commented that advice had been given previously to homeowners in the area that there would be no development on the Tilbury Lane site.

Another local Member also raised some concern regarding the access.

Some Members spoke against the application making the following comments:

- There was concern regarding issues of air quality; noise and pollution and the nearby overhead power cables and how safe they were.
- It was question whether there were any measures which could be imposed to improve protection should the levels of emf be unacceptable. The Officers responded advising that the application needed to be determined based on the information available and as presented including the views of the Health Protection Agency.
- There was a need for boundary treatment to ensure a barrier of trees and shrubs. It was suggested that conditions should be added to any permission in this regard.
- There was concern regarding the impact of noise and pollution from the A420. In response to a request for a buffer zone of trees and shrubs it was noted that this was a reserved matter and that the Environmental Health Officer had reported, in respect of previous application, that vegetation did not provide

much protection against noise. Furthermore, it was commented that acoustic protection was only considered necessary for the northern most houses on the site.

- There was concern regarding the open space areas and the installation of play equipment. It was suggested the Officers should consider further the comments of Sports England in terms of play provision for older children. The Officers reported that provisions had been based on discussions with the Council's Leisure Service and that further advice should be sought from them.
- One Member questioned whether the application could be deferred to enable further discussions with the developer regarding the concerns raised.
- With reference to the Section 106 obligation there was concern regarding the play areas and play equipment and the lack of consultation with Sports England. It was questioned whether Sports England could now be consulted and whether the Parish Council could be assisted in a joint approach on this.
- It was questioned whether the PCT was content with the financial contribution it would receive. It was reported that the PCT had understood that it could only require a proportionate contribution and it was content with the proposal and had agreed that it was proportionate to the development.
- There was concern regarding the use of land outside of the application site for open space and whether this had allowed the proposed housing numbers to be increased. The Officers responded confirming that the density limit was acceptable and that a more spacious layout had been produced. The numbers of units had not increased due to the use of the area outside of the site, but the public open space within the site had decreased.
- Reference was made to a development at Ladygrove in Didcot where buildings had been constructed near electricity cables. A report in this regard had been prepared known as the Scott report, and it was suggested that Officers should have regard to this.
- It was considered that the level of affordable housing should be clearly stipulated. The Officers confirmed that this would form part of the Section 106 obligation and that there would no scope for the developer to raise concerns at a later date regarding viability.
  - There was concern regarding surface water and foul water drainage issues and concern that Thames Water had felt it necessary to impose a Grampian condition.
  - The width of Fogwell Road was 6 metres wide but it was questioned whether this was for the entire length of the road which it was considered became narrower in places.
  - Concern was expressed regarding traffic movements on the site as well as the access.

One Member commented that it was unfortunate that the member of the public asking a question about affordable housing had not remained in the meeting to listen to this debate, noting that the public was against this housing development which it was noted would provide affordable housing. It was noted that this site had been allocated for development in the current Local Plan and as such the principle of development had been established. Therefore, he suggested that the Committee needed to consider what was acceptable. He commented that the Committee should have regard to the professional advice unless there was good reason not to. He commented that he accepted the advice received but had reservations regarding the locked gate. Furthermore, he referred to the play area commenting that there would be two small areas without equipment and he welcomed the fact that the latest plan showed that the eastern most area would now have some equipment and urged that as much equipment as possible should be provided.

Some other members spoke in support of the application commenting that: -

- There was no evidence to suggest that the proposed access was harmful.
- The design was a reserved matter but it was suggested that an informative should be added to advise the applicant that this should be of a high quality.
- 60 units would be affordable which was important bearing in mind the number of people on the housing list.
- This application could not address the inadequate leisure provision elsewhere and that it was only necessary to provide leisure provision adequate for this development.
- The principle of development had been established.
- The development would need to have adequate drainage and sewage disposal for itself and did not need to address the existing problems. It was noted that the intention of the Grampian Condition suggested by Thames Water was to sort the drainage and sewage problem out in the area as a whole. It was noted that the condition would prevent this scheme proceeding until the problems in the catchment had been resolved. The Officers reported that they had met with Thames Water and they were very clear about the Grampian condition. Thames Water was aware of the drainage problems and required the condition which would hold back the development until they were satisfied.
- The informal open space was a good use of the Green Belt land although it maintenance needed to be provided for.

One Member commented that there was a need to ensure that the play spaces were set up properly and available for future use. It was noted that there was a need to consult the two Parish Councils and that the balance of demands needed to be recognised. It was suggested that further consultation in this regard was needed.

One Member commented that the play equipment should not necessarily be for very young children it being noted that the needs of young teenagers should be considered. He suggested that the provision of shelters where young people could meet should be looked into. He referred to the statistics referred to by one of the speakers commenting that the Parish Councils should be realistic regarding the level

of play provision. Furthermore, he expressed surprised that house buyers had been told that houses would never be built on this site. He commented that the site had been an allocated site for some time. In terms of air quality measurements he expressed surprise that they did not deal with particulates which was the emerging significant issue and he questioned whether it would be reasonable to examine this issue further.

The Officers clarified that the site had been not been allocated, but was designated as safeguard land in earlier local plans which meant it could be released for development at some time in the future when needed. In 2006 the Planning Inspectors report had concluded it should now be released for development.

One Member suggested that a meeting with all interested parties, including the Chair and/or Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Committee and local Members for Appleton and Cumnor and North Hinksey and Wytham with the officers and the developer to discuss open spaces and play equipment would be beneficial

One Member commented that he would wish to receive further information on particulates in planning terms and how they could be addressed. However, it was noted that as set out in the report, the Council's consultant had concluded that particulate levels would not exceed harmful limits. There was no suggestion that particulates from this site would be harmful. One Member commented that he had understood that particulate matter was decreasing generally due to more efficient engines.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be delegated authority in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee to approve application CUM/NHI/20107-X subject to: -*

- (1) further discussion with all interested parties, including the Chair and/or Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Development Control Committee, the local Members for Appleton and Cumnor and North Hinksey and Wytham, the two Parish Councils and the developer to clarify the position regarding open space and play equipment provision associated with the proposed development, including maintenance;*
- (2) the completion of Section 106 Obligations with the Vale and with Oxfordshire County Council to secure provision of affordable housing and contributions towards services infrastructure;*
- (3) conditions, to include the submission of reserved matters, a limitation on the number of dwellings to no more than 150, details of the modified junction*

*arrangement, the provision of the footpath/cycleway, details of lighting of the footway/cycleway, the details for restricting access to Tilbury Lane, tying in elements of the design and access strategy, foul drainage, noise insulation, the energy and water conservation strategy, the recommendations of English Nature on ecology, and those of the Environment Agency on surface water drainage*

(4) *an informative regarding the orientation of dwellings on plots facing the A420.*

(5) *an informative to advise the applicant that the design should be a high quality.*

DC.233 WAN/20268/1 - DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY GARAGE/EXTENSION. ERECTION OF A SINGLE AND TWO STOREY EXTENSION. REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FRONT FLAT ROOF WITH PITCHED ROOF. 9 ELM ROAD, WANTAGE, OXON, OX12 7EE

One of the local Members commented that she had no objection to the proposal noting that there were similar extensions in the area.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application WAN/20268/1 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 8.35 pm