

# DC.30

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 14TH JULY, 2008 AT  
6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Richard Gibson (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Matthew Barber, Paul Burton, Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Mary de Vere, Richard Farrell, Jenny Hannaby, Anthony Hayward, Sue Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Terry Quinlan and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Tony de Vere for Councillor Val Shaw.

OFFICERS: Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl, Stuart Walker, Emma Parkes, Sarah Commins, Martin Deans and Mike Gilbert.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 60

**DC.36 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 having been received from Councillor Val Shaw.

**DC.37 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 July 2008 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

**DC.38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members declared interests in report 41/08 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Application</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Min Ref</u>
Jerry Patterson	Personal	SUN/16776/2	In so far as he was an ordinary member of the Oxford Preservation Trust.	DC.51
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	GRO/20495-X	In so far as she was a County Councillor for Wantage and Grove and was also a member of the Planning Committee for the County Council. However, she explained that she had taken no part	DC.52

			in any previous consideration of this matter.	
Jerry Patterson	Personal	GRO/20495-X	In so far as he was a member of the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) and he was also a member of the Liberal Democrat Party and a consultee. However he explained that he had taken no part in any consideration of this at either SEERA or as a Liberal Democrat.	DC.52
Richard Farrell	Personal and Prejudicial	Materials	In so far as he was a Board Member of the Vale Housing Association.	DC.43
Jenny Hannaby	Personal and Prejudicial	Enforcement report – Wantage Pizza & Kebab, Wallingford Street	In so far as she lived in the vicinity of the kebab van.	DC.56

## DC.39 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the meeting. For the benefit of members of the public he explained the procedure to be followed at the meeting.

The Chair highlighted the emergency exits.

The Chair asked everyone present to switch off their mobile telephones and to listen to the debated in silence without interruption.

## DC.40 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

## DC.41 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

## DC.42 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 15 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting. However 1 member of the public declined to do so.

**DC.43 MATERIALS**

**GFA/19983/2-D Folly Farm, Faringdon**

Councillor Richard Farrell had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 33 he left the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee received and considered materials in respect of the above development. One Member commented that more notice of materials on site should be given. Notwithstanding the limited time to view these materials, Members were satisfied that the materials presented should be considered at this meeting.

By 14 votes to nil, with 1 of the voting Members having left the meeting during consideration of this item it was

***RESOLVED***

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

Walls – Berkstone reconstituted stone in buff/black and buff/brown  
Terca Smoked Orange Multi Gritt Stock Brick  
Henson Kimbleton Red Brick  
Terca Smoked Antique Red Multi Brick  
Cream coloured Render

Tiles – Artificial Mineral Fibre Slate Tile  
Gemini Double Camber Concrete Tiles in Brindle and Mixed Russett

**DC.44 APPEALS**

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal which had been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.

***RESOLVED***

*that the agenda report be received.*

**DC.45 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS**

The Committee considered details of forthcoming enquiries and hearings.

***RESOLVED***

*that the report be received.*

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee received and considered report 41/08 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 speak were considered first.

DC.46 DRA/5680/3 ERECTION OF A GARAGE 32A HIGH STREET, DRAYTON OX14 4JL

Members supported the application.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application DRA/5680/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.47 ECH/9964/1 ERECTION OF A NEW WORKSHOP. CHALLOW HOUSE FARM, MAIN STREET, EAST CHALLOW, OX12 9SR.

Mr Cannings made a statement in support of the application commenting that the workshop was required to enable work currently undertaken outside to be taken under cover. It was explained that the workshop space was to allow small machines to be repaired under cover. He referred to the need for improved security and explained that there would be no adverse visual impact. He commented that there would be a reduction in noise as the building would be insulated. He explained that car parking was clearly signed and whilst staff car parking was not marked he explained that everyone had their own known parking areas. He referred to the lack of complaints in many years of trading.

Members supported the application commenting that this was a rural district with much agricultural machinery and equipment which needed to be repaired and maintained. It was considered that the proposal was reasonable in this location and that there would be no adverse impact. It was commented that car parking was haphazard on the site but that this was a minor issue.

By 15 voted to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ECH/9964/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.48 DRA/10313/2 SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS, AND TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION. ALTERATIONS TO FRONT GABLE TO INCREASE THE ROOF HEIGHT, AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE TO THE FRONT. 83 HIGH STREET, DRAYTON, OX14 4JW.

Mr J Thornton had given notice that he wished to make a statement at the meeting in support of the application but he declined to do so.

It was noted that there had been some concerns regarding the garage block, but amended plans had been received to address this. It was commented that the proposal was similar to applications elsewhere.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application DRA/10313/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.49 SUT/15827/2 ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ENLARGEMENT OF REAR DORMER WINDOW. 24 MILTON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY. OX14 4BP

The Officers drew the Committee's attention to the previous reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

Parish Councillor D Hignall made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly raised concern regarding the extent of the proposal which was significant; the view that the proposal would overwhelm the existing dwelling; harmful impact on the residential amenity of neighbours; adverse impact of the works on No.22; design being out of keeping; proximity with the first floor extension being 350 mm away from the neighbouring roof light; loss of light and sunlight; harmful impact on the visual appearance of the pair of dwellings; loss of local features; the design being contrary to policy and the two storey flat roof extension being out of keeping. He commented that there should be a site visit by all Members of the Committee.

Mr D Challen the neighbour at No.22 made a statement objecting to the application also raising concerns relating to matters covered in the report. He particularly expressed concern regarding the rear dormer window resulting in a loss of light and privacy; proximity of the proposal to his velux; the proximity being only 35cm; the dormer protruding 3m from the roof line; visual impact; over dominance; and no reference having been made to his window. He commented that Members and Officers should view the site from his garden to appreciate the impact.

Some Members spoke in support of the application making the following comments: -

- The proposed dormer would be close to the velux window of the neighbour but it was not considered harmful.
- The view of the dormer was a private view.
- Every extension had some degree of impact on its neighbour but the harm was not considered to be so significant as to overrule the general presumption of development in this case.

Some Members spoke against the proposal making the following comments: -

- The dormer was too bulky and would have an adverse visual impact.
- The proposal was over-dominant.
- Harm would be caused to the amenity of the neighbour in terms of proximity and neighbourliness.

- There would be a degree of overshadowing.

In response to comments made the Officers explained that there was no protection in planning terms to velux windows. It was commented that the proposal would have an impact but that this needed to be assessed and the planning application judged on its merits. The Officers confirmed that they did not consider the proposal so harmful as to warrant refusal.

By 10 votes to 5 it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application SUT/15827/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

**DC.50 CUM/16764/2 REPLACEMENT OF GLASS WALLING TO SECOND FLOOR WITH WINDOWS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION (RETROSPECTIVE). AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMISSION CUM/16764/1.56 CUMNOR HILL, OXFORD, OX2 9HB**

Mr Graham Shuttleworth, a neighbouring resident of Cumnor Hill made a statement on behalf of other residents of Cumnor Hill objecting to the application. He raised concerns regarding adverse impact; the proposal being out of keeping; bulk; over dominance; overlooking of gardens; the proposal being much bigger and more massive than previous proposals; the use of plain rendering; the overhanging of the balustrade; design; height; mass; over bearing impact; over looking; fenestration; appearance and design.

Miss Patti, the applicant spoke in support of the application commenting that the property had been her family home for some years and that it had an art deco feel to it. She reported that the roof had always had a terrace which had been part of the style of that period. She commented that the lack of glass screening along the front of the house would mean that overlooking would be reduced. She reported that the property had always been a 5 bedroom house and that the windows were in keeping with the 1930's style. She explained that rendering had been on the exterior of the existing house; there would be no increase in traffic; all properties on the Lane overlooked each other to some extent; the design was acceptable and the proposal was in keeping.

One of the local Members expressed his support for the proposal commenting that he thought that the amendments now proposed to the approved scheme resulted in an improved appearance of the property. He welcomed the reduced glazing commenting that overlooking would be reduced.

Another local Member also spoke in support of the application commenting that the design was acceptable and that the appearance of the dwelling would be improved. Furthermore, he considered that the house sat well in the site.

Other Members spoke in support of the application agreeing that the design was acceptable and the reduction in glazing an improvement.

In response to comments made it was highlighted that the Committee could have no regard to the fact that the application was retrospective or to the motives or intentions of the applicant. The Committee was advised that it needed to take a view of the merits of the proposal as presented.

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application CUM/16764/2 be approved subject to the condition set out in the report.*

DC.51 SUN/16776/2-T TEMPORARY PERMISSION FOR AN AGRICULTURAL DWELLING, FOXCOMBE HILL FARM, LINCOMBE LANE, BOARS HILL OX1 5DU

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.

It was noted that an appeal against the refusal of permission for a temporary dwelling on this site in 2002 had been dismissed by the Planning Inspector.

The Committee's attention was drawn to Section 5 of the report which referred to PPS7 and set out the criteria to be considered. It was noted that an Independent Agricultural Consultant believed that the 3 criteria were met in this case.

Further to the report, the Officers reported the receipt of an additional three letters of objection which repeating concerns relating to matters already referred to in the report and also raised concerns regarding a commercial use in a residential area which it was considered should be investigated. The Officers clarified that there was an alleged unauthorised development on the site which was being investigated by the Council's Enforcement Officer.

The Officers reported that they believed that a case had been made for a temporary dwelling at the present time but that this would need to be reviewed in the future.

It was noted that there had been concern regarding the use of the three mobile homes on the site and it was reported that a Section 106 obligation would be entered into to ensure that the units were used for one dwelling only. The Committee was advised that agreement to delegated authority to the Deputy Director to grant planning permission and to agree the 106 obligation was now being sought.

Mr Hugh Smith a resident of Lincombe Lane made a statement representing other residents objecting to the application raising concerns regarding it not having been proven that the farm was viable; the proposal being no different to any other small business; the alleged income of £60,000 which could be made from growing water cress but that this did not require someone to live at the site; the main crop being nettles which had not been mentioned in the Plan; the previous positioning of poly tunnels on the site with only one remaining and the whole site being a mess. He

commented that in 2001 it had been stated that there was no availability at a nearby caravan site but there was space now; there was concern regarding the intention of the applicant; the land was used by Kingerlee Construction Vehicles; there were three other adults living on the site and that a commune was being established.

Mr Richard Stevens, a representative of the Oxford Preservation Trust also made a statement objecting to the application commenting that there was no sign of cattle or agriculture on the site. He reported that the RSPCA had been called and that the situation on site was regrettable. He advised that an enforcement notice had been ignored and he urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Mrs Kingerlee, the applicant made a statement in support of the application. She drew Members' attention to the Agricultural Consultants report in respect of profit and explained that she had tried various business models. She reported that farming was very difficult and that she had tried to come up with a number of farming methods to make the business viable. She reported that she had the skills necessary to take the farm forward and to make it a success. She explained that she had started schemes in the past which unfortunately had not been successful. However, she emphasised that she believed in what she was doing and that she was not running a commune. She explained that volunteers had been working on the farm. She reported that she was carrying out organic farming and that she had sold her house in order to carrying on with this. She reported that her husband had left her because of this project and whilst the land was visited by Kingerlee Construction Vehicles it was not used for any purpose associated with that business. She emphasised that there were no hidden reasons for putting forward this application and that her cows were located at a site in South Hinksey because she did not have grass on the Farm at the moment. Finally, she repeated that she just wanted to do what she believed in.

One Member made reference to the three mobile homes on site and the need to ensure that they were used for one dwelling. It was explained that the accommodation was for a family unit.

Another Member highlighted that the accommodation was proposed to be occupied by seasonal workers and he questioned as to what extent this was acceptable in a single family unit. He was concerned that a hostel would result and that it would be difficult to control this in planning terms. The Officers clarified that a number of unrelated people could live together in a single unit sharing facilities and that the test was the interdependency within the property.

In response to a comment made regarding whether volunteers were employees the Officers clarified that condition 2 set out in the report would be amended to reflect the intention that it related to people engaged on the land at the site.

The Officers confirmed that they were convinced that the applicant could not afford to live somewhere else and work this land. It was reported that there was no suitable accommodation in the immediate area either to live or rent.

One Member referred to the Consultant's report commenting that there appeared to be a need although he questioned if the enterprise was likely to be successful. The Member suggested that this was an important issue which should be considered.



One Member referred to the loan mentioned in the Consultant's report. However, the Officers reported that the loan was made through a private arrangement and there were aware of the detail and were satisfied with the conclusions reported.

One Member noted that the Consultant's views were those of an expert and considered that the Committee would be unwise to ignore them. The Officers confirmed that assessing the tests in PPS7 required a certain level of technical expertise and that was why the views of an expert had been sought. It was accepted that there were areas of uncertainty and that was why a temporary permission was suggested. It was clarified that the functional test related to the need for on site residence and the financial test related to the profit made. The applicant would have to show that the business had become profitable after 3 years, when a new application would be required.

Having regard to the advise received some Members considered that a temporary permission was reasonable.

By 11 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions 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 SUN/16776/2-T subject to conditions and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement regarding the occupation of the mobile units as a single dwelling.*

DC.52 GRO/20495-X OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR MIXED-USE CLASS B1 DEVELOPMENT, OPEN SPACE AND PLAYING FIELDS WITH ASSOCIATED CHANGING AND CAR PARKING FACILITIES. LAND NORTH OF BELLINGERS GARAGE, STATION ROAD, GROVE.

Further to the report the Officers clarified that the County Highway Authority had objected to the proposal due to the impact on the highway network contrary to Policy T8 of the Structure Plan.

The Officers drew the Committee's attention to the report which set out why the proposal was considered contrary to planning policy and hence should be refused.

Mr T Gashe made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly commented that the proposal was contrary to planning policy and whilst it might be that there was a need for employment in the Wantage and Grove area, this was not proven. He reported that there was an Employment Land Review which should indicate the amount, quality and location of employment land required in the District and that any proposal should await the outcome of this. He reported that PPS3 required the authority to maintain a register of housing land which was deliverable at all times, but there was no such requirement for employment land. He commented that it the Review determined that

there was a need for land then there should be a review of the whole of the Wantage and Grove area.

Mr M Dobson, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application. He drew Members' attention to paragraph 5.4 of the report suggesting that the site was not an unsustainable location. He explained that Grove was one of the locations identified to accommodate substantially more development and as such there was a need to provide about 3000 jobs. He stated that with new housing, inevitably there would need to be more local employment and that this balance was addressed in this proposal. He referred to the Inspector's report and commented that there was support from the parish Council because of the recognised need. He noted that it had been stated that there was a need for longer term development sites and that the Grove Technology Park could meet this. However, he had concern regarding this. He noted the comments of the Environment Agency but disagreed with its conclusions. Finally, he commented that the proposal would increase sustainability and not lessen it.

One of the Local Members whilst noting the comments of the Parish Council expressed her reservations at the proposal and expressed concern regarding the loss of open land in a location outside of the development boundary.

One Member spoke in support of the application agreeing that this was a sustainable location and that there was a need for employment to match the extra housing that was coming.

Other Members spoke against the application noting that proposals should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan and that this application was clearly contrary to policy. Furthermore, Members agreed that it was essential to know the outcome of the Employment Land Review and to develop a strategy which reflected the findings of that.

By 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application GRO/20495-X be refused for the reasons set out in the report.*

**DC.53 ASH/20576 –ERECTION OF AN OAK FRAMED 4 BAY GARAGE WITH LOFT ROOM OVER. BILLYS COTTAGE, 4 HIGH STREET, ASHBURY, SN6 8NA**

Mr S Wilson made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He explained that he lived at No.2 Cross Trees Cottages and reported that his garden joined the rear garden of the application site which was separated by a deciduous hedge. He particularly raised concern regarding proximity; loss of views; overshadowing; loss of privacy; inaccurate plans; insufficient information to view the proposals and make comments; height and glazing resulting in adverse impact and loss of privacy; proposed use of the gardens; the elevated position of the site which should be taken into account and conditions added to address this; the need to re-orientate the proposal to align it better with existing properties; the need for amended plans to omit the upper glazed element; lack of screening it being noted that the hedgerow was deciduous; the proposal being

contrary to planning policy statements (PPS3 and PPS9) in terms of bio diversity and impact on bats.

In response to the comments made the Officers reported that evidence of bats situated in the area would be need and not just evidence of foraging in the location.

One Member commented that it the proposal was 40metres away from the neighbour which exceeded the Council's guidelines. Other Members also supported the application.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ASH/20576 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.54 GFA/20534 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE 4A, AND CONSTRUCTION OF 5 DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH NEW ACCESS FROM COXWELL ROAD 4A AND LAND TO THE REAR OF 6 FERNHAM ROAD, FARINGDON

The Committee noted that the Town Council had not objected to the proposal but had asked for a financial contribution towards the play equipment in Marlborough Gardens. However, it was explained that the Officers did not consider that this was reasonable in view of the proximity of the play equipment to this development.

It was noted that the County Council sought a financial contribution towards infrastructure such as fire and rescue, libraries and schools. The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application, authority to do so should be delegated to the Deputy Director subject to the completion of a Section 106 obligation.

The Committee noted that the Officers considered the layout acceptable and could not see that any harm would be caused. It was noted that there had been concern raised regarding the loss of vegetation because of the new access. However, amended plan had been submitted which had brought the dwellings back and no trees would be lost. Furthermore, there would be new planting. It was considered that providing the dwellings were reasonable in height the proposal would not be harmful and the access acceptable.

Ms L Norton a neighbouring resident opposite the application site made a statement on behalf of other residents objecting to the application. She raised concerns regarding the access and the harmful impact of this on the area; pedestrian safety it being noted that there were many children in the vicinity and there was a crossing nearby; parked cars; increased traffic; parking generally; the site already having access off Fernham Road and a lack of understanding as to why a new access was required; loss of vegetation; loss and lack of screening; adverse visual impact; loss of outlook and the proposal being out of keeping in this part of Faringdon near the countryside.

One of the local Members spoke in support of the application noting that the vision splay was adequate; the drainage was acceptable subject to conditions; the trees were to be retained; a financial contribution was to be made; the County Highway Authority had no objection; landscaping was to be provided; density was in accordance with PPS3; the parking was sufficient and whilst there was a significant amount of traffic along Coxwell Road, the traffic could be equally as busy along Fernham Road and therefore the use of the access was acceptable.

Another local Member considered that whilst an alternative access onto Fernham Road would lessen the impact on the speaker, it would not be preferable. He considered that from a safety point of view, the access off Coxwell Road would be better particularly having regard to the positioning of the crossing further down the road. On consideration of this matter he asked whether Officers could liaise with the County Council to secure a speed activation device along this road.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

- (a) 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 be delegated authority to approve application GFA/20534 subject to the conditions set out in the report and to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure a financial contribution to the County Council towards infrastructure requirements; and*
- (b) that the Officers discuss with the County Council the possibility of a speed activation device along Coxwell Road.*

DC.55 WTT/20550 DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING PROPERTY AND OUTBUILDINGS. ERECTION OF 1 DETACHED DWELLING AND TWO SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS, WITH CLOSURE OF EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS AND CREATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS. HALDON, LAMBOROUGH HILL, WOOTTON, ABINGDON OX13 6BY.

Commander Taylor made a statement objecting to the application. He commented that he represented the views of 5 residents of Limborough Hill. He raised concerns regarding the inaccuracy of the boundaries; loss of light; the extension of the new building; the adverse impact on neighbour buildings; proximity; the ongoing boundary dispute; over-development; the need for the proposal to be lower; height; adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours and the objection to the proposal by local people. He commented that the kitchen window which faced the front on the neighbouring dwelling was not the main window. Furthermore, he commented that the neighbour was registered disabled and as such spent lots of time at home and would incur increased lighting costs as a result of the proposal and consequent overshadowing.

Mr D Aspinall representing the applicant made a statement in support of the application. He commented that there had been substantial pre-application discussions to ensure an appropriate use of the land and the submission of an acceptable proposal. He explained that the design was appropriate; there were no

objections in highway terms; the scheme had been sensitively designed and should be approved.

Members spoke in support of the application noting that the windows which would be affected were secondary windows and that there was no requirement to protect them. However, it was considered that a condition should be added to require that the windows on the side elevations should be obscure glazed. Furthermore, the height of the proposal was considered acceptable although it was suggested that a condition to address slab levels should be added.

One Member referred to the ownership of the hedge and the boundary of the site. The Officers responded that the boundary details was a private law matter and was not a material planning consideration.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and / or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to approve application WTT/20550 subject to: -*

- (1) the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the required contribution for social and highways infrastructure;*
- (2) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (3) further conditions to require the windows on the side elevations to be obscure glazed and a condition to address slab levels.*

DC.56 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

Councillor Jenny Hannaby had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in part of this item in so far as it related to the Wantage Pizza and Kebab' 30 Wallingford Street, Wantage and in accordance with Standing Order 33 she left the meeting during consideration of that part of the item.

The Committee received and considered report 42/08 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which sought approval to take enforcement action in one new case and informed Members of four resolved enforcement cases where authority was sought to remove them from the active enforcement list.

*RESOLVED*

- (a) that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Committee Chair and/or Vice Chair, to take enforcement action against Mr Mason and Land South of Bramble Grange, Hanney Road, Steventon, to remove an unauthorised; access, access track, and residential caravan, and to remove all spoil from the site, if he considers it expedient to do so, (agreed by 15 votes to nil);*

- (b) *that no further action be taken in the case of an unauthorised micro wind generator at 7 Membury Way, Grove, OX12 0BP and that the case be removed from the active enforcement list, (agreed by 15 votes to nil);*
- (c) *that no further action be taken in the case of unauthorised opening hours at 'Wantage Pizza and Kebab' 30 Wallingford Street, Wantage and that the case be removed from the active enforcement list, (agreed by 14 votes to nil with 1 of the voting Members having left the meeting during consideration of this item);*
- (d) *that no further action be taken in the case of the breach of condition (7 of CHD/18694) at The Close, West Street, Childrey and that the case be removed from the active enforcement list, (agreed by 15 votes to nil); and*
- (e) *that no further action be taken in the case of the unauthorised mixed use of Willowdene, Great Coxwell, Faringdon, SN7 7LU and that the case be removed from the active enforcement list, (agreed by 15 votes to nil).*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 9.15 pm