

# DC.91

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 27TH OCTOBER, 2008 AT  
6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Tony de Vere and Gervase Duffield

OFFICERS: Laura Hudson, Geraldine Le Cointe, Sarah Commins, Martin Deans and Mike Gilbert and Claire Litchfield

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 110

DC.117 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The attendance of Substitute Members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the Provisions of Standing Order 17 (1) was recorded as referred to above with an apology having been received from Councillors Terry Cox and Terry Quinlan.

DC.118 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of a meeting of the Committee held on 15 September 2008 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.119 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Interests were declared in respect of report 107/08 – Planning Applications as follows:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal and Prejudicial	SUTAPF616(60 CM)	She was a Member of the County Council who was making the final decision on this application and was the Portfolio	DC.127

			Holder for Waste at the Vale.	
Anthony Hayward	Personal	CUM20624	He was acquainted with the applicant's agent Adrian James	DC.136
Anthony Hayward	Personal	SUTAPF616(60CM)	His daughter was an employee of the Environment Agency	DC.127
Gervase Duffield	Personal	SUTAPF616(60CM)	He was the local member for Sutton Courtenay and Appleford and as a result was acquainted with some of the objectors to the application.	DC.127
Tony de Vere	Personal	DRA20146(2)	He was acquainted with the speaker from Drayton Parish Council, Jennifer Pooley	DC.132
Mary de Vere	Personal	DRA20146(2)	He was acquainted with the speaker from Drayton Parish Council, Jennifer Pooley	DC.132

DC.120 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed everyone present to the meeting. For the benefit of members of the public he pointed out the Officers who were present to give advice and to minute proceedings and he explained that only elected Members of the Development Control Committee could vote on the items on the agenda.

He requested that members of the public listen to the debate in silence and refrain from any disorderly conduct.

The Chair announced that the section of the Enforcement Programme, item 23 relating to Abingdon Marina would not be considered at this meeting.

DC.121 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.122 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.123 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 19 members of the public had given notice that they wished to make a statement, however one of the members declined to do so and another was not in attendance at the meeting.

DC.124 MATERIALS

The Committee received and considered materials in respect of the following:

- (1) WAN/2186/14 and 17, St Mary's School, Wantage

By 15 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the following materials be approved:-*

*Sandtoft concrete tiles in 'terracotta' and 'rustic'; the terracotta to replace the previously approved Redland concrete terracotta tile.*

DC.125 APPEALS

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

*RESOLVED*

*that the agenda report be received.*

DC.126      FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a report detailing forthcoming public inquiries.

*RESOLVED*

*that the agenda report be received.*

DC.127      SUTAPF616(60CM) WASTE RECYCLING GROUP LTD ENERGY FROM WASTE INCINERATOR (EFW) INFRASTRUCTURE PLUS THAT FOR COMBINED HEAT AND POWER (CHP), INCINERATOR BOTTOM ASH (IBA) PROCESSING PLANT WITH OUTSIDE STORAGE AREA, AND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL RESIDUE (APCR) TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL FACILITY, VISITOR AND OFFICE ACCOMMODATION AND LANDSCAPING. LAND AT APPLEFORD SIDINGS, APPLEFORD, DIDCOT, OXON.

In accordance with Standing Order 32, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item, Councillor Jenny Hannaby left the room during the discussion.

The Officers introduced the report and confirmed that this was a County Council matter and it came before the Committee as the Vale of White Horse District Council was a consultee.

Officers referred the Committee to several photographs of the proposed site of the incinerator and access plans together with photomontages of how the proposed building would look from various vantage points.

It was reported that since the report was drafted a further 35 letters had been received raising the following concerns:-

- the site was unsuitable given the proposed expansion of Didcot.
- the land proposed was supposed to be for agricultural use
- the proposal contravenes Council policies
- serious concerns regarding the effects of the incinerator on human health
- the adverse impact on biodiversity
- the proposal has been made as a result of a desire to avoid EU fines
- the weather data used by the applicant was not accurate, having been taken at Brize Norton

It was also reported that Natural England had raised an objection, the details of which were not yet available. Officers further reported that a letter had been received from Councillor Julia Reynolds, who was not in attendance at the meeting, urging the Committee to recommend that the County Council consider the use of Gasplasma technology. It was noted that Councillor Reynold's letter had been circulated amongst Member prior to the meeting.

Officers stated that the Committee could consider three elements, the impact on highways/transport, the impact on the landscape and the impact on air quality, noise, contamination and flooding.

With respect to the impact on highways/transport the Committee noted Officer's concerns that the transport assessment had not considered the redevelopment of older areas of the Milton Park site. In addition it was noted that in order to avoid unacceptable levels of additional vehicular traffic the County Council would need to have in place a comprehensive set of controls.

The Committee noted that the Officers supported the objections of the Environment Agency relating to the potential impact on biodiversity in the area and the risk of flooding.

It was noted that Officers were not satisfied with the air quality model which had been relied upon in preparing the application. It was reported that Officers were recommending that a robust independent audit be carried out on the model.

Councillor David Hignall from Sutton Courtney Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. He commented that he was aware of the content of the Officers report and was pleased with the recommendations. He stated that the proposals conflict with policy plans and government guidance. He stressed that the site was not brownfield.

He commented that the Parish Council was concerned that this application would lead to increased numbers of vehicles and therefore pollution. He stated that residents were very concerned about the implications of the proposed incinerator on their health. He further raised concerns regarding ground pollution and flood risk.

He concluded his statement by commenting that the Parish Council was totally opposed to incineration as a means of dealing with waste and was in support of recycling.

Councillor Nicola Simonson made a statement in objection to the application on behalf of Appleford Parish Council. She stated that in addition to being a resident of Appleford and a Parish Councillor, she was also an Environmental Consultant. She was concerned that there were some significant omissions from the application stating that things were referred to in the application, yet missing from it. She was concerned that there had been no independent review of the information supplied by the applicant, and that the planning authority was being asked to take their findings on trust. She pointed out that the Environment Agency had not commented on pollution controls and she was concerned that the human health risk assessment was missing, which was of great importance to the residents.

She stated that the height of the stack for the proposed incinerator was 95 metres, which was significant when compared with Didcot B's stack which was estimated to be 45 metres high.

She highlighted that the photomontages had not considered the detrimental effect on the landscape of a visible plume from the incinerator. In addition to this omission she stated that the photomontages had not considered the need for additional electricity

lines. She further commented that there had been no consideration in the application of the fact that Didcot A would be shutting in 2015, which was likely to result in its removal. She made the point that this would mean that the incinerator would have a greater effect on the sensitivity of the landscape.

She raised further concerns in respect of loss of habitat for wildlife, in particular the loss of nesting habitat for Sand Martins.

Mr Paul Green made a statement on behalf of the applicant in support of the proposal. He commented that the Officers concerns highlighted in the report could be overcome by satisfying the points raised in paragraph 6.2 of the recommendations. He stated that the national grid connection had been identified and that the generation of electricity was an essential part of the viability of the scheme. He commented that the Human Health Risk Assessment had been recently submitted and would be circulated by the County Council shortly.

He advised that development was appropriate in this area and stated that the intention was to enhance the existing landscaping with planting. He commented that this was tried and tested technology and it was being granted approval elsewhere. He stated that it was an appropriate alternative to landfill and was well placed to manage the County's waste.

The Chair opened the debate by reminding the Committee that the application came to the Vale for consultation.

One Member commented that the Human Health Risk Assessment was missing from the application and it should have been carried out. He considered that the point raised by Councillor Simonson relating to the removal of the Didcot A stack was interesting. He suggested that this be highlighted to the County together with the comments of Councillor Reynolds regarding gasplasma technology.

One Member raised concern regarding the air quality issues. It was explained by the Council's Environmental Health Officer that the air quality model which the application had been based on had concluded that there was no substantial impact of ground level particulate. He commented that the model had not been the subject of external scrutiny and therefore confidence in the model needed to be established. The same Member was very concerned that this Council had not to date had sight of the Human Health Risk Assessment, which was of great importance to the local residents.

The Local Member commented that the people of Sutton Courtenay and Appleford had been told repeatedly that once the landfill had gone the land would be returned to agricultural use. He stated that he was concerned that the impact of the landscape would be significant when Didcot A was eventually removed as the remaining Didcot B tower was small in comparison. He raised the point that local doctors had raised concerns about repeated exposure to particulates and local residents were very concerned about the potential impact of the incinerator on health. He agreed with the suggestion of Councillor Reynolds, that alternatives need to be explored. Finally he wished to express his gratitude to the Vale's Officers in Planning and in Democratic Services who had been very helpful in dealing with a great number of queries from local residents.

The Members considered the Officer's recommendations. It was commented by a Member that amendments ought to be made to the recommendation at 6.2 (iii) to state that the word "peripheries" ought to be stressed and that Natural England's objection should be noted in the same way that the Environment Agency's objections had been noted. In addition he suggested that both the human health risk assessment and the air quality model needed to be the subject of robust independent interrogation. Other Members agreed with these proposals, one commented that Members were not experts and should it be determined that the incinerator had an effect on human health it would be deemed unacceptable.

Another Member commented that policy NE11 should be included in objection 1.

By 14 votes in favour, 0 against (one Member having left the room) it was

**RESOLVED**

*that the Vale of White Horse District Council raises objections to the application along the lines of the Officer's recommendation (set out below) but that the wording of the objection be delegated to the Deputy Director in consultation with the Chair to include the nature conservation objection from Natural England and other minor changes*

- 1. the development is contrary to Policies GS2, NE9 and NE11 of the adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011;*
- 2. the development will have an adverse impact on the open rural landscape, particularly having regard to the likely demolition of Didcot A and its cooling towers within the next 5-7 years;*
- 3. the proposal represents a potential flood risk as demonstrated by the objection received to the proposal from the Environment Agency;*
- 4. the proposal does not conclusively demonstrate how the energy generated from the EfW incinerator will be fed into the national grid;*
- 5. no draft legal agreement or heads of terms has been submitted to show how the potential cumulative impact of the proposed use, along with existing permissions on the site, will be controlled to ensure that there is no significant impact on the local highway network as suggested by the submitted transport assessment;*
- 6. the cumulative impact assessment of other large scale developments in the area has omitted to take into account the redevelopment of the 40's, 50's and 60's site at Milton Park;*
- 7. the assessment of the impact on local air quality relies solely on a model which has not been the subject of robust independent audit;*
- 8. although it is understood that a Human Health Risk Assessment has recently been submitted to the County Council, this document has not been submitted to the District, which has concerns that the proposal could have an adverse impact on human health;*

9. *the proposal represents a possible harmful impact to local biodiversity in that Environmental Statement has not used the new lower critical levels of ammonia in the analysis of the impacts from potential air pollutants and this has led to an objection from Natural England dated 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2008;*
10. *no independent assessment/review of the Environmental Statement has taken place to ensure that it provides sufficient detail for a proper assessment, to validate the EIA Methodology and to ensure that all legal obligations have been fulfilled; and*

*These objections could be overcome by the County Council satisfying itself regarding the following:*

- (i) *that the applicant demonstrates that the proposed incinerator will genuinely provide a source of energy to the national grid;*
- (ii) *that it can be demonstrated that the landscape impact of the proposal can be mitigated by a scheme of additional substantial woodland planting on the peripheries of land under the control of the applicant;*
- (iii) *that the objections to the scheme from the Environment Agency and Natural England can be overcome in full;*
- (iv) *that in light of existing permissions on the site, the level of traffic generation from the development and its impact on the local highway network can be adequately controlled through Section 106 and other agreements and that the cumulative impact of the recent development at Milton Park has been adequately addressed;*
- (v) *that the air quality model and the Human Health Risk Assessment are the subject of robust interrogation by an independent suitably qualified parties in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Health Protection Agency respectively and that these audits judge the air quality model fit for purpose and the health risk assessment acceptable; and*
- (vi) *that that the grant of any planning permission on the site includes the following conditions:*
  - (1) *“Noise levels from the proposed development shall not exceed 45dB LAeq (15 min) measured at 1m from the façade of the nearest noise sensitive dwelling between the hours of 0700 and 2300 and 40dB LAeq (15 min) measured at 1m from the façade of the nearest noise sensitive dwelling between 2300 and 0700.”; and*
  - (2) *“No development shall commence until a phased contaminated land risk assessment has been carried out by a competent person in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agencies ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land, CLR 11’. All phases need to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). It is recommended that the LPA are*



*consulted at each phase of the investigation for their approval.*

*Phase 1 shall incorporate a desk study and site walk over to identify all potential contaminative uses on site and to inform the preliminary conceptual site model. If potential contamination is identified then Phase 2 shall be undertaken.*

*Phase 2 shall include a comprehensive intrusive investigation in order to characterise the type nature and extent of contamination present, the risks to receptors and to inform the remediation strategy proposals. If significant contamination is found then Phase 3 shall be undertaken.*

*Phase 3 requires production of a remediation and/or monitoring scheme to ensure the site is rendered suitable for its proposed use. The remediation shall be carried out in accordance with a scheme and timetable first agreed in writing by the LPA and no development or phase of development shall be occupied until all remedial works have been approved by the A. Following implementation of the remedial measures a full validation report detailing the measures carried out to ensure compliance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA."*

DC.128 DRA6169(7) - ERECTION OF A CHALET BUNGALOW. 85 ABINGDON ROAD, DRAYTON, OX14 4HL

This application was dealt with at the reconvened meeting of the Development Control Committee held on Wednesday 29 October 2008.

DC.129 ABG10185(2X) ERECTION OF 2 DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING, PARKING AND UPGRADING OF ACCESS DRIVE. 7A CHANDLERS CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 2NN

Councillor Martin Smith of Abingdon Town Council made a statement objecting to the application. He stated that the plans did not provide adequate space for emergency vehicles, would lead to loss of privacy of neighbouring properties and would lead to loss of light to neighbouring properties. He commented that the plans made inadequate provision for amenity and garden space. He stated that although planning policy H10 provided for efficient use of the land, he did not consider it was appropriate to squeeze properties into small spaces. He raised concern that there was inadequate parking provision for visitors and indeed for the property's use.

Chris Jones made a statement on behalf of the surrounding households to Chandler's Close in objection to the application. He also presented a petition to the Committee which contained 52 signatures opposing the plans.

He stated that he opposed this application as strongly as he had opposed the first and reminded the Committee that the previous application had been refused as being unneighbourly, detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring properties resulting in a harmful and over dominant impact. He advised that it had been noted that this application was for outline consent on the matters of access and layout, wherein it was identical to the previous application. He stated that the proposed changes mainly

concerned the reserved matters of scale and appearance which should have no bearing on the council's decision. He commented that the only change to the layout was a slightly shorter drive to plot 3 with the garage placed behind number 10 Chandlers Close. He commented that this would not reduce the noise nuisance for numbers 8, 9 and 10 and that numbers 7 and 8 would also be affected by noise from the main drive and ground-borne vibration from the proposed rumble strip.

He contended that the site could not accommodate additional housing without an adverse impact on one another, or adjoining properties, in terms of over-dominance, loss of light and privacy. He stated that 7a used storm drains in St Peters Road which were frequently overwhelmed by heavy rain, causing flooding. He added that during 2007, other properties adjoining the site suffered a flood surge that came within inches of their back doors which caused him concern that any further development of this site would result in regular and costly floods.

In respect of access he referred the Committee to the Oxfordshire County Council Road Design Guide which he stated was supposed to ensure safe access to new developments. He commented that the distance from the site entrance to the furthest point on plot 3 exceeded 45 metres which meant that access had to be suitable for fire tenders. He stated that the centreline radius at the entrance and turning head was less than the required 7.8 m which therefore prevented access to fire vehicles in a single movement.

He stated that the long entrance required a passing space but was not wide enough to accommodate one. He raised concern regarding how waste was to be collected and highlighted the problems that the access created, effectively a staggered cross roads which was the wrong orientation and less than 1 carriageway width apart.

Finally he commented that although he recognised that the council may be liable for appeal costs if it decided against the recommendation of officers, he considered a far greater liability would be incurred if the Council approved a proposal that was hazardous and contravened its own guidelines.

The Committee heard a statement from Local Member Councillor Alison Rooke, which was read by the Chair. She expressed concern regarding the lack of room for vehicles to pass, lack of parking provision, the creation of a pinch point at the boundary of the estate and the fact that the building would be domineering. She commented that the current scheme had incorporated minor amendments which did not address previous concerns. She stated that she did not see how the County Engineer had reached his conclusions as she believed that highway safety would be compromised. She was in agreement with Abingdon Town Council's position and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

One Member commented that in considering the application and whether there were grounds to refuse, he noted that the County Engineer had made no objections, the Principal Drainage Engineer had no objections and the Waste Management Team had no objections. He stated that the plans showed that the application showed a turning circle for emergency vehicles. He commented that the design met with design guidance and did not violate the amenity or space of the other properties.

Another Member stated that the amended plans had an impact on number 10 more than the other neighbouring properties in the garage was now nearer to number 10 and the traffic still took the same route. He expressed concern in respect of how refuse would be collected, as there was no mention of the developers providing a bin store.

The Chair suggested a further condition be added to require the details of waste collection proposals to be submitted.

By 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG10185(2X) be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional condition to require that details of waste management proposals be submitted.*

DC.130 UPT18307(3) ERECTION OF A DETACHED TWO-STOREY DWELLING (RE-SUBMISSION) 1 BEECHING CLOSE, UPTON OX11 9JR

Mr Stuart Norman made a statement to the Committee on behalf of Upton Parish Council in objection to the application. He commented that the Parish Council had concerns regarding the access and the building itself. He stated that the proposed access from Station Road would lead to the loss of 5 or 6 trees and would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the tree canopy. He stated his concern regarding the safety of the proposed access, given its steep incline. He expressed the concern of the Parish Council as to how the construction vehicles would access the site.

Mr Graham Dewilde spoke on behalf of the residents of numbers 2-4 Beeching Close in objection to the application. He stated that the proposed access was unsafe and inadequate and that the report had contained a number of errors and omissions. He commented that when the 2006 application was submitted the Highways Authority considered that Beeching Close should be the only means of accessing the site. He stated that in July 2008 an application had been refused which sited the access 22 metres further along station road. He commented that the proposed access would be onto a busy and dangerous road. With regards to the design of the building he commented that although the other buildings in Beeching Close were large, they were not jammed in to the plots as this design appeared to be. He further commented that the plans were inaccurate.

Mr Mike Orr spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He commented that the site was not in the AONB, and it was not visible from points on the AONB. He reminded the Committee that the site had already been given outline planning permission. He commented that the design had little or no impact on the street scene. He made the point that the plans demonstrated that visibility splays could be achieved without the loss of other trees. He commented that the design complies with the Vale's design guide and that this project would have little impact on the neighbouring properties.

In response to a question Officers confirmed that the Arboricultural Officer was happy with the proposals.

One Member commented that he had great doubts regarding the proposed access. He considered that the most remarkable comments appeared to come from the County Engineer. He stated that he considered that it should be rejected as the access was insufficient. He expressed concern regarding the use of the phrase "removal of a tree and vegetation" as it was unclear what the extent of the vegetation to be removed would be.

Another Member stated that he had visited the site and called upon the applicant who had explained that the preferable means of access via Beeching Close was not possible. He considered that the proposal would be acceptable were a 9<sup>th</sup> condition added requiring the access to be agreed as acceptable by Officers prior to its use.

One Member expressed concern in respect of the loss of trees and vegetation and commented that were the access built and Officers deemed it to be unacceptable, the applicant would be left with a useless access and the trees would be lost.

Another Member commented that the earlier proposed 9<sup>th</sup> condition would address his concerns.

By 8 votes in favour and 7 against it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application UPT18307(3) be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional 9<sup>th</sup> condition requiring that the proposed access must be agreed as acceptable by Officers in writing prior to the commencement of the remaining development.*

DC.131 CUM19155(4) ENTRANCE GATES, PILLARS AND DRIVEWAY WALL 44  
CUMNOR HILL, OXFORD OX2 9HB

This item was dealt with at the reconvened meeting of the Committee held on 29 October 2008.

DC.132 DRA20146(2)DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING. ERECTION OF TWO  
3 BEDROOM SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING.  
(RESUBMISSION OF APPLICATION DRA/20146/1) (RETROSPECTIVE) 35  
SUTTON WICK LANE, DRAYTON, OX14 4HH..

Councillors Tony de Vere and Mary de Vere had each declared a personal interest in this matter and in accordance with Standing Order 34 remained in the room during its consideration.

Officers referred to the variety of house styles and sizes in this part of Drayton and showed photographs of the site. It was noted that 11 letters of objection had been received and that Drayton Parish Council objected to the development. It was noted that the letters raised a number of concerns, highlighted in the report. Officers commented that the concerns raised in respect of loss of privacy and overlooking had

been addressed by the fact that the side facing first floor windows in plot 1 were obscure glazed and the ground floor windows faced the blank flank wall. Officers commented that this led to the conclusion that there were no planning grounds on which to refuse the application in relation to the impact on neighbouring properties.

Councillor Jennifer Pooley of Drayton Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the builder of this property had flouted the original planning permission. She advised that this development was out of keeping with the surrounding area and made a mockery of the planning process. She stated that by permitting the building a message would be sent that the Parish and District Council Planning Committees could be ignored.

She raised the following concerns:-

- The development was overbearing and large
- The plans stated that the outside finish was to be brick and tile hung. The actual building was entirely brick, which was unattractive and detrimental to the area.
- The plans made reference to two glass conservatories at the rear. The actual building had brick built rooms to the rear.
- The area of land laid to concrete in front of the property was unattractive, particularly with the bollards near the pavement.

She concluded by urging the Committee to support the objections of the neighbours and the Parish Council.

Mr Adam Barak made a statement in objection to the application. He commented that the plans for what currently lay on site had never been approved. He stated that the Vale's planning officers had dismissed objections and considered the Officer's report to be inaccurate.

He stated that the design was too big for the plot, was out of character and the development had resulted in a loss of amenity to his property as the boundary fences were 1.5 metres from his house. He raised further concerns that the 40 degree rule had been broken, loss of light to number 37 Sutton Wick Lane and that the development had led to cars blocking the lane.

He strongly urged the Committee to refuse this application and order the building's demolition.

Mr Opindar Liddar made a statement on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He stated that the plans had been approved last year. He confirmed that materials had been approved and several conditions had been attached. He advised that the planning enforcement team had visited the site and concluded that it was fine.

The Development Control Manager explained that in this application planning permission had been granted in September 2007, however it subsequently came to light that the Ordnance Survey plan which had been used as part of the application was inaccurate in showing the relationship between the neighbouring properties and the development.

Some Members commented that they were sympathetic with the objectors, one Member stating that the bollards were particularly unattractive.

Some Members were of the view that there was no justification in planning terms to refuse the application. One Member questioned whether there had been a requirement that landscaping be carried out to the front of the property. It was confirmed that this could be required as part of the conditions.

By 11 votes in favour with 4 abstentions it was

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission be granted in respect of application DRA/2046(2) subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report and an additional condition requiring a landscaping treatment.*

DC.133 KBA20244(1) - APPLICATION FOR A DROPPED KERB WOODRUFF, FARINGDON ROAD, KINGSTON BAGPUIZE, OX13 5AQ.

This application was dealt with at the reconvened meeting of the Development Control Committee held on Wednesday 29 October 2008.

DC.134 SAH20411(1) DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING. ERECTION OF A 1 ½ STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE, 2 X 2 BED FLATS AND 2 X 1 BED FLATS WITH FORECOURT PARKING. 79 BESSELSLEIGH ROAD, WOOTTON, ABINGDON OX13 6DX

Officers referred the Committee to the report and the recommendations therein.

Julie Mansbridge spoke in objection to the application and raised the following concerns:

- The development was unneighbourly and its appearance was domineering.
- It would have a detrimental impact on the village scene.
- Loss of privacy
- Overlooking of her property through main living windows
- Inadequate parking provision for visitors would lead to traffic problems on the street.

She concluded by urging the Committee to refuse this application.

Tony Woods spoke as the applicant in support of the application. He stated that this proposal makes a contribution towards the affordable homes market. He commented that following negotiations with Vale's planning officers a previous similar scheme had been withdrawn. He stated that revisions had been made to the design and he considered that the current proposal in front of the Committee was acceptable.

Members commented that they were satisfied with the Officer's recommendations.

By 14 votes in favour and 1 abstention it was

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission be granted in respect of SAH/20411/1 subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report.*

DC.135 SAH20594 ERECTION OF A REAR EXTENSION WITH ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO ACCOMMODATE FIRST FLOOR LIVING ACCOMMODATION.17 LANDSDOWNE ROAD, DRY SANDFORD, ABINGDON, OXFORDSHIRE, OX14 2AE.

The Committee noted that St Helen Without Parish Council had raised objections on the grounds of overdevelopment and that no objections had been received from neighbours.

Mr Shevchenko made a statement as the applicant in support of the application. He stated that this property would sit well with others on Landsdowne Road and the proposed design layout was very similar to them. He commented that there were 19 houses on this Road, with either the same footprint as this house or with a larger footprint and therefore did not agree that the proposal amounted to overdevelopment.

One Member commented that none of the other properties were extended at the front.

By 13 votes in favour, with 2 against it was

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission in respect of application SAH/20594 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.136 CUM20624 ERECTION OF A DETACHED 2 STOREY DWELLING WITH 3 BEDROOMS. LAND ADJACENT TO TITHE BARN, HIGH STREET, CUMNOR, OX2 9PE

The Committee heard that this application involved construction in the Cumnor Conservation Area. Officers advised that the Committee must consider whether the development could be shown to preserve or enhance the established character or appearance of the conservation area. It was noted that there was a difference of opinion between the consultees, the Parish Council and the Vale's Conservation Officer objecting to the application and the County Engineer, Drainage Engineer, Arboricultural Officer and the Architect Panel raising no objections. The supportive comments of the Consultant Architect were noted.

Giles De la Mare made a statement in objection to the application. He raised concerns that the development would affect the conservation area adversely and result in the loss of an important local space. He commented that the proposed building would be

too close to the Tithe Barn, infringing the privacy of its garden and making access difficult. He stated that the design would clash stylistically with the conservation area and was unsuitable.

Keith Eddie made a statement in objection to the application. He stated that he was in support of the planning officer's recommendation to refuse the application and the comments of the Conservation Officer. He advised that he was a resident of High Street, Cumnor and stated that other residents of High Street had similar views.

Adrian James made a statement on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He stated that although the recommendations seemed clear cut, there was a debate to be had. He advised that the proposed building added interest to the conservation area and enriched it. He referred the Committee to the comments of the Consultant Architect that he considered the concept to be of the highest quality. He stated that he completely concurred with the views of the Consultant Architect and recommended that the Committee grant planning permission for the application.

One Member commented that he disagreed with the Conservation Officer's view and the recommendations of the Officers. He stated that he considered that the scheme would enhance the conservation area and that it would look terrific. He stated that he would therefore be voting against the officer recommendations.

Another Member stated that he had thought very carefully about this proposal and following a site visit he agreed with the views of the Consultant Architect, that it would enhance the conservation area.

Other Members were concerned with the close proximity of the application to the Tithe Barn.

By 6 votes in favour and 9 votes against the proposal to agree to the Officer's recommendations was not carried.

The Chair proposed that the application be approved, subject to attached conditions to come back to the next meeting of the Development Control Committee.

By 12 votes in favour and 3 against it was

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission be granted for application CUM/2064 subject to conditions which would come back to the next meeting of the Development Control Committee for agreement.*

DC.137 ABINGDON MARINA - APPLICATION TO MODIFY CLAUSE OF THE SECTION 106 PLANNING OBLIGATION

This application was dealt with at the reconvened meeting of the Development Control Committee held on Wednesday 29 October 2008.

DC.138 ABINGDON MARINA - APPLICATION TO MODIFY THE FOURTH SCHEDULE OF SECTION 106 PLANNING OBLIGATION



This application was dealt with at the reconvened meeting of the Development Control Committee held on Wednesday 29 October 2008.

DC.139      ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

It was noted that the portion of the report relating to Abingdon Marina would be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 10.30 pm