

DC.99

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON
ON MONDAY, 15TH OCTOBER, 2007 AT
6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Joyce Hutchinson for Councillor Jenny Hannaby; Councillor Bob Johnston for Councillor Tony de Vere; Councillor Zoe Patrick for Councillor Jerry Patterson and Councillor Chris Wise for Councillor Angela Lawrence.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Geraldine LeCointe, Carole Nicholl and George Reade.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 10

DC.145 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The attendance of Substitute Members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with apologies for absence having been received from Councillors Tony de Vere, Jenny Hannaby, Angela Lawrence and Jerry Patterson.

DC.146 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 3 September 2007 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.147 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Declarations of interest were declared in report 81/07 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Name of Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute ref</u>
Anthony Hayward	Personal and prejudicial	FYF/20181	He was the architect for the applicant	DC.161
All other Members of the	Personal	FYF/20181	In so far as Councillor Anthony Hayward, the Architect for the	DC.161

Committee			applicant, was known to them.	
Zoe Patrick	Personal	GRO/19162	She was acquainted with Mrs Green who used to live at the Station House and also she was a County Councillor and the County Council was the applicant.	DC.160
Chris Wise	Personal	GRO/19162	He was a County Councillor and the County Council was the applicant.	DC.160
Bob Johnston	Personal	GRO/19162	He was a County Councillor and the County Council was the applicant.	DC.160

At this point in the meeting the Head of Democratic Services explained the new procedures in place with regard to Councillors who had a personal and prejudicial but wished to address the Committee. She advised that in accordance with the Code of Conduct, such Members had the same rights as members of the public in that they could make a statement at the meeting, provided that they had given notice to the Proper Officer by 12.00noon on the preceding working day. However, having made any statement a Member with a personal and prejudicial interest would be required to leave the meeting room during the debate on the item. Members were advised to contact the Head of Democratic Officer should they require further advice on this matter.

DC.148 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. For the benefit of members of the public he explained that Officers were present to advise the Councillors who would consider the items on the agenda.

He reported that as Chair of the meeting, his role included summing up the debate before a vote was taken. He explained that in doing so he would not be seeking to sway the Committee into his way of thinking but to be impartial and conclude what he considered to be the main points of the discussion.

The Chair asked everyone present to ensure that their mobile telephones were switched off during the meeting.

DC.149 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

The Committee was advised that one member of the public had given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting as follows: -

Mr Geoff MacIntyre made a statement concerning report 83/07 – Tree Preservation Order (Abingdon) No.3 2007.

Mr MacIntyre reported that he had contacted the Council in August 2005 and had been informed that the Council was in discussion with Bloor Homes regarding the purchase of a plot of land. However, Bloor Homes had subsequently informed him that there had been no such negotiations. Mr MacIntyre was then offered the freehold of the land. Mr MacIntyre commented that the Council had had some 33 years in which to purchase the land, but had chosen not to do so.

Mr MacIntyre reported that his solicitor had carried out a registration of common land and town or village green requisition for an official search and this had been returned in October 2006 with no entries. The land was therefore not common land owned by the Council, as was thought to be the case by many people.

Mr MacIntyre advised that he had asked to remove some trees on the land adjacent to his property explaining to the Committee that the land was in his ownership. He referred to the comments of the Council's Landscape Officer (Arboriculture) that the trees provided a high degree of public amenity. He explained that he intended to plant trees all around the borders and he would erect a green metal fence one metre high. He commented that it was not his intention to remove all the trees only those nearest to his house because he considered that they were too close to his property and prevented any alteration to it.

Mr MacIntyre reported that he had enquired whether he could take down a couple of trees and this enquiry had led to the Tree Preservation Order being served. He commented that if he had not contacted the Council he would have been within his rights to remove the trees. He commented that any trees which would have been removed would have been replaced elsewhere on the site further away from his house near the footpath. He commented on the amount of time he spent clearing up rubbish and vandalised branches on his land. Furthermore, there were regularly groups of youths on the land and he therefore wished to enclose the plot. He commented that the reported stated that it was not the purpose of the Order to prevent development, but he found this difficult to believe.

Mr MacIntyre referred to the Council's leaflet "Developing Affordable Housing" explaining that he had been influenced by the text in it concerning "the Council in conjunction with you providing of affordable housing"; "the Council's priority of encouraging land owners and developers to provide affordable housing and interest in any local housing schemes"; and "the Council working towards providing affordable housing, helping to bring forward opportunities and being flexible and responsive to developers needs".

Finally, Mr MacIntyre reported that the Councils' Principal Legal Officer had confirmed in writing that he was the freehold owner of the land. The Tree Preservation Order had been issued after he had purchased the land.

The Chair thanked Mr MacIntyre for his statement advising that the Committee would have regard to it when considering report 83/07 later in the meeting.

DC.150 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.151 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

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

DC.152 MATERIALS

The Committee received and consider materials as follows: -

(1) ABG/1175/23 – Construction of 62 Dwellings, Former Crossroads Garage, Drayton Road, Abingdon

RESOLVED(nem com)

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

<i>Bricks</i>	-	<i>Hanson Madehurst Multi</i>
	-	<i>Terca Sienna Red</i>
	-	<i>Blockleys Marlow Red Multi</i>
<i>Render</i>	-	<i>Cream</i>
<i>Tiles</i>	-	<i>Redland Concrete Plain Smooth Red</i>
	-	<i>Redland Concrete Plain Farmhouse Red</i>
	-	<i>Redland Concrete Plain Old English Dark Red</i>
	-	<i>Eternit Fibre Cement Artificial Slates</i>

(2) ABG/19956 – Refurbishment and Alterations, Bury Street Precinct. Bury Street, Abingdon

RESOLVED(nem com)

that the use of the following materials be approved: -

<i>Render</i>	-	<i>Ivory, Mauve Clair and White</i>
<i>Rainscreen Cladding</i>	-	<i>Terracotta</i>
<i>Cornice</i>	-	<i>GRP in Ivory</i>
<i>Window Boxes</i>	-	<i>GRP in Grey</i>
<i>Sash Windows</i>	-	<i>Hardwood painted white</i>
<i>Other Window Frames</i>	-	<i>Iron Grey</i>

Metal Canopy Structure - Metallic Silver Finish
Glass for Canopy - Pilkington Self-Clean in OptiWhite
Benches - Steel with Oak Slats and Arms

- (3) ABG/1145/10 - New Store with Flats, Co-op, 5 – 11 West St Helen Street, Abingdon

RESOLVED(nem com)

- (a) *that the use of the following materials be approved: -*
Main brick - Michlemersch Hampshire Red Multi
Detail brick - Farnham Red Mixture
Render - Cream
- (b) *that the use of the following materials be refused: -*
Roof tiles - Rosemary Plain Clay Tiles

DC.153 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal in respect of Gabbits Copse, Kingston Lisle (SPA/1040/9) which had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.154 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

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

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.155 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (ABINGDON) NO 3 2007

The Committee received and considered report 83/07 of the Landscape Officer (Arboriculture) which advised that during April 2007 the Council had been contacted by Mr MacIntyre of 7 Nash Drive, Abingdon asking if he could remove some trees adjacent to his property. The Committee was advised of an amendment to the report in that the trees were on Mr MacIntyre's land and not adjacent to it.

The Committee was informed that the Landscape Officer had visited the site and had identified a group of Norway Maples on the grass area next to 4 Nash Drive that were easily visible from Nash Drive, Ely Close and Medicott Drive. In the Landscape Officer's view the trees provided a high degree of public

amenity and as the trees were under threat, a Tree Preservation Order had been issued to seek their protection.

The Committee noted that objections to the Tree Preservation Order had been received from Mr MacIntyre of 7 Nash Drive, Abingdon details of which were set out in the report.

Further to the report the Landscape Officer (Arboriculture) reported that he maintained that the trees formed a significant visual amenity to the area. He drew the Committee's attention to the objections raised by Mr MacIntyre commenting that the tree were fine trees and were early mature and as such would develop into something better. He considered that they were significantly important to this area. Finally, it was explained that the plot of land was an open space, albeit privately owned and there were others in the area where it was possible that there would be other trees in need of protection. He asked the Committee to confirm the Order.

In response to a question raised the Committee was advised that the ownership of the land was not a material issue in considering whether to confirm a Tree Preservation Order and the test was whether the trees were of public amenity.

The Officers commented that even if there were no trees on this area of open land, the land itself, even if privately owned, provided public amenity value.

In response to a further question raised regarding the prevention of development on open spaces of land, the Committee was advised that this was dependent on the designated of the land as open space.

In response to a further question raised, the Committee was advised that should it confirm the Order there was an appeal process which would be explained to Mr MacIntyre outside of the meeting.

One Member commented that it appeared to him that Mr MacIntyre had purchased the land with a view to developing it for his own purpose. It was noted that had he not contacted the Council Mr MacIntyre could have removed the trees without permission. However, as the Council was now aware that the trees were in danger of being felled it should use its powers to protect them.

One Member questioned whether it would be possible to allow the removal of some of the trees to enable Mr MacIntyre to develop the land. In response the Officers advised that any application from him for development would be considered in the usual way.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that Tree preservation Order (Abingdon) No.3 2007 be confirmed.

The Committee received and consider report 82/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which informed Members of nine resolved enforcement cases, and sought authority to remove them from the active enforcement list.

Each case was considered and the following comments specifically made: -

Two metre high fence adjacent to the highway at 22 Woodhill Drive, Grove, Wantage

One Member commented that it would be untimely for the Council to take enforcement action now and agreed that the item should be removed from the active enforcement list.

However, other Members expressed concern regarding the loss of openness on this estate and the perception given to the public that breaches of conditions were acceptable. Other Members agreed and considered that in not taking enforcement action other similar fences would be erected, which cumulatively would be harmful to the character and open appearance of the area.

One Member questioned why enforcement had been outstanding for 7 years to which the Officers responded that they would need to look into this and report back.

The Committee requested that a report be presented to a future meeting of the Committee relating to all outstanding enforcement cases where authorisation to take enforcement action was given prior to 1 April 2005.

Unauthorised works to the former Air Balloon Public House - 169 Ock Street, Abingdon

In response to a question raised the Officers reported that the contravention of the listed building consent was not considered sufficient to warrant a prosecution in this case.

RESOLVED

(a) *that no further action be taken in the following cases and they be removed from the active enforcement list: -*

- (1) *unauthorised UPVC Windows at 2-4 Ock Street, Abingdon, OX14 5AH, ABG/8129/11-LB;*
- (2) *unauthorised summerhouse/games room at 5 Norman Avenue, Abingdon, OX14 2HQ, ABG/19058/3-E;*
- (3) *unauthorised works to the former Air Balloon Public House (a Grade II Listed Building) at 169 Ock Street, Abingdon, OX14 5DW, ABG/4771/8-E;*

- (4) *unauthorised business use and compound in the domestic garden at 104 West Way, Botley, Oxford, Oxon, OX2 9JU, NHI/18265/1-E;*
 - (5) *unauthorised business use and compound in the domestic garden at 106 West Way, Botley, Oxford, Oxon, OX2 9JU, NHI/16911/4-E;*
 - (6) *unauthorised basement extension at Cubs Puddle, Millway Lane, Appleton, OX13 5LD, APT/16711/3-E;*
 - (7) *unauthorised window openings and a two storey garage/playroom tower at 10 Hids Copse Road, Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9JJ, CUM/18082/3-E.*
- (b) *that consideration of whether to take no further action be deferred in respect of the following cases pending a report on the policy and other implications in these cases should enforcement be pursued: -*
- (1) *2 metre high fence adjacent to the highway at 22 Woodhill Drive, Grove, Wantage, OX12 0DF, GRO/14616/2-E;*
 - (2) *2 metre high fence adjacent to the highway at 5 Collett Way, Grove, Wantage, OX12 0NT, GRO/8665/2-E*
- (proposed by Councillor Richard Farrell, seconded by Councillor Bob Johnston and agreed nem con)*
- (c) *that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be requested to report to the Committee on position of any enforcement cases outstanding since April 2005.*

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 81/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy). Planning applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.157 DRA/477/11 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS. ERECTION OF 4 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING. ERECTION OF DOUBLE GARAGE. THE GREEN, DRAYTON, ABINGDON, OX14 4JA

The Committee noted that the Parish Council had raised concern regarding the Red Line on the application drawings (which it was noted had now been corrected) and the use of the buildings as a work shop, although it was noted that this would be an ancillary use to the site.

It was noted that the local Member, Councillor Richard Webber had requested that the application be submitted to the Committee for determination.

Unfortunately Councillor Webber was unable to attend the meeting but had submitted comments which were read out in full. He particularly commented that the present owners of the site had no wish to put forward a proposal that would harm the village; the developers wished to develop the site in a way which enhanced the site; the site had been an “eyesore” in a prime location in the village for too long and the development would represent a substantial improvement; and the Committee should consider the removal of a number of mature poplar trees which had not been well maintained and were in a poor condition.

Councillor Webber had stated that a number of driveways to the new houses would be provided. The original `unofficial access` gate (pushed through onto the bridleway many years ago) which now gave the site access was to be replaced by access gates all along the bridleway. The owners of the new houses would regularly drive down the bridleway to access their driveways and visitors to the new houses would park at the side of the bridleway. As such, he considered that the bridleway would be a bridleway in name only. He commented that the developer’s advice was that the bridleway was also an “unmetalled” road. Councillor Webber asked that should the Committee be minded to approve the application a condition be added to any permission seeking to minimise, and where possible alleviate, the impact of the development on the bridleway.

Further to the report the Committee was advised that the County Rights of Way Officer had submitted comments which were summarised in full at the meeting. The County Rights of Way Officer had raised some concerns regarding a number of issues including that there should be no granite sets above ground level; concern regarding three bollards which might obstruct the use of the bridleway; no trees should be planted in the surface of the bridleway; and there should be no trees and plants on bridleway. To this end it was agreed that an informative should be added to any permission to address these concerns.

In response to a comment made regarding permeable materials, the Officers explained that the surface material of the road would need to be in keeping with the rural character of a bridleway and that tarmac would not be appropriate.

One Member commented that to maintain the character of the bridleway appropriate surface materials might include tightly rolled crushed stone or grasscrete, although he did not support the use of grasscrete. Another Member advised that hogging had different degrees of permeability and that it could be an appropriate material for a bridleway surface.

One Member expressed concern regarding the potential conflicts of use of the bridleway.

Another Member expressed concern regarding the installation of bollards and it was noted that the status of the bridleway was unknown.

By 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

RESOLVED

that application DRA/477/11 be approved subject to: -

- (1) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (2) an informative to require permeable surfaces.*
- (3) an informative regarding highway legislation advising that elements that block the highway can be removed.*

DC.158 MAR/3793/4 - CONSTRUCTION OF ROOF ON FORMER BARN TO FORM DOMESTIC STORE AND WORKSHOP. COTHILL FARM HOUSE, BLACKHORSE LANE, COTHILL, OX13 6JJ

The Committee was advised that the applicant could construct a shallow pitch roof, 4 metres in height without the benefit of planning permission. It was explained that the Officers did not consider this fall back position to be a concern. Members were asked to have regard to the proposal in terms of its impact on openness. Finally, it was explained that the application was presented to Committee at the request of the local Member Councillor Jane Hanna, who supported the application.

Mr Hoek the applicant made a statement in support of the application referring to the history of the site. He explained that the roof had been blown off during heavy storms and part of the walls had come down some 20 years ago. He explained that he had discussed the condition of the property at that time with the Planning Officers and had been left with the impression that he could rebuild the property to make it look like it used to without planning permission. Mr Hoek reported that he had been restoring the building over the last 14 years. However, the Planning Officer had visited the site in 2000 and had advised that planning permission was required. Mr Hoek explained that he wished to restore the building to its former glory and that he hoped to achieve a visually attractive building. He explained that a local architect had designed the roof at a pitch of 45 degrees, which was similar to other buildings in the area. He commented that there had always been a building on this site and that part of the original build could still be seen.

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

- The proposal would be an improvement on the current state of the building.
- The detailed plans shown at the meeting differed to those set out in the report and that the detailing around the windows and doors was welcomed.
- The proposal would sit well in the Green Belt.
- This was a genuine project of restoration and much care had gone into making the building attractive.

- The roof height would not be out of keeping with those of neighbouring buildings.

In response to a question raised the Officers reported that the roof would be slightly higher than the original gable.

In response to a further question raised the Officers reported that they were unable to provide details of the roof heights of neighbouring buildings elsewhere in the road, although the finished structure of the proposed building would be about 6 metres high.

One Member commented that clay tiles required a 45 degree pitched roof and it was questioned whether an amended proposal could be discussed with the applicant. However, the Officers advised that Members needed to consider the application on its merits as presented.

One Member referred to the history of the site noting that had the building been rebuilt at the time of the gales, the applicant would not have required planning permission. In response the Officers commented that the extent to which the building had become dilapidated at that time was uncertain. It was explained that if the building had been beyond reasonable repair it would have required being rebuilt and rebuilding works required planning permission.

In response to a question raised the Officer explained that the use of the building would be domestic store and workshop. One Member expressed concern that the building could be converted into additional accommodation. In response the Officers explained that any existing domestic outbuilding could be used for accommodation of that house.

It was commented that if there was a high pitch roof, accommodation could usually be made within that roof pitch. One Member suggested that a condition could be added to prevent this although the Officers questioned the reasoning behind this as the intention of Green Belt policy was usually to protect the openness of the Green Belt.

It was proposed by the Chair that application MAR/3793/4 be refused for the reason set out in the report. On being put to the vote this was lost by 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention.

One Member commented that materials for this proposal were crucial and he asked that careful consideration be given to them, notably the choice of clay tiles for the roof.

It was then proposed by Councillor Bob Johnston, seconded by Councillor Matthew Barber and by 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and / or Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the

Development Control Committee and the local Member, be delegated authority to approve application MAR/3973/4 subject to appropriate conditions.

DC.159 GFA/10178/2 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW. ERECTION OF 9 NO. 2 AND 3 BED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING. 49A BROMSGROVE, FARINGDON

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application an informative should be added to require permeable surfaces within the site.

Mr Best made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He referred to the lack of notice of consideration of the application at the Committee this evening due to the postal strike and explained that there were other people who objected to the proposal. He referred to the numbers of objected advising that residents were unaware of the need to repeat objections at each stage of the application. Mr Best particularly raised concern regarding access across a privately owned car park; traffic; car parking; accessibility for large vehicles including emergency and service vehicles; and lack of pedestrian walk way in Walnut Court and hence pedestrian safety.

The Officers clarified that the car park was a private car park and that right of access was a legal matter and not a material planning consideration.

One of the local Members spoke against the application raising concerns regarding the proposed waste collection arrangements. He commented that in agreeing this application residents would be excluded from a public service and that they should be entitled to a rebate on their Council Tax. He considered that a private arrangement was not a satisfactory solution. However, he commented that should the Committee be minded to approve the application the resurfacing of Walnut Court should be required and its adoption investigated.

Another local Member spoke in support of the application. Whilst accepting that the access into the site was tight there would be no overlooking and the proposal was acceptable. He considered that resurfacing Walnut Court would be beneficial and agreed that this should be sought.

In response to a question raised the Officers advised that if the waste collection service provided was not consider adequate enforcement action could be taken.

Some Members spoke against the application making the following comments:

-
- It was not desirable to build houses which could not access public services.
- A S106 Agreement did not seem a satisfactory way to secure a waste collection service. In response the Officers advised that the S106 Agreement would run with the land regardless of its ownership.
- There was concern regarding access and parking in Walnut Court.

- A speed hump was suggested to slow vehicles in view of concerns regarding pedestrian safety. The Officers emphasised that there had been no objection from the County Engineer.

Other Members spoke in support of the application commenting that any private waste collection service should include recycling waste.

By 10 votes to 3 with 2 abstentions 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 GFA/10178/2 subject to: -

- (1) consideration to traffic calming measures along the access to the site;*
- (2) a S106 Agreement to secure a suitable waste collection arrangements to include recycling;*
- (3) the conditions in the report; and*
- (4) an informative regarding permeable surfaces within the site.*

DC.160 GRO/19162 -FORMER RAILWAY STATION AT GROVE OX12 0DH

Councillors Zoe Patrick, Chris Wise and Bob Johnston had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Officers drew Members' attention to the report which advised that Grove Parish Council had not objected to the application but had made a number of details comments which were attached to the report. Furthermore, it was noted that the County Engineer had no objection subject to conditions.

The Committee was advised that the Environmental Health Officer had suggested that a condition should be added to require that a noise and light assessment be carried out.

One of the local Members welcomed the proposal commenting that this application should not be prejudiced having regard to what might or might not happen in the future in terms of development at Grove or in terms of any decisions made by the Strategic Rail Authority. It was explained that the intention was that this would be a local station.

Another local Member also supported this application and commented that this Council should positively welcome the proposal. In response, the Officers explained that the adopted Local Plan allocated an area of land beside the railway line north of Grove to ensure that no development would be permitted within it which would prejudice the re-opening of the Wantage Road Station at

Grove and also that the District Council would work with the County Council on proposals for its re-opening.

Other Members also supported this application commenting that public transport in this part of the Vale would be enhanced.

In response to a comment made, the Officers clarified that apart from means of access, all matters of detail were reserved for future consideration at the reserved matters stage. Furthermore, in terms of the adequacy of the proposed level of parking, the Committee noted that the County Engineer had no objection and was aware of the proposed development at Grove.

One Member advised that Network Rail had taken over from Rail Track. He welcomed the proposal commenting that new track and link systems would be needed. He commented that if an adequate service was to be provided for Grove, any track and system proposals would need to be substantial.

One Member whilst welcoming the proposal expressed some concern regarding the comments of the Regional Planning Manager as set out in Appendix 4 to the report in terms of unaffordable costs to promoters. He suggested that this issue needed to be resolved.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application GRO/19162 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.161 FYF/20181 - ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION. 17 ST
JOHNS CLOSE, FYFIELD, ABINGDON OX13 5LP

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

All other Members of the Committee had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee noted that the application had been amended to reduce the depth of the proposed two storey rear extension, the omission of a first floor bedroom window and to provide obscure glazing of the en-suite roof light window.

The local Member raised no objection to the application commenting that the proposal would be in keeping with the area.

By 14 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application FYF/20181 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.162 UPT/20226-X - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW. ERECTION OF 2 CHALET BUNGALOWS. HITHERTO, CHURCH STREET, UPTON, OX11 9JB

The Committee noted that the Parish Council had objected to the application raising concerns that the chalet bungalows were excessive in both area and height for the plot size and were not in keeping with this part of the village being immediately opposite an 11th century church and old school. Furthermore the Parish Council had commented that an additional entrance on what was a narrow and largely pedestrian road was undesirable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the illustrative drawings and it was explained that the Officers considered that two chalet bungalows would be acceptable. Furthermore, it was highlighted that the County Engineer had no objection if the proposal was amended to a single shared access subject to conditions.

The local Member noted the commented of the Parish Council but disagreed with its view. He explained that this was an outline application and therefore only the concept of development was being considered and not the detail. He noted that the design layout and other matters would come back at a later stage. He advised the Committee that the site was not immediately opposite an 11th century church and old school and that there were other properties by the church. Finally, he commented that he could see no material planning reason to refuse the application.

Other Members supported the view of the local Member agreeing that the proposal was acceptable.

One Member raised some concern regarding all matters coming back and suggested that the applicant should be informed that the Committee considered that chalet bungalows on this plot would be acceptable. To this end it was agreed that an informative should be added to any permission advising that any proposal more than chalet bungalows might have an adverse impact in this location.

By 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

RESOLVED

that application UPT/20226-X be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and an informative to advise that any proposal more than chalet bungalows might have an adverse impact in this location.

None.

The meeting rose at 9.30 pm