

DC.254

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON
ON MONDAY, 21ST APRIL, 2008 AT
6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

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

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Pat Lonergan for Councillor Tony de Vere, Councillor Laurel Symons for Councillor Terry Quinlan and Councillor Chris Wise for Councillor Sue Marchant.

NON MEMBERS: Councillors Yvonne Constance and Alison Thomson.

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

OFFICERS: Grant Audley-Miller, Sarah Commins, Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Carole Nicholl, Emma Parkes and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 120 approx.

DC.325 **NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The attendance of Substitute Members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with apologies having been received from Councillors Tony de Vere, Sue Marchant and Terry Quinlan.

DC.326 **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 February 2008 were adopted and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendments: -

(1) **Minute DC.274 – Declarations of Interest**

In table delete “Councillor Richard Farrell declared a personal in applications SUT/20316 and SUT/20330 in that he knew the owners of neighbouring properties (DC.288 and DC.289) and replace with “Councillor Richard Farrell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application SUT/20316 in so far as he knew one of the objectors”.

(2) **Minute DC.288 – SUT/20316**

The insertion of the words under the heading “Councillor Richard Farrell 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.”

(3) Minute DC. 289 – SUT/20330

The deletion of the words “Councillors Margaret Turner and Richard Farrell had each declared a personal interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration” and the substitution thereof with the words “Councillor Margaret Turner had declared a personal interest in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration”.

DC.327 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in report 188/07 as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Jenny Hannaby	Personal	Item 13 - WAN/10044/3	In so far as she was a Member of the Town Council which had commented on the application. She explained that she had been present at the meeting to hear the debate but that she had taken no part in the deliberations on the matter.	DC.337
Jerry Patterson	Personal	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	In so far as he was acquainted with the applicant.	DC.338
Pat Lonergan	Personal and Prejudicial	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	In so far as he was a Member of the Town Council and had previously taken part in considering the application.	DC.338
Laurel Symons	Personal	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	In so far as she knew the applicant.	DC.338
Angela Lawrence	Personal	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	In so far as she was a Member of the Town Council which had commented on the application. However, she explained that she had not taken part in any deliberations on the application.	DC.338

Matthew Barber	Personal	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	In so far as he was acquainted with the applicant.	DC.338
Terry Cox	Personal	Item 14 - ABG/10612/17	He so far as he knew the applicant.	DC.338
Roger Cox	Personal	Item 15 – GFA/12807/10 and GFA/12807/1-LB	In so far as he was a Member of the Town Council which had commented on the application. However, he explained that he had not taken part in any deliberations on the application.	DC.339
Roger Cox	Personal	Item 16 - RAD/15745/2 - T	He so far as he was acquainted with the Member of the Town Council who spoke at the meeting.	DC.340
Terry Cox	Personal	Item 16 - RAD/15745/2 - T	In so far as the representative of the Town Council was known to him.	DC.340
Matthew Barber	Personal and Prejudicial	Item 16 - RAD/15745/2 – T	In so far as he was closely acquainted with one of the objectors.	DC.340
Pat Lonergan	Personal	Item 16 - RAD/15745/2 – T	In so far as he was acquainted with one of the speakers.	DC.340
Jerry Patterson	Personal	Item 18 – CUM/19155/2	In so far as he was acquainted with the architect.	DC.342
Roger Cox	Personal	Item 19 – GFA/19425/2	In so far as he was a Member of the Town Council which had commented on the application. However, he explained that he had not taken part in any deliberations on the application.	DC.343
Alison Thomson	Personal	Item 20 – GFA/19649/2-D	In so far as she was acquainted with some of the objectors.	DC.344
Roger Cox	Personal	Item 20 – GFA/19649/2-D	In so far as he was a Member of the Town Council which had commented on the application. However, he explained that he had not taken part in any deliberations on the application.	DC.344

Matthew Barber	Personal	Item 20 – GFA/19649/2-D	In so far as he was acquainted with some of the objectors.	DC.344
Chris Wise	Personal	Item 23 – WTT/20222/1	In so far as he was a Member of the Wootton Parish Council which had commented on the application. However, he explained that he had not taken part in any deliberations on the application.	DC.347
Val Shaw	Personal and Prejudicial	Item 23 – WTT/20222/1	In so far as she was acquainted with the agent.	DC.347

DC.328 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair asked everyone present to ensure that their mobile telephones were switched off during the meeting. Furthermore, he asked everyone to listen to the debate in silence.

The Chair pointed out the emergency exits.

The Chair reported that for the benefit of members of the public that only Members of the Committee could vote at the meeting. He clarified that Officers were present to give advice. He reported that the procedure at the meeting was set out in explanatory leaflets available at the meeting.

Finally, the Chair announced that he had suffered a stroke some time ago and that he occasionally found it difficult to express some words.

DC.329 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

Mrs Wright had given notice that she wished to make a statement under this Standing Order regarding the Enforcement Report. However she was not present at this point in the meeting.

DC.330 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.331 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 23 members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak. However, one member of the public declined to do so.

DC.332 MATERIALS

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

LRE/957/66 – Village Care Centre, Letcombe Regis

By 13 votes to 2 it was

RESOLVED

that the following materials be approved: -

1. *Facing Brick Typical – Terra Baggeridge Witton Multi Stock*
2. *Feature Brick – Ibstock Mayfield Multi Stock*
3. *Mortar Colour Typical – Remix Medium Yellow Mortar*
4. *St Catherines “Knapped Flint” Blocks*
5. *Horizontal Feather Edge Timber Boarding – Colour Ebony*
6. *Eternit Machine Made “Smooth Brindle” Clay Roof Tile – VCC, Blues Omitted*
7. *Eternit Handmade “Ashdowne Aylsham” Clay Tile*
8. *Eternit Machine Made Natural Orange Clay Roof Tile – ILUs Roof Typical*
9. *Self- coloured render in “Grey Stone” by Prorend*

DC.333 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal which had been dismissed in respect of application SUT/14050/11 – X.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.334 CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS

The Committee received and considered report 189/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which outlined the work that had been carried out to review conservation areas at Northcourt in Abingdon, East Hendred and Wytham. The report outlined the consultation process and methodology for the three appraisals, responded to the comments received and recommended the adoption of the appraisal documents and the extensions to the boundaries of all three areas. The future programme of work was also set out.

At this point in the meeting the Officers expressed their thanks for the support given to Sally Straddling the Conservation Area Appraisal Project Officer.

Further to the report, it was noted that an additional paper regarding the East Hendred Appraisal was circulated at meeting.

Members thanked the Officers for their work noting that the appraisals had been considered in detail by the Structure and Local Plan Advisory Group.

Another Member commented that he recognised the amount of work which had been undertaken by the Officers in carrying out the three appraisals. He suggested that there was potentially a need to review many more which he commented would take a long time and require significant resources. Notwithstanding this he considered that it would be beneficial to carry out other appraisals,

One Member asked that it be recorded in the minutes that to review the whole of the Vale would be an onerous task but it was thought that Officers should do their utmost to adequately appraise all areas.

By 14 votes to nil, with 1 of the voting Members having not yet arrived at the meeting it was

RESOLVED

- (a) *that the steps that have been taken to involve the community in the appraisals of the Northcourt in Abingdon, East Hendred and Wytham Conservation Areas be noted and that it be confirmed that for future appraisals these steps are appropriate for involving communities;*
- (b) *that the responses which have been made to the appraisals in the Northcourt in Abingdon, East Hendred and Wytham Conservation Areas as set out in Appendix 1 to report 189/07 be noted and the officers' observations and recommendations be agreed;*
- (c) *that the Executive be asked to recommend to Council the adoption of the Conservation Area Appraisals for Northcourt in Abingdon, East Hendred and Wytham as set out in Appendix 2 to report 189/07 and agreed to extend the Conservation Areas as set out in Map 4 of the Northcourt appraisal, Map 4 of the East Hendred appraisal and Map 4 of the Wytham appraisal;*
- (d) *that the current programme of conservation area appraisals for Cumnor, Bourton and Sutton Courtenay be noted.*

DC.335 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered details of forthcoming public inquiries and hearing.

RESOLVED

that the report be received.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered part of report 190/07 detailing planning applications the decisions of which are recorded below. Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

Due to the lateness of the hour the meeting of the Committee adjourned and therefore the remained of report 190/07 was considered at the reconvened meeting. See Minutes of the reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.336 WHA/4310(9) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW GRAIN STORE, CONSTRUCTION OF HARDSTANDING FOR MANOEUVRING, AND REVISED ACCESS POSITION ON THE HANNEY – DENCHWORTH ROAD, LAND AT PRIORS COURT FARM, WEST HANNEY

Further to the report, the Officers reported receipt of additional comments from Charney Bassett Parish Council reiterating previous objections concerning traffic to the barn; access; traffic through the village; damage to the river Ock bridge; the need to explore traffic implications further and the non acceptance of the County Council's comments regarding lack of impact on the village.

The comments of the County Engineer as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the report were highlighted and it was considered that notwithstanding those comments a condition should be added to any permission granted to restrict the use of the barn for agriculture for the existing holding or to land within the immediate vicinity of the barn.

Mr Day made a statement on behalf of West Hanney Parish Council commenting that there were no objection to a drier and a grain store. However there were objections regarding the building on the northwest boundary of the farm holding. He suggested that the building should be further north on the other side of the site nearer the farm roads. He raised concern regarding poor road access; parking in villages; lack of footpaths; access roads in terms of weight restrictions, roads with bridges with structural faults, width restrictions and roads being unsuitable for hgv's; lack of restriction on hgvs which were not suitable for this area; unsightly building; the need for any landscaping to include semi mature trees and not oaks and the need for agricultural movements to be via farm roads. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Mr H Venners the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application. He commended the officers' report commenting that none of the issues raised by the objectors were relevant. He stated that policies were in place which supported this proposal and that there was a need for farm buildings and replacement buildings for food storage. He stated that this building would not lead to greater traffic generation and that the store would allow the storage of the summer peak of grain which would be dissipated throughout the year. He reported that the central site was out of the way and that there would be screening. Finally, he commented that the Parish Council had made comments regarding the electric undergrade and he reported that this would be addressed.

One Member commented that the previous permission had been subject to a routing agreement and there was no evidence to suggest that this was no longer needed it being noted that there were still old bridges with structural faults; roads still had weight restrictions and were narrow and there were still concerns regarding traffic in the village. The Officers advised that this was a subjective issue for the Committee to consider.

Other Members noted the comments of the County Engineer who was the professional advisor in these matters and agreed that a routing agreement was not necessary.

One Member reported that the Parish Council was seeking a weight restriction on the bridge crossing the river Ock and therefore there would be a need for a routing agreement should this be approved.

It was proposed by Councillor Terry Cox, seconded by Councillor Matthew Barber and by 12 votes to 2 with 1 of the voting Members not having yet arrived at the meeting

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be delegated authority to approve application WHA/4310/9 subject to: -

- (1) prior to the commencement of development the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure a routing agreement;*
- (2) the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.337 WAN10044(3) REMOVAL OF CONDITION 10 OF PLANNING PERMISSION
WAN/10044/2 FORMER OAKES BROS SITE, GROVE ROAD, WANTAGE, OXON
OX14 7AA

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.338 ABG/10612/17 – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DOUBLE GARAGE AND
ERECTION OF A 4 BED BUNGALOW WITH INTEGRAL CAR PORT. ERECTION OF
NEW DOUBLE GARAGE FOR LONGWALL HOUSE (LAND ADJACENT TO
LONGWALL HOUSE) OX14 1PN

Councillors Matthew Barber, Terry Cox, Angela Lawrence, Jerry Patterson and Laurel Symons had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

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

Mr R Brockbank made a statement objecting to the application commenting that he was please to see the Northcourt Conservation Area Appraisal advising that there was a need to preserve quite open garden space and protect the lane. He raised concerns regarding the proposal being contrary to policies; the direct affect of the proposal; over development; road safety; only notional traffic calming measures; the importance of neighbouring houses; loss of trees; adverse impact on the quiet lane; noise; parking; loss of rural character and the ineffectiveness of a Grampian condition. He suggested that the Committee was correct to refuse the application in 2005 and he stated that as nothing had changed the Committee should refuse this application.

Mr Impney the applicant made a statement in support of the application commenting that he had sent papers to Councillors outside of the meeting addressing the concerns in the Inspector's report. He referred to the report commenting that he would welcome any suggestions to stop the narrowing of the road. He commented that he would minimise disturbance as much as possible and that infilling was normal. He expressed his vexation at the comments from the neighbour commenting that the neighbour had given an undertaking not to object to development. He explained that the neighbour had removed an old yew tree and that maintenance was required to other trees. Finally he explained that the landscaping scheme would be beneficial.

The local Members, joined with other Members made the following comments in support of the application: -

- The bungalow would be tucked away out of sight and would have no adverse impact on the visual appearance of the area.
- The trees would be preserved.
- Passers by would not be adversely affected by the proposal.
- There would be no harm caused as the proposal would be not be visible from any public view points.
- Development in a Conservation Area could be allowed where there was no harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, in this case it was unclear what the harm would be. Members' attention was drawn to paragraph 14 of the report and Officers explained that the issue of spaciousness had not been overcome.

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

- The Conservation Area should be preserved.
- The Inspector talked of the "silvan nature" of this wooded site and there was a need to protect the trees.
- It was not agreed that the proposal would be totally hidden from public view behind the wall.
- There was concern regarding traffic.
- The suggestion of a Grampian condition was noted and concern was expressed that this was not being considered particularly in the light of the Inspector's comments. The Officers drew the Committees attention to paragraph 5.6 of the report explaining that it was unlikely that these conditions would be allowed in isolation. It was considered that the County Engineers comments regarding a Grampian condition were not encouraging.
- Approval of the application would set a precedent and that cumulatively similar proposals would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.

By 8 votes to 4 with 2 abstentions it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/10612/17 be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

DC.339 GFA/12807(10 & 11)- REPORT AMENDMENT TO APPLICATIONS GFA/12807/8 AND GFA/12807/9-LB TO CREATE TWO ADDITIONAL SELF-CONTAINED ONE BEDROOM FLATS. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING LEAN-TO EXTENSION. ERECTION OF NEW EXTENSION TO REAR OF COURTYARD, AND PROVISION OF CYCLE STORAGE, PORTWELL HOUSE, 27 MARKET PLACE, FARINGDON, SN7 7HU

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.340 RAD/15745(2T) RWE NPOWER TEMPORARY CHANGE OF USE FROM SINGLE DWELLING TO ACCOMMODATE SECURITY AND SITE SUPERVISION PERSONNEL UNTIL 31 MARCH 2009. SANDLES, THRUPP LANE, RADLEY OX14 3NG.

Councillors Roger Cox, Terry Cox and Pat Lonergan had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Matthew Barber 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.

Jenny Standen made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application. She explained that when RWEpower had applied to the County Council in 2004 for permission to use Thurpp Lake for ash disposal, the use of Sandels had been specified for a caretaker. She reported that the property had originally been designed and approved as a club house, which had indicated only intermittent use. However, she reported that it had subsequently become a home accommodating an average size family but since February 2007, Sandels had housed a large number of security guards all the time. Mrs Standen noted the applicant's comments regarding dealing with foul sewage and she asked the Committee whether it was satisfied with the proposed number of occupants of the property; the capacity of the septic tank; the frequency of the emptying of the septic tank; the level of risk to public health from overflow and the level of risk of overflow causing severe damage to the ecology of the lake. She commented that now RWEpower had deferred plans to use the lake for ash disposal the risk of overflow was particularly important in view of the need to protect wildlife. She reported that the Parish Council was also concerned regarding the state of the property. She urged the Committee to refuse the application unless Members were satisfied as to the points she had raised. Finally, she commented that should the Committee be minded to approve the application a condition should be added to provide that no temporary structures, such as portacabins be constructed within the cartilage without further express permission being sought.

Some Members spoke in support of the application noting that there was no evidence to suggest that any sewage was overflowing or that there would be health concerns arising from this application. With reference to the number of occupants of the property, it was noted that this was a matter which could be dealt with under other legislation and was not a material planning consideration.

In response to the request for an additional condition, the Officers explained that conditions regarding maintenance and preventing other buildings or structure on site were proposed.

By 13 votes to nil with 1 abstention it was

RESOLVED

that application RAD/15745/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.341 CUM/16152(1)DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING. OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CREATING 13 UNITS.119 CUMNOR HILL, OXFORD, OX2 9JA.

Further to the report, it was noted that the Environment Agency had objected raising concerns regarding the foul water proposing a risk and also to the culverting of the water course which it was considered could increase the risk of flooding resulting in the destroying of wildlife habitats.

The Officers quoted from Planning Policy Guidance 14 in response to comments made regarding unstable land, the points to consider and the developer's liability in this regard. It was suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application an informative could be added to any permission setting out the requirements.

Mr Philip Hawtin made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly raised concerns regarding adverse impact on the character of the area in terms of density and design resulting in overlooking, adverse visual impact, and the design being out of character and keeping; surface water and foul effluent drainage it being noted by the County Council that drainage from this site contributed directly to the routine flooding in Eynsham Road, the management of surface water run off was not clear in the application, there were concerns by Thames Water regarding the capacity of the foul water drainage system and the lack of an agreed long term drainage strategy; and access and parking, it being noted that the track was steep and narrow with poor visibility.

Jill Turner made a statement objecting to the applications raising concerns regarding the speed of water flow in the stream; the slope of the site; the positioning of flats against the stream; the lack of trees on one side of the stream; the lack of a hedge and there being inadequate space to plant one; the possibility of the river bank becoming destabilised and the risk of flooding; damage to property; adverse impact of the amenity of neighbouring properties; impact of the wild life habitat; mud and land slides; the proposal being dominating; traffic; vehicle manoeuvring and pollution.

Mr Ross also made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding heights; slab levels; adverse impact; loss of amenity; inaccurate drawings; lack of trees and harm to existing trees and land instability.

Mr J Philcox the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that there had been extensive pre-application discussions. He reported that there had been a full topographic survey. He explained that as part of the discussions the applicant had been kept updated on the Thames Water report which was still awaited. However with regard to flood risk, the applicant had engaged a specialist to provide advice who had reported that there were no problems or causes for concern identified. He reported that a satisfactory solution could be made to address water drainage. He reported that the applicant was willing to make a financial contribution towards the Section 106 unilateral undertaken which it was noted was a reason for refusal. He commented that the layout was indicative but was based on the advice of the structural engineer and that there was no evidence of land slippage on site. He commented that these issues could be considered at the detailed design stage. Finally, he asked the Committee to look on the principle of development favourably.

One of the local Members commented that he had no objection to the principle of development but he was concerned regarding the scale of the proposal and the civil engineering works. He commented that this was a "difficult" site and that it was necessary to know the detail of the proposal at the outset in view of this as the number of units and the extent of the development was critical. He referred to the slope of the site and commented that the eaves line shown for some of the dwellings would be the same height as the back of the quarry and that in his view this would lead to adverse impact on amenity through loss of light. He noted that the proposal included indicative drawings only but he had concerns regarding how much development could be accommodated on the site. Finally, he suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application an informative should be added regarding the stability of the site .

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

- There were known drainage problems in this area and this proposal would add to those.
- The access to the site would be difficult.
- The number of units whilst indicative only, was considered excessive for this site.
- Members were not convinced that the development as illustrated could be built having regard to the short distances between walls and given that it was a very steep quarry site with a steep access.
- There was concern regarding the stability of the site.

Members considered that the application should be refused for the reasons set out in the report plus an additional reason specifying that due to the lack of information provided there was doubt that 13 units could be accommodated on the site.

Furthermore, it was suggested that an informative be added to the reasons for refusal regarding the need to require a slope stability report to accompany any resubmission.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) be delegated authority in consultation with the Chair / Vice-Chair and Opposition Spokesman of the Development Control Committee to refuse application CUM/16152/1 subject to: -

- (1) the reasons set out in the report;*
- (2) an additional reason specifying that due to the lack of information provided there is doubt that 13 units can be accommodated on the site; and*
- (3) an informative regarding the need to require a slope stability report.*

DC.342 CUM/19155(2)- DEMOLITION OF EXISTING REAR EXTENSION. LOFT CONVERSION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAR, SIDE AND FRONT EXTENSION TO FORM ADDITIONAL HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION AND DOUBLE GARAGE. CONVERT EXISTING GARAGE STRUCTURE TO FORM DINING ROOM WITH NEW ROOF.44 CUMNOR HILL, OXFORD, OX2 9HB.

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.

Further to the report, the Officers advised of the receipt of amended plans showing a 0.7metre reduction in the height of the gable. Furthermore, it was noted that the applicant had emailed all Members of the Committee in support of the application.

Mr E Griffith made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. In particular, he raised concerns regarding the photographs shown at the meeting being misleading; the inadequacy of screening in terms of lack of leaves on trees for most of the year; the view of the house for most of the year from the neighbouring garden; the design being inappropriate as the area consisted mostly of modest houses on plots; the steep drive onto a busy road; the ground sloping from east to west on the site; height; proximity in that the extension would be only 5 m from the common boundary; loss of outlook; loss of light; overlooking; bulk and over dominance; the proposal being contrary to policy and over shadowing. He commented that the soil was of a clay nature with most of the garden area being boggy already. He added that any run off would be into his garden.

One of the local Members questioned whether an additional condition was required regarding drainage. However, the Officers advised that Thames Water had no objection to this house extension and there was no requirement to have an additional condition as the water drainage would be no different.

The local Member commented that whilst there would be impact in terms of overlooking and the design could be better, there were no grounds to refuse the application.

One Member whilst understanding the concerns regarding the extension asked the Committee to have regard to the elevations. He pointed out that this was a steep part of Cumnor Hill, but there were buildings on the other side of the road which were even

higher. He commented that the pitches sloped away and the balconies were set well back. He advised that he could see no reason to refuse the application.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application CUM/19155/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.343 GFA/19425/2 – PROPOSED ERECTION OF A REPLACEMENT SET OF GATES AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT, 26 COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON, SN7 7EZ

Councillor Roger Cox had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application an additional condition should be added to require that the Council's Arboriculture Officer should be present during the excavation works on site which should be hand dug to protect the trees.

The Officers reported that concerns had been raised regarding a gated community and it was noted that the applicant had stated that the gate would be operated by a key fob and that there would be access for visitors as the gates would not be locked. It was explained that the gate was to define the private road.

Mr I Fletcher, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that there was a similar gate at this site; there would be no loss of amenity; tree roots would be protected; the intention of the gated access was to define the extent of the development; there would be an unlocked public pedestrian access; the proposal would prevent crime.

One of the local Member raised concern regarding the gates commenting that Faringdon was an ancient open town and that there was no need for them. He commented that there had been no reported crime in this area and he could not recall gates in this location. He commented that the proposal was out of keeping and that the gates would result in traffic congestion. He explained that he was aware that there had been traffic accidents in this area.

Another local Member commented that he could see no reason to refuse the application.

Another local Member commented that the Town Council was opposed to the gating as there were concerns regarding traffic congestions.

Some Members spoke in support of the application noting that there were gated developments

In response to a question raised, the Officers reported that access for emergency services was a matter for the applicant to sort out and was not a planning consideration.

Some Members spoke against the application considering that gated developments were not appropriate. Reference was made to residents and visitors which needed assistance such as the elderly or disabled and it was considered that the gated access would disadvantage these people.

By 8 votes to 7 it was

RESOLVED

that application GFA/19425/2 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.344 GFA/19649/2-D – COTSWOLD GATE RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH NEW ACCESS, LAND ADJOINING COXWELL HOUSE AND WINSLOW HOUSE, COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON SN7 7EG.

Councillor Matthew Barber, Roger Cox and Alison Thomson had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee was advised that the applicant was willing to address concerns raised regarding additional on-street parking, but could not agree because it would lead to a loss of open space which would be in conflict with the amount of public open space specified in the outline planning permission. Moreover, removal of the passageways would prevent the scheme receiving accreditation under the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Dr Mike Wise made a statement on behalf of the Town Council raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly raised concerns regarding screening of the site; 3 storey dwellings on the ridge; visual impact; the contrast of development; the proposal being out of keeping; lack of consideration given to the wind in this area; pedestrian safety; traffic congestion; parking; vehicle manoeuvring; the access being dangerous; traffic speed; sewage disposal; low water pressure; over development of the site; the proposal being out of keeping with the character of the area and the standard of the houses being built in terms of design and quality. Finally, he commented that the Town Council was not against the principle of development but this proposal was unacceptable.

Mr D Belcher made a statement objecting to the application on behalf of the residents of Tollington Court and Carters Crescent reiterating concerns previously raised as set out in the report. He particularly referred to concerns regarding impact; the need to change the orientation of the layout; the height and adverse impact of the 3 storey dwellings; over looking; loss of privacy; footpaths and pedestrian safety; layout; orientation; lack of sufficient consideration of concerns raised. He commented that he had contacted his MP about the application and Ed Vaizey had visited the site and

had agreed that there would be over looking and over shadowing. Mr Belcher raised further concerns regarding the devaluation of existing houses and suggested that the proposal should be re-orientated on the site.

The local Members spoke against the application making the following comments: -

- It was not agreed that this was the type of development the Planning Inspector had envisaged for this site.
- Analogies with Radcot Road were not accepted.
- The three storey buildings were too high.
- If Members were minded to approve the application the first floor changing room window on plot 30 should be obscure glazed.
- The developer did not appear willing to address concerns raised.
- The passage ways were inappropriate.
- There would be closed boarded fences along Carters Crescent to separate gardens from the passageway and this would be harmful.
- There was inadequate parking.
- Shared surfaces was unacceptable in a development of this size.
- The height of the dwellings would be out of keeping.
- There would be a lack of screening.
- There was concerns regarding traffic speed and the need for traffic calming measures.
- There would be loss of privacy to the residents of Tollington Court.
- The design was unacceptable.
- There were concerns regarding safety.

The Officers clarified that the access had already been approved under a previous planning permission and that the principle of up to 50 dwellings had been agreed. It was noted that the number of dwellings was a guideline only and that the County Engineer had raised no objection.

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

- The consultant architect had raised no objection to the scheme.
- The shared surfaces and parking were supported by the County Engineer
- The three storey element was acceptable for modern developments.
- The Crime prevention Design Advisor had no objection to the rear passageways.

By 8 votes to 5 it was

RESOLVED

that application GFA/19649/2 – D be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.345 ASH/19908/3 – ERECTION OF A SINGLE DWELLING, SINGLE GARAGE AND RE-USE EXISTING ACCESS (RE-SUBMISSION), LAND ADJOINING TILLING, BERRYCROFT, ASHBURY, SN6 8LX

Further to the report, the Officers advised that the Drainage Engineer had reiterated his comments on the most recent application and had asked for details of surface water treatment.

Ms T Rousell made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She particularly raised concern regarding size and impact; length and height; harmful impact on the adjacent cottage; the proposal being similar in scale and size to the refused application; whilst the ridge line appeared reduced it had increased to the south which would impact on the neighbouring property; proximity; the house filling the separation gap near the listed building; loss of amenity; vehicles and construction traffic into the site; vehicle manoeuvring; access; the narrowness of the lane, the poor state of repair of the lane; the increased risk of flooding it being noted that there had been flooding in the past; materials not being in keeping with cottages and overlooking.

Mr A D Lord, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that planning permission already existed; the cottage had been relocated on the site; there would be improved living space; a single garage was to be provided; the roof would be split; the proposal was lower and the design was in keeping; the cottage would be dug into the site and would be as low as possible; regard would be taken to slab levels; the upper floor would be partly within the roof space; the plot was a good size and the proposal was acceptable.

One of the local Members referred to the history of development on the site expressing concern regarding the proposal in terms of size; height; length; ground levels; impact on the setting of the listed building; adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the harmful impact on the amenity of neighbours.

Members noted that the application had been previously refused and considered that the reasons for refusal at that time had not been overcome with the current proposal.

The Officers explained that the principle change was that the current proposal moved the two storey massing away from the listed building.

Members noted this but did not agree that this addressed the concerns raised, particularly regarding overlooking.

It was proposed by the Chair that application ASH/19908/3 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report. On being put, this was lost by 11 votes to 4.

It was thereupon proposed by Councillor Terry Cox, seconded by Councillor Matthew Barber and by 11 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions it was

RESOLVED

that application ASH/19908/3 be refused with the reasons for refusal to be formally endorsed at a future meeting of the Committee such reasons to include the harmful impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the Listed Building and the adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours.

DC.346 WAN/20127/1 – ERECTION OF 5 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS TO THE ACCESS AND CAR PORTS 1 EBLANDS COTTAGE, CHALLOW ROAD, WANTAGE, OX12 9DW.

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.347 WTT/20222 1 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SIDE EXTENSION AT 12 ST PETERS CLOSE AND FOR THE ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY TWO BEDROOM DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT PORCH TO EXISTING DWELLING LAND ADJACENT TO 12, ST PETERS CLOSE, WOOTTON, ABINGDON. OX13 6LD

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.348 HAT/20322 ERECTION OF OFFICE, TACK ROOM, STORE, STORAGE BARN AND TEMPORARY DWELLING (RETROSPECTIVE) AND CHANGE OF USE OF LAND TO EQUESTRIAN, GREY FOX STABLES, HATFORD, FARINGDON SN7 8JE

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.349 KBA/20349 CONSTRUCTION OF THREE DWELLINGS. WEST HAYES, FARINGDON ROAD, SOUTHMOOR, OX13 5BH.

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.350 SUT/20422 GARDEN ROOM WITH ATTACHED GARDEN STORE. (RETROSPECTIVE) THE NOOK, CHURCHMERE ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY, OX14 4AQ

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.351 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

This item was considered in the reconvened part of the meeting. See minutes of reconvened meeting held on 24 April 2008.

DC.352 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

Having regard to the lateness of the hour, it was proposed by the Chair and

RESOLVED

that the meeting of the Committee do adjourn until Thursday 24 April 2008 at 6.30pm in the Guildhall, Abingdon to consider the remaining items on thee agenda.

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

None.

The meeting adjourned at 10.05 pm