

# DC.217

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON  
ON MONDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY, 2008  
AT 6.30PM**

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

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Matthew Barber, Roger Cox, Richard Gibson, Anthony Hayward, Angela Lawrence, Jerry Patterson, Val Shaw, Margaret Turner and Tony de Vere.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Joyce Hutchinson (In place of Jenny Hannaby) and Zoe Patrick (In place of Sue Marchant)

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Steve Culliford, Martin Deans, Rodger Hood, Laura Hudson, Geraldine Le Cointe, Claire Litchfield and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 62

DC.272 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

In accordance with Standing Order 17 (1) the attendance of Substitute Members were recorded as referred to above with apologies for absence received from Councillors Sue Marchant, Terry Cox and Jenny Hannaby.

DC.273 MINUTES

The minutes of a meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 7<sup>th</sup> January 2008 were adopted and signed as a correct record with the following amendment:-

Minute DC.232, Amended bullet point number 8 to read: - "there had been instances when refuse vehicles had encountered parked vehicles obstructing the highway but this had been in the side roads and not along the spine road"

DC.274 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were declared in respect of report 142/07 – Planning Applications as follows:-

Member	Type of Interest	Item	Reason	Minute Reference
Councillor Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/1187/5 ABG/15219/4 ABG/19956-X	In so far as she is a member of the Abingdon Town	DC.282 DC.284 DC.286

		SUT/20316	Council, but had not taken part in any discussion on these applications  In so far as she knew the applicant	DC.289
Councillor Margaret Turner	Personal	SUT/20330	In that her daughter works for a firm which occasionally supplies drivers to the applicant.	DC.289
Councillor Richard Farrell	Personal	SUT/20316 SUT/20330	In that he knew the owners of neighbouring properties	DC.288 DC.289
Councillor Tony De Vere	Personal	ABG/1187/5	In that he knew the objector Peter Harbour	DC.282
Councillor John Woodford	Personal	SUT/20316	In that he knew the owner	DC.288

DC.275 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair asked everyone present to switch off their mobile telephones during the meeting. The Chair explained, for the benefit of the public that the Officers were present to give advice to the Committee and furthermore he reminded everyone present to remain silent during the debate and presentations.

DC.276 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None

DC.277 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

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

“Please can I have a breakdown of the figure of 5750 homes that was quoted in Councillor Farrell’s answer to me which I received on 29 January, into individual sites and numbers (the sites with 20 or less units can be accumulated into one set of figures so as not to produce too large a table), and the likely number of affordable homes at each site (again the sites with 20 or less units can be accumulated in to one set of figures so as not to produce too large a table) in the figure of 5750, if known.”

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

DC.278      STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING  
ORDER 33

It was noted that 21 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting.

DC.279      MATERIALS

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

24-28 Newbury Street, Wantage (application no. WAN/20119).

*RESOLVED*

*the following materials be approved:*

*Blocks 1-3: Baggeridge G10765 Blended Red Multi Stock Bricks  
Redland Plain Tile – Breckland Brown*

*Blocks 4-6: Baggeridge G10765 Blended Red Multi Stock Bricks  
Plain Clay Weathered Tile VDS (Val de Sienne by Phalempin)*

*Blocks 7-9: Charnwood Forest Brick Ltd Handmade Sussex Red Multi  
Plain Clay Weathered Tile VDS (Val de Sienne by Phalempin)*

*Blocks 11-14 Refurbishment: Tile hanging from building re-used where possible and  
re-claimed matching tiles where required*

DC.280      APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of two appeals which had been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate.

*RESOLVED*

*that the agenda report be received.*

DC.281      FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

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

*RESOLVED*

*that the report be received*

DC.282 ABG/1187/5 REVISION OF DESIGN OF HIGH LEVEL ROOF- (AMENDMENT TO ABG/1187/4). 243 SOUTH AVENUE, ABINGDON, OX14 1QT

(Councillors Tony de Vere and Angela Lawrence had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration)

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that the application was a resubmission of a previous scheme with an amendment proposed to the height of the roof.

Mr Peter Harbour made a statement to the Committee objecting to the proposed application. He raised concerns that the increased height of the ridge would lead to the loss of light to his property, be overbearing and would dominate the street scene. He expressed his regret that gardens were being lost to overdevelopment. He advised the Committee that he had intended to install solar panels to the roof of his property, however he felt that this was no longer possible due to the shadow that would be cast by the increased height of the roof on the neighbouring property. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

One Member commented that he did not consider that the increased height of the ridge would cause excessive darkness.

By 14 votes to nil it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/1187/5 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.*

DC.283 WAN/2186/14 & 15-CA & 16- LB - DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS, CONVERSION (INCLUDING LISTED BUILDINGS). ERECTION OF 230 DWELLINGS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING, & HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS. CHANGE OF USE OF CHAPEL TO B1, A2, A3 AND A4 USE, ST MARYS SCHOOL, NEWBURY STREET, WANTAGE OX12 8BZ

The Committee was asked to consider three applications covering two sites north and south of Ormond Road. A new footpath was proposed along the south eastern edge of the site to provide a safer access for children attending the Primary School. The path would require the transfer of some land from Wantage Town Council to the developers and would result in the loss of three mature Lime trees. The footpath would not be an

adopted path but would be maintained by the new development's management company.

An additional condition was suggested by the Planning Officer to gate off some undercroft parking areas for security purposes. Some internal fireplaces would be retained in the blocks to be refurbished. There had been no response from English Heritage to consultation on the amended plans for Block B1.

At this point in the meeting it was proposed by the Chair and

*RESOLVED (nem com)*

*that the meeting of the Committee do adjourn for 10 minutes to allow Members an opportunity to view a model of the proposal.*

The meeting adjourned at 7.30pm and reconvened at 7.40pm

Further to the report the Officers advised the Committee of some of the issues surrounding this application. It was confirmed that the District Council's Arboriculture Officer was opposed to the removal of three mature lime trees to accommodate the proposed footpath along the south eastern boundary of the site. She read out a statement from the Arboriculture Officer which advised that the removal of these trees sent out a negative message in respect of the environment and he was of the opinion that the path could run alongside the trees and therefore they could be retained.

It was noted that in line with the Local Plan policy, 40% of the development would be affordable housing, consisting of 71% rental accommodation and 29% shared ownership. The Officers confirmed that the proposed breakdown and location of the affordable housing units were satisfactory and it was added that the affordable housing units would be indistinguishable from the rest of the development, indeed some of the affordable units forming part of the focal buildings on the site.

In respect of the Art, Music and Drama block, the Officers confirmed that 29 letters of objection had been received and Wantage Arts Campaign had lodged a petition with the District Council which had 2500 signatures opposing the loss of the block. It was advised that a letter had recently been received from the Wantage Arts Campaign which requested a Section 106 agreement to offer the music and drama block for sale to the group at a reasonable price as it was the Wantage Arts Campaign's intention to raise the funds to purchase the centre. It argued that only 8 units would be lost as a result of the retention of the block, having minimal impact on the development.

The Officers stated that it was not reasonable to seek to central the sale of the block through the planning process. Furthermore the nature and extent of the use of the arts block has been considered and it was concluded that this was not sufficient to warrant its retention or to seek a financial contribution or contribution in kind from the developer. It was reported that the use of the block had been on an ad hoc basis and there were alternative venues in close proximity, namely the Wantage Civic Hall, which was currently underused and the proposed venue at Tugwell Fields. The Officers stated that the effect of the retention of the block would be the loss of around

18 units, as there would have to be car parking provision for the centre and therefore the retention would have a significant impact on the development.

In respect of the impact on neighbouring properties, the Officers advised that Torestyn, a bungalow on Post Office Lane currently sat beside a large modern school building, which was due to be demolished as part of the development. The Officers considered that the proposed replacement terrace houses would be more sympathetic, set further back than the current building and with lower eaves. The Officers confirmed that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the neighbouring properties, would enhance the Conservation Area and would incorporate existing design elements into the scheme.

The Officers advised that had letters had been received in support of the proposed footpath, together with a letter from Wantage Arts Campaign and statements from Local Members Councillors Bill Melotti and Julia Reynolds, which were read out.

Councillor Melotti had expressed his support for the footpath for the Primary School. He considered that this path would improve access to the school, which currently is through a congested single entrance at the front of the school onto a narrow yet busy main road into Wantage.

Councillor Julia Reynolds had expressed support for the footpath and a safer route to school for the children of Wantage. She had suggested that a gate be installed at the corner of Post Office Lane and Eagles Close where there was a communal green area in the hope that it would prevent anti-social behaviour by restricting access between the green and the shop. She had expressed regret that the School had not offered the Music and Drama block to the community, as it was an excellent facility for arts groups in Wantage and Grove. She was concerned that the elderly should have access to venues which were in the town centre and that the Wantage and Grove Health Check had identified a lack of facilities for cultural activities which was why Wantage Town Council had given support to the Wantage Arts Centre Campaign.

Councillor Andrew Crawford made a statement on behalf of Wantage Town Council. He reminded the Committee of the significance of this site. He expressed his disappointment that the applicant had chosen not to consult with the Town Council. He considered that the development amounted to overdevelopment of the area as it was 36% over and above what was necessary to achieve the density recommended in the Local Plan. He commented that the Town Council had been offered an insufficient contribution towards planning gain for services within the town. He commented that Wantage Civic Hall was not an appropriate alternative for the music and drama block. He made the point that the Officers had attached 61 conditions to the application and questioned whether Members had fully appreciated each one and therefore he urged the Committee to defer any decision on this application pending further consideration of the issues.

Mr Andrew Burford made a statement objecting to the development. He commented that he would like to see a public review of Anglo Saxon archaeological finds in the area prior to planning permission being granted. He advised that he was concerned that there could be finds to be made on this ancient site.

Mr Neil Hamilton made a statement objecting to the development. He expressed concern about the proposals to destroy healthy trees and the effects on the environment. He felt that development would have an adverse effect on the neighbours and the grave yard area.

Mr Ray Bond made a statement objecting to the development. He raised concerns about restriction of light to Post Office Lane which would be caused by the development and how it would make the area feel closed in.

Mr Nigel Thornbay made a statement objecting to the development in support of the retention of the music and drama block. He advised that the arts groups in Wantage were committed to a nomadic existence and this block was exactly what was required. He described the block as a meeting place for a range of arts projects and its retention would be in line with the Arts Development Strategy. He urged the Committee to preserve the music and drama block.

Mr Saunders Davies made a statement in support of the application on behalf of the applicant company. He confirmed that a range of consultations had taken place before the application had been submitted. He advised that he was committed to the immediate installation of the footpath and confirmed that the highways work would commence in the summer holidays to minimise disruption. He made the point that the Governors of the school had made the decision to sell the site to the developer. He considered that the music and drama block was an unsuitable space; there was no stage or equipment and no lift. He believed that the Wantage Civic Hall was the best alternative.

Mr Stone made a statement in support of the footpath and the application. He was in favour of the footpath as a safer route to the school. He asked the Committee to consider changing condition 38 to propose that the ghost lanes should be completed prior to the commencement of works.

One Member disagreed that Wantage Civic Hall was an appropriate alternative to the music and drama block. She considered that this development was taking away community facilities, and commented that use of the block had been restricted as it belonged to a school. She advised that she would like to see Section 106 money to be made available for alternative facilities at the Civic Hall and that any money given in respect of education should be ring fenced for Wantage. She considered that the loss of the Lime trees was a shame; however the safety of children travelling to the school was a priority. She raised concerns over the proposed access arrangements in that this was a busy main road and ghost lanes would add to the traffic problems, and that the location of the proposed play area was not in a position which was overlooked. In response, the Officers confirmed that it was her understanding that education monies would be ring fenced for Wantage. It was commented that Section 106 funding which had been agreed would not be available for alternate arts facilities at the Civic Hall, as it currently operated under capacity. With respect to the position of the play area, Officers confirmed that the Police had raised no objections.

Another Member commented that she would like to see the Music and Drama block retained as it could be used to assist in the integration of new residents.

One Member considered the scheme commendable. He felt that the site was sustainable and in a good location. He considered it was unfortunate that the Lime trees would be lost, however he was convinced that the benefit of having the footpath outweighed the loss. In terms of the points raised by Mr Burford in relation to the archaeological issues, he considered that the current recommendations would ensure that these issues were addressed. He accepted that the Committee could not require the sale of the Music and Drama block to the Wantage Arts Campaign. He questioned how the entrance gates were to be managed. In response the Officers confirmed that this would be covered by an additional condition as proposed for the gates to the undercroft parking areas.

One Member commented that he could see that there were three main contentious issues: the traffic, housing density and the music and drama block. He advised the Committee that as the County Highway Engineer had not raised any concerns in respect of the traffic, he was satisfied that the proposals were acceptable. He felt that the density of the housing was acceptable and within recommended guidelines. In respect of the music and drama block he was of the opinion that it was not reasonable to require the developer to provide an arts centre. He agreed that the proposed gates should be controlled.

Another Member agreed with the earlier comments that the application was of high quality and that it was sensitive to its neighbours. He questioned whether it would be possible to require a Section 106 agreement to the effect that work on the footpath should be completed before the commencement of development, as suggested by Mr Stone. In response the Officers confirmed that this would not be possible, however reminded the Committee that it was proposed that work on the footpath would commence this summer. It was therefore suggested that an informative should be added to the recommendations to the effect that work should commence as soon as possible.

One Member raised a concern that there was little evidence that the existing tennis courts were regularly used to a significant degree and yet the developer was required to provide replacements. He questioned why this was not the case for the music and drama block. The Officers responded by confirming that there was a difference in Government Policy, in that there were onerous levies on developers of school playing fields.

With respect to parking for the proposed 1 and 2 bed flats it was confirmed that there were 139 spaces (out of a total of 338 spaces), which equated to 1 space per flat. One Member commented that this was not enough, as many families would have 2 cars. The Officers commented that evidence was emerging from the Oxford Design Partnership suggesting that occupiers of flats often did not own cars. One Member added that therefore the average number of cars was less than one per household.

One Member questioned why there was provision for the change of use of the Chapel building. The Officers confirmed that a particular use had not been specified because there were no definite plans for the use of the building; it was simply included so as to acknowledge that the building could have a commercial use.

By 11 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention it was



*RESOLVED*

- (a) *that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy), in consultation with the Chair and or Vice Chair and of the Development Control Committee to approve application WAN/2186/14, subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report and subject to*

- (1) the provision of 10% lifetime homes  
(2) gates be provided to the undercroft parking to aid overnight security and;  
(3) control of existing and new gates within the development and*

*an informative that work on the footpath should commence as soon as possible.  
(Agreed by 11 votes to 3 with 1 abstention)*

- (b) *that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee to approve application WAN/2186/15Ca subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report (agreed by 12 votes to nil with 3 abstentions) and;*

- (c) *that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair of the Development Control Committee to approve application WAN/2186/16LB subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report. (agreed by 11 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions).*

**DC.284**     ABG/15219/4 RELOCATION OF SIDE WINDOW TO NEW SIDE WALL,  
WINDOW TO BE OBSCURE GLASS. 9 NORMAN AVENUE, ABINGDON OX14 2HQ

(Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration)

The Committee considered the Officer's report. Miss Charlotte Riggs, who owned the neighbouring property made a statement objecting to the application. Miss Riggs raised concerns that this application was contrary to planning policies DC9 and H24(iii). She advised that the room in which the window was to be placed had been changed and that the extension in its entirety was overbearing.

Wana Fois, the applicant, made a statement in support of the application explaining that she wished to install the window to allow light into the darker end of the bathroom. She confirmed that the window would be obscure glazed and that it would not be opened.

One Member commented that she understood why the objector was concerned in that the window looked directly into her property. Another Member questioned whether it could be a condition could be added that the window be non-opening. Another Member stated the applicant had confirmed that the window was to allow light into the room and therefore requiring that the window was non opening was not onerous.

By 13 votes to nil with 1 abstention (one member having left the meeting) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application ABG/15219/4 be approved subject to the following conditions:-*

- 1. TL1 Time Limit – Full Application*
- 2. MC10 Obscure glazing, non opening; no Permitted Development rights for other windows to the end of the wall.*

DC.285 CUM/19875/1 DEMOLITION OF NO. 8 ARNOLDS WAY. ERECTION OF 5 DETACHED DWELLINGS (RESUBMISSION). LAND AT NO. 8 AND REAR OF 6 AND 10 ARNOLDS WAY, CUMNOR HILL, OX2 9JB

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that five further letters of objection had been received reiterating concerns relating to matters already covered by the report.

Mr Mark Rowley made a statement objecting to the application on behalf of local residents. He raised concerns regarding the potential health and safety issues arising from the use of cesspools. He advised that he entirely agreed with the Officer's recommendations for refusal and commented that this application should be considered when investigations into the sewage network capacity were complete. He considered that any development should be postponed until the drainage system was upgraded and urged the Committee to refuse permission for the application.

Mr Paul McCann made a statement in support of the application. He reminded the Committee that the Environment Agency had raised no objection to the use of temporary cesspools and that the use of cesspools in this application was strictly on a temporary basis until the foul drainage system was upgraded. He stated that the Committee had resolved to approve a development of 150 dwellings at Tilbury Lane, Cumnor, where a negatively worded Grampian Condition had been used to ensure that the dwellings were unoccupied until improvements were made to the local sewerage system, which was effectively what this application was seeking.

The Committee considered the comments of both Mr McCann and Mr Rowley. The Officers commented that the use of the Grampian Condition had been acceptable in the Tilbury Lane application because Officers were satisfied that should the remedial works to the drainage system not be completed within the required time limits it was reasonable to expect a development of that size to fund the works, which was not the case in this relatively small application. Officers advised that this made the condition unenforceable.

One Member commented that he was in support of the Officer's recommendations. Other Members shared this view.

By 14 votes to nil (one voting Member having left the meeting)

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission in respect of application CUM/19875/1 be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.*

DC.286 ABG/19956-X EXTENSIONS TO RETAIL UNITS. REPLACEMENT OF RETAIL KIOSK WITH TWO STOREY RETAIL UNIT. THE PRECINCT, BURY STREET, ABINGDON.

The Committee was reminded that the application for Phase 2 of the proposed works to Bury Street Precinct had been delegated for approval to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Committee Chair subject to negotiations to secure a financial contribution towards the Abingdon Integrated Transport Strategy and to the further conditions outlined in the report.

It was reported that negotiations had ceased as Oxfordshire County Council had withdrawn its request for a contribution to ABITS further to the applicant's representations that the amount required was not reasonably related to the scale or nature of the proposed retail floor space.

Mr Perry had given notice that he wished to make a statement objecting to the application, however he was not in attendance at the meeting.

Local Members expressed regret that no contribution was to be offered by the developer. They considered that there were several projects in Abingdon which would benefit from a contribution, including the Britain in Bloom project, the provision of Christmas lights and the refurbishment of the Market Place. Another Member suggested that Local Members should be involved in any further discussions in respect of seeking contributions from the Developer.

By 14 votes to nil (one of the voting Members having left the meeting) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that the authority be delegated to the Deputy Director in consultation with the Committee Chair and/or Vice Chair of the Developmental Control and Local Members subject to the following conditions:*

1. *TL2 Time Limit*
2. *OL1 Standard Outline Application*
3. *MC2 Submission of Materials (Samples)*
4. *HY25 Car Park Layout (Building)*

DC.287 HAR/19966/1 – DEMOLITION OF SHED AND ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING ACCESS AND PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES FOR BLENHEIM TERRACE AND BURR COTTAGE. LAND TO REAR OF BLENHEIM TERRACE, BURR STREET, HARWELL.OX11 0DT

The Committee was reminded that at its meeting held on 5 November 2007 it was resolved that a Section 106 agreement be sought to secure 4 car parking spaces for the development.

The Committee was advised that it had not been possible to secure this agreement as the land owner had refused to agree to its terms. The Officers confirmed that car parking provision was not a requirement of the development, and that the applicant had offered to include them to benefit the area.

Mr Andrew Raven spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He confirmed that the land owner had decided to retain two car parking spaces for himself and therefore the proposed spaces would not be possible.

Officers commented that the Committee should ask itself whether the car parking spaces were required as part of the development.

By 11 votes to nil with 3 abstentions (one voting Member having left the meeting) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application HAR/19966/1 should be approved subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report.*

DC.288     SUT/20316 ERECTION OF A THREE BEDROOM DWELLING. LAND TO THE REAR OF COURTENAY LODGE, 12 CHURCH STREET, SUTTON COURTENAY, OX14 4NJ.

The Committee received and considered the Planning Officer's report and noted that concerns had been raised by Sutton Courtney Parish Council and Councillor Gervase Duffield relating to matters already covered in the report.

William Hanks of Sutton Courtney Parish Council made a statement objecting to the application. He raised several concerns, including; fears that the design was too modern and out of keeping with the Conservation Area, glare from the proposed glass building, the safety of the driveway, problems with traffic, and sewerage and drainage issues.

The Committee considered that this was an exceptional piece of architecture. Members considered that the driveway was acceptable as it was already in use by the other properties. Furthermore it was in agreement that this was of excellent design and would sit well in the plot.

By 14 votes in favour (one voting Member having left the meeting) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the Planning Officer's report.*

DC.289 SUT/20330 ERECTION OF B8 DISTRIBUTION WAREHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED OFFICES, SERVICE AREAS AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES. LAND EAST OF SUTTON COURTENAY LANE, SUTTON COURTENAY, ABINGDON.

(Councillors Margaret Turner and Richard Farrell had each declared personal interests in this application and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.)

Further to the report, the Committee was advised that Officers were awaiting recommended conditions from the Environment Agency.

William Hanks made a statement objecting to the application on behalf of the Parish Council. He raised concerns with regard to the increased level of traffic; particularly heavy goods vehicles and level of noise which would be caused by the development. He was concerned that not all goods vehicles would follow the routing agreement and use the A34 resulting in an adverse impact on the village.

Mr O'Donovan made a statement on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He reminded the Committee that this development was set back from the road and the visual impact was minimal. He confirmed that there would be fewer HGVs as a result of a restructure in the warehouse network as vehicle movements would be spread throughout the day. He added that traffic, landscape and drainage issues had all been addressed.

One Member questioned whether the Committee could require a sign to be placed in the village advising HGVs to turn left onto the A34. The Officers confirmed that this would be a matter for the Highways authority.

Another Member suggested that the local Members should be consulted by the Officer determining this application.

By 14 votes to nil, (one voting Member having left the meeting) it was

**RESOLVED**

*that authority be delegated to the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) to approve application SUT/20330 in consultation with the Committee Chair and/or vice Chair of the Development Control Committee and Local Member, and subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report and subject to:*

- (1) a Section 106 Agreement to secure limitations on the movements of HGV, control worker's shift patterns to avoid peak periods and to provide a financial contribution to the local highway network; and*
- (2) further conditions which are awaited from the Environment Agency and*
- (3) amendments to the wording of the Highways Authority Conditions set out in the Agenda.*

DC.290 KBA/20349/1 DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND DETACHED GARAGE. CONSTRUCTION OF ONE-AND-A-HALF STOREY EXTENSION AND DETACHED GARAGE. WEST HAYES, FARINGDON ROAD, SOUTHMOOR, OX13 5BH.

Further to the Officer's report it was confirmed that in response to the Parish Council's concerns, the County Engineer had raised no objections to the proposed route of access.

The Officers stated that there should be a further condition added to ensure that the sill heights were to be determined on the west facing windows and rooflights.

One Member questioned whether the Committee could restrict cars from parking in front of the neighbouring property's kitchen window. The Officers confirmed that it could not.

By 14 votes to nil (one voting Member having left the Meeting) it was

*RESOLVED*

*that application KBA/20349/1 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition to determine sill heights of the west facing windows and roof heights.*

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

None.

The meeting rose at 22.45