

Minutes

of a meeting of the

Planning Committee

held on Wednesday, 22 January 2025 at 7.00 pm in
Meeting Room 1, Abbey House, Abbey Close,
Abingdon, OX14 3JE

Open to the public, including the press

Present in the meeting room:

Councillors: Max Thompson (Chair), Val Shaw (Vice-Chair), Ron Batstone, Cheryl Briggs, Jenny Hannaby, Scott Houghton, Robert Maddison, Mike Pighills and Jill Rayner.

Officers: Luci Ashbourne (Democratic Services Officer), Emily Barry (Democratic Services Officer), Holly Bates (Team Leader – Applications South), Katherine Canavan (Senior Planning Officer), Emily Hamerton (Development Manager), Stuart Walker (Major Applications Team Leader), Hanna Zembrzycka-Kisiel (Principal Major Applications Officer), Sarah Green (Senior Planning Officer), Natasha Ireland (Planning Business Manager), Harjit Gill (Principal Planning Litigation and Housing Lawyer).

Remote attendance:

Councillors: Diana Lugova

Officers: Bertram Smith (Broadcasting Officer).

166 Chair's announcements

The chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, outlined the procedure to be followed and advised on the emergency evacuation arrangements.

167 Apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence.

168 Minutes

RESOLVED: to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 December 2024 as a correct record and agree that the chair sign these as such.

169 Declarations of interest

Councillor Scott Haughton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest relating to item 7 on the agenda, P23/V0420/MPO. Councillor Haughton confirmed that he would withdraw from the room and not participate in the debate or vote for this item.

Councillor Val Shaw declared that she had been involved in conversations with officers relating to item 7 on the agenda, P23/V0420/MPO. However, she expressed confidence that she had an open mind and would listen to the debate before reaching a decision and voting on the application.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared that she was the representative for Oxfordshire County Council on the North Wessex Down committee in relation to item 7 on the agenda, P23/V0420/MPO. Councillor Hannaby also declared that she was a Trustee for the Wantage Care Charitable Trust in relation to item 8 on the agenda, P23/V2861/O.

Councillor Robert Maddison declared that he was ward member for item 8 on the agenda, P23/V2861/O. Councillor Maddison confirmed that he would stand down from the committee and not participate in the debate or vote for this item.

170 Urgent business

The development manager reminded attendees that the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on the 12th of December. Additionally, on the 9th of December, the joint local plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination. In line with the NPPF, decision-makers could give weight to the relevant policies of the emerging plans, depending on several factors, including the stage of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections, and the degree of consistency with the NPPF. The starting point for decision-makers remained the policies in the current adopted local plans.

The joint local plan was at an advanced stage of preparation and therefore carried some weight. However, where unresolved objections had been received on policies, limited weight should be applied. Members were reassured that officers would advise of the weight of any emerging policies that needed to be considered for the applications presented.

171 Public participation

The committee noted the list of members of the public who had registered to speak at the meeting and noted the statements that had been circulated prior to the meeting.

172 P23/V0420/MPO - Botley Centre West Way Botley Oxford OX2 9LP

Councillor Scott Haughton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item as he lived near to the site. Councillor Haughton withdrew from the room while this item was discussed and did not participate in the debate or vote.

The committee considered planning application P23/V0420/MPO:

Variation to amend the restriction on occupation in the 10th schedule of the Section 106 agreement under application reference number P19/V1731/FUL (P16/V0246/FUL)

From: For a period of at least 43 weeks per year, not to permit the Occupation of any units of Academic Residential Accommodation by any persons other than full time students attending universities in the City of Oxford, the Vale of White Horse or South Oxfordshire, or

employees including (but not limited to) interns and research assistants working or studying at academic institutions in the City of Oxford or the Vale of White Horse.

To: For a period of at least 43 weeks per year, not to permit the Occupation of any units of Academic Residential Accommodation by any persons other than Students of Further Education or Students of Higher Education attending academic institutions in the City of Oxford, the Vale of White Horse or South Oxfordshire District Council on a course of study of no less than 16 weeks duration, or employees including (but not limited to) interns and research assistants working or studying at academic institutions in the City of Oxford, the Vale of White Horse or South Oxfordshire District Council. (Re-consultation due to change of description on 18 September 2024)

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history, were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The planning officer explained that the application sought a variation to amend the clauses of schedule 10 of the Section 106 legal agreement, which related to student occupation of the Botley Centre development permitted under application reference P19/V1731/FUL. The applicant intended to amend the wording to allow a greater range of students and employees to occupy the student accommodation and to enable more flexible tenancies due to current market challenges. This followed changes in demand for student accommodation across the city and district post-COVID, resulting in approximately 85% occupancy.

The proposed changes included altering the wording to permit occupation for a period of at least 43 weeks per year, not limited to full-time students attending universities in Oxford, Vale of White Horse, and South Oxfordshire, or employees, including interns and research assistants. New definitions for further education, higher education, and students of both were to be added to the agreement.

The officer noted that the relevant planning considerations were limited to the matters for which the modification was sought. There were no amendments to the physical built form of the scheme, the number of student units, cycle parking spaces, internal arrangements, or other permitted facilities. The application solely sought to amend the wording of the legal agreement. The representation from the Friends of Boars Hill, seeking a 10-week restriction, was not part of the proposal and was deemed unnecessary as no planning harm was identified with the proposed wording changes. The proposed changes were considered acceptable and would not result in a material change to the use of the building as student accommodation.

The application was recommended for approval as set out in the report.

The Committee noted a statement from ward member Councillor Debby Hallett in support of the application.

Members enquired why a 16-week duration was preferred to 10 weeks. The officer explained that research indicated 16 weeks was the minimum course length for postgraduate diplomas and other university courses. Therefore, 16 weeks was considered the minimum period necessary to cover such courses, ensuring that the accommodation met the definition of housing university students.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the amendments was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve the amendment to schedule 10 of the s106 agreement to the following wording:

Restriction on Occupation

The Developer covenants with the District Council and the City Council:

For a period of at least 43 weeks per year, not to permit the Occupation of any units of Academic Residential Accommodation by any persons other than students of Further Education or Students of Higher Education attending academic institutions in the City of Oxford, the Vale of White Horse or South Oxfordshire District Council on a course of study of no less than 16 weeks duration, or employees including (but not limited to) interns and research assistants working or studying at academic institutions in the City of Oxford, the Vale of White Horse or South Oxfordshire District Council.

And the following definitions shall apply:

Further Education - post-secondary education that is not Higher Education consisting of a formal course of study towards a qualification designed to lead to the award of an accredited certificate diploma or national vocational qualification (NVQ)."

Higher Education – means tertiary education leading to an academic degree including short-cycle, bachelor, master doctoral level or equivalent.

Student of Further Education – a person enrolled at a further education institution on a further education course.

Student of Higher Education – means a person enrolled at a higher education institution on a higher education course.

Councillor Haughton re-joined the meeting.

173 P23/V2861/O - Land north of Copenhagen Drive Abingdon OX14 1RF

Councillor Robert Maddison declared a non-registerable interest in this item as he was the local ward member. Councillor Maddison stood down from the committee during the consideration of this application and did not participate in the debate or vote.

The committee considered planning application P23/V2861/O:

Hybrid application comprising: 1. Outline application with all matters reserved except access and layout for C3 Residential Development, open space, associated car parking, green infrastructure and; 2. Full planning permission for the erection of a Care Home (C2) with associated access, car parking, landscaping and drainage, which is capable of coming forward in distinct and separate phases in a severable way. (as amplified by amendments submitted 24 & 29 January, 29 July, 20 August, 14 October and 4 November 2024).

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history, were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The Planning Officer outlined that this was a hybrid application consisting of an outline and full application for a care home and 39 residential units. The application site forms a part of a larger strategic allocation in the Local Plan. Since the Local Plan's adoption, the site had been partially developed and currently included a superstore (to the West of Wootton Rd) and other residential development (to the East of Wootton Road). The care home was considered a residential use, despite objections, and was deemed acceptable in principle.

Concerns were raised about noise from the nearby A34, drainage, and highway impacts. However, Oxfordshire County Council's highways officers assessed the development and found no detrimental impact on the network. Ten trees would be removed for access, but mitigation measures were included.

The application was divided into three phases: the care home, residential units, and necessary infrastructure. The care home was designed to provide private amenity space and mitigate noise with special glazing. Visualisations and photographs were shown to illustrate the site's layout and access points.

Additional measures, such as a pedestrian crossing, were proposed following discussions with county officers. Drainage concerns were addressed through negotiations, resulting in a pumping solution due to geological constraints of the site. Sustainable drainage elements were also included in the proposed scheme.

It was recommended to approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.

Councillor Mark Giddins spoke on behalf of Abingdon-on-Thames Town Council in objection to the application.

Peter O'Hare spoke objecting to the application.

Scott Davidson, representing Henry David Developments (the applicant), spoke in support of the application.

Ward member Councillor Robert Maddison spoke on the application.

Members asked for clarification on whether the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was payable for the application. The Planning Officer explained that the confusion arose because the report combined an outline and full application. The residential units (39 in total) were CIL liable at £280 per square metre, payable after the reserved matters stage when the floor space could be calculated. However, the care home was not CIL liable. Financial contributions were secured through a legal agreement, including £61,560 for healthcare, as well as contributions towards transport infrastructure, education, and waste.

Further questions were raised about the reclassification of the site for a care home instead of residential dwellings. The Planning Officer explained that the decision was based on discussions with the policy team and the interpretation of the local plan, which supported the provision of residential units and accommodation for the elderly. Core Policy 26 and its

supporting text indicated that housing for older people, including care homes, was acceptable in strategic allocations. The site's proximity to amenities and facilities, as well as public transport availability, was considered acceptable.

Members expressed concerns about the genuine intent of the local plan, emphasising that it was meant to provide affordable housing due to the nature of the site. They questioned the rationale behind changing the intended use. Infrastructure issues, particularly road capacity, were highlighted, with members noting that additional traffic could exacerbate the situation. Healthcare provision was also a concern, with a lack of GPs and NHS dentists mentioned.

It was noted that the Integrated Care Board had commented that medical facilities were sufficient, but also that there were objections from the Long Furlong Medical Centre. Members agreed that care homes were valued, and residents had rights to medical services. It was also noted that statutory bodies had not objected, and the care home was deemed to fit the site.

Members debated the suitability of the site for a care home, considering its location and public transport availability. The officer's view was that the proposed C2 use was acceptable.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P23/V2861/O subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Reserved matters to be approved
 2. Reserved matters time limit for submission
 3. Time Limit - Outline Application
 4. Time limit - Full Application
 5. Approved plans & document list
- Prior- commencement
6. Biodiversity Offsetting Scheme
 7. Construction Environment Management Plan (Biodiversity)
 8. Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
 9. Community Employment Plan
 10. Detailed Tree Protection Condition
 11. Landscaping Scheme
 12. Tree pits design
 13. Sustainable drainage scheme
 14. Foul drainage
 15. Details of cycle parking facilities
 16. Samples of materials

Concurrent with the submission of the Reserved Matters

17. Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity)
 18. Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP)
 19. Sensitive lighting strategy for bats
 20. Landscaping
 21. Noise mitigation
- Pre-occupation conditions and later trigger points
22. SUDS Compliance report

23. Public Art
 24. Electric vehicle charging points – Residential
 25. Framework Travel Plan
 26. Travel Plan
 27. Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) 29: Care Home Infrastructure
 28. Residential Infrastructure
 29. Care Home Infrastructure Compliance
 30. Noise mitigation – Care Home Informative
1. Legal Agreement S106
 2. Estate roads (20mph speed limit)
 3. S278/S38/Private Streets Agreement
 4. Trees and visibility splays
 5. Works within the public highway

Councillor Robert Maddison re-joined the committee.

174 P24/V1980/FUL- Land south of Curie Avenue Harwell Campus Didcot OX11 0DF

The committee considered planning application P24/V1980/FUL:

Erection of two linked employment buildings, with associated green infrastructure and car parking. (As amplified by the additional plans and documents received 13 November 2024)

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history, were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The current proposal under consideration was for full planning permission to erect an employment building of 6,500 square metres for uses B2 and E (offices, research, development, and general industry) at Harwell Campus. The site, part of the enterprise zone, was allocated for employment purposes in the development plan and already housed many scientific research and high-tech firms.

The application, named Tech Edge 3 and 4, was adjacent to completed buildings Tech Edge 1 and 2. Extensive pre-application engagement aimed to achieve the best outcome, given the site's location in the National Landscape. The proposal included generous boundary buffers for landscape and biodiversity enhancements.

Despite objections from the Parish Council regarding tree loss, officers (landscape, ecology, and tree officers) concluded that the proposed mitigation was sufficient.

The planning officer outlined some of the proposals in the landscaping plan. New trees would be planted to replace those lost during the development. The selection of tree species would be carefully considered to ensure they were suitable for the local environment and provide long-term ecological benefits.

The plan incorporates features to enhance biodiversity, such as native plant species, wildflower meadows, and habitats for local wildlife, creating a more diverse and resilient ecosystem.

Elements like green roofs and walls would be included, contributing to the site's ecological value, mitigating the urban heat island effect, improving air quality, and providing additional habitats for wildlife.

The plan integrated SuDS to manage surface water runoff sustainably, including features like swales, rain gardens, and permeable paving, reducing flood risk and improving water quality.

Boundary buffers will provide visual screening, reducing the visual impact of the development from surrounding areas, which was crucial given the site's National Landscape location.

The plan includes the creation of amenity spaces for employees and visitors, such as seating areas and walking paths, enhancing the environment's overall quality and provided opportunities for recreation and relaxation.

Photographs showed the current state of the site and its context within the campus. Officers acknowledged the loss of trees but emphasised that the site was allocated for employment. Extensive discussions during the pre-application stage ensured the proposal's design, location, scale, and sustainability were optimised. On balance, the employment benefits of the proposal were considered significant for the local area and the council.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to S106 and conditions in the report.

Councillor Roger Turnbull spoke on behalf of East Hendred Parish Council in objection to the application.

Mark Beddow spoke objecting to the application.

Steven Sensecall, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Ward Councillor Sarah James spoke on the application.

Members raised a query about the provision of shower, washing, and changing facilities mentioned in the OCC Highways comments. The Planning Officer clarified that these facilities would be up to the future occupier to provide, as there was already a hub on the site offering these amenities. The officer confirmed that the facilities were covered by existing provisions on the site.

A motion, moved and seconded to defer for a site visit fell on being put to the vote.

The committee debated the merits of the application, with some members expressing concerns about the loss of trees and the adequacy of the landscaping plan. However, it was noted that the proposal had undergone rigorous testing and multiple design alterations to achieve the best outcome.

Members also discussed the employment benefits of the proposal and the importance of the site within the enterprise zone. The Planning Officer reiterated that the proposal was in line with the campus master plan and complied with relevant policies.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P24/V1980/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Time limit - Full Application
2. Approved plans and documents

Prior Commencement

3. Faunal Enhancements
4. Unsuspected Contaminated Land Condition

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 22 January 2025

Prior occupation

5. Off-site highway works (implementation as approved)
6. Vehicular access
7. Car Parking
8. Bicycle Parking
9. EV Charging Points
10. Travel Plan
11. SUDs Compliance Report

Compliance

12. Public Art
13. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)
14. Community Employment Plan (CEP)
15. Tree protection (implementation as approved)
16. Landscaping implementation
17. Materials in Accordance with App
18. External Lighting
19. Implementation of Ecological Mitigation

Informative

20. Informative - Biodiversity offsetting
21. Informative - Thames Water

175 P24/V1839/FUL - 28 & 30 Lime Road Oxford OX2 9EG

The committee considered planning application P24/V1839/FUL:

Change of use for two dwellings from dwellinghouse (class C3) to one 9 person HMO and one 7 person HMO, plus provision of bin and bike stores for each. With internal reconfiguration on one property and a part two storey side, part two storey rear, part single storey rear extension on the other.

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history, were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The planning officer confirmed that one further representation was received since the report was published, stating that highway site visits did not accurately reflect congestion times, particularly during school hours, and requesting further monitoring.

The proposal was to convert two dwellings into Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), with 7 rooms in number 30 and 9 rooms in number 28, all for single occupancy with shared kitchens. This single occupancy would be secured by condition. The proposal also included a two-storey side extension and a part single, part two-storey rear extension. Other than the extensions, there would be little alteration to the external appearance.

Existing driveway parking included 3 spaces at the rear of number 30 and 1 space at the front of number 28. The proposal included providing drop kerbs to the front of both properties to create 2 new spaces at number 30 and 2 additional spaces at number 28, while retaining the 3 spaces at the rear of number 30. Bin stores and cycle stores were shown on plans, with a condition recommended to secure their details and dimensions to meet capacity requirements.

Concerns were raised during the consultation process about changing the dwellings from family homes to HMOs. It was noted that under permitted development rights, both dwellings could change to HMOs with six rooms each, totalling 12 individuals without changes to parking, cycle storage, or waste storage. The proposed increase to 16 rooms (16 individuals) would not significantly increase the impact but would allow for securing amenities for residents.

Concerns about congestion and parking were reviewed by highways officers, who carried out out-of-hours visits and confirmed that the requirement for 0.5 spaces per resident could be met, raising no objections. The primary concerns related to congestion during school drop-off and pick-up times, which were traffic management issues related to the school, not directly caused by the proposal.

The conclusion was that the proposal's impact was not significantly greater than what could be achieved using permitted development rights for 12-bed HMOs, but it included provisions for parking, cycle storage, and waste storage. Conditions were recommended to restrict the number of rooms to 16 and single occupancy only, and to secure 8 parking spaces before any residents moved in.

The recommendation was to approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Adam Rankin spoke on behalf of Botley and North Hinksey Parish Council in objection to the application.

Neil Simpson, the agent representing the application, spoke in support of the application.

The head of development suggested tightening condition four, which set out the provision of car parking spaces. Specifically, it was recommended to ensure that the parking spaces were unobstructed by the removal of a lamp post before occupation. This adjustment aimed to ensure that the spaces were fully accessible and free of obstructions.

During the committee discussion members highlighted the need for affordable accommodation and noted that the proposal would provide housing for 16 individuals who

might otherwise struggle to find a place to live. Members appreciated the clarification that the HMOs were not intended for student occupation, given the potential reduction in student numbers in the area.

Members expressed concerns about the loss of family homes and the impact on local congestion, particularly near Matthew Arnold School. Members also questioned how the proposal aligned with the local plan's housing mix requirements, which indicated a need for larger homes.

Members acknowledged the demand for affordable housing in Oxford and supported the proposal, noting that it was a controlled, high-quality conversion with provisions for waste and car parking. They also emphasised the employment benefits and the rigorous testing the proposal had undergone.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application, with the additional wording to condition 4, was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P24/V1839/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Work to commence within 3 years
2. In accordance with plans

Prior to occupation

3. Details of works to entrance and kerb, and visibility splays
4. Provision of car parking spaces – Amended wording: *Prior to the occupation of the new development, eight car parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on approved drawing numbers OXL-27-24-12 Rev B and OXL-27-24-10 Rev B.*

Each of the parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be accessible from the highway into the parking space and unobstructed, and any associated works to achieve this shall be carried out prior to occupation of the development. The parking spaces shall be constructed, laid out, surfaced, drained and completed to be compliant with sustainable drainage (SuDS) principles, and shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and manoeuvring of motor vehicles at all times.

Reason: To minimise displacement of parking onto the highway and to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport (Policies CP33, CP35 and CP37 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and Policy DP16 of the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 2).

5. Electric vehicle charging points
6. Cycle parking provision and store
7. Details of waste / cycle stores, and route to highway
8. Details of boundary treatment

Compliance

9. Materials as shown on plans
10. HMO – restricted occupation: No 30 to 9 individuals only and no 28 to 7 individuals only

Advisory notes

11. HMO licence
12. Dropped kerb works – licensing works
13. Obstruction to the highway

1. Informative - Biodiversity offsetting
2. Informative - Thames Water

Note: A short break was taken at 21:00. The meeting resumed at 21.02

Note: The Chair moved item 12 up the agenda.

176 Appeals Information

The committee received the appeals information report from the head of planning.

The committee agreed to note the report.

177 P24/V2077/FUL - Land to the rear of Orchard Farmhouse Orchard Lane East Hendred OX12 8JW

The committee considered planning application P24/V2077/FUL:

Single Self Build Dwelling (BNG exempt). (Additional Information received 11 October 2024 - Design and Access Statement, Heritage Statement, Tree Survey, Sustainable Construction checklist) (Amended site plan relocating dwelling and additional information received 29 November 2024).

Consultations, representations, policy and guidance, and the site's planning history, were detailed in the officer's report, which formed part of the agenda pack for the meeting.

The planning officer presented the report to members.

The planning officer confirmed that the application was called in for decision by committee at the request of ward Councillor Sarah James. The application is for a new dwelling on land formerly used as a Bowling Green in East Hanney, located behind the former Plough public house. The site, within a conservation area and surrounded by listed buildings, was previously intended to retain the Bowling Green and build a new club house, as part of the development proposals for the Plough

The proposed dwelling is centrally located on the site, with access from Orchard Lane, parking at the front, and a garden at the rear. The design features a series of joined barns in an L-shape, varying between single and one-and-a-half storeys. The dwelling's position was adjusted during the application process to be further from the southern boundary.

Photographs of the site show its current state and surrounding context, including views towards the old Chapel, Chapel House, Chantry Cottage, and Yard House.

A bowls need assessment concluded that the Bowling Green was surplus to requirements, with sufficient capacity at other clubs to meet current and future demand. This aligns with the Council's updated leisure facility assessment and strategy, which did not identify East Hanney's Bowling Green as necessary.

The design and scale of the proposed dwelling were considered appropriate for the context. While the building would reduce the site's openness and contribute less to the conservation

area, this harm was deemed less than substantial. The public benefits, including new housing and self-build housing, were considered to outweigh the low level of harm.

No significant impacts on neighbour amenity or highway safety were identified, and no technical matters preventing granting permission. The application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions outlined in the report.
Recommendation to approve subject to conditions.

Ward member Councillor Sarah James spoke on the application.

Members discussed the application, acknowledging the challenges of losing pubs in villages and the resulting changes to the landscape. They noted that, from their perspective and experience the proposed dwelling fit extremely well within the site. Members appreciated the time and effort invested in ensuring the proposal balanced acceptance within the community and the conservation area.

A motion, moved and seconded, to approve the application was carried on being put to the vote.

RESOLVED: to approve planning application P24/V2077/FUL subject to the following conditions:

Standard

1. Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission
2. Approved plans

Pre-commencement

3. Drainage Details (surface water)
4. Schedule of Materials

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 22 January 2025

5. Landscaping scheme
6. Boundary details
7. Car parking and turning plan

Pre-slab level

8. Ecological enhancements – bird and bat boxes

Pre-occupation

9. Bicycle storage

Compliance

10. Obscured glazing to rooflight on south elevation
11. Removal permitted development rights for alterations and extensions – Classes A, B C
12. Removal permitted development rights for outbuildings – Class E

The meeting closed at 9.12 pm

Chair

Date

