

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
Held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2:00 pm on Monday 14 November 2016

PRESENT

Councillors: Mrs M J Crossland (Chairman); R A Langridge (Vice-Chairman); M A Barrett;
H B Eaglestone; P Emery; Mrs E H N Fenton; S J Good; J Haine; P J Handley; H J Howard;
P D Kelland; Mrs L E C Little and J F Mills

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Miranda Clark, Cheryl Morley and Paul Cracknell

40. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 10 October 2016, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J C Baker and the Head of Paid Service reported receipt of the following resignation and temporary appointment:-

Mrs L E C Little for D S T Enright,

42. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Good declared an interest in application Nos. 16/02723/FUL and 16/02724/LBC (Penny Black House, High Street, Aston, Bampton) by reason of the proximity of his property to the site. He indicated that he would leave the meeting during consideration of these applications.

Mr Handley advised that, whilst the land the subject of application No. 16/02588/OUT (Land West of Minster Lovell/South of Burford Road, Minster Lovell) had been in the ownership of his family in the past, it had been sold by them in 1938. Consequently, he had no interest in the application and was not precluded from taking part in its determination.

43. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated. A schedule outlining additional observations received following the production of the agenda was circulated at the meeting, a copy of which is included within the Minute Book.

RESOLVED: that the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

(In order to assist members of the public, the Sub-Committee considered the applications in which those present had indicated a particular interest in the following order:-

16/03148/OUT; 16/01902/FUL; 16/02369/FUL; 16/02723/FUL; 16/02724/LBC;
16/03099/FUL; 16/02949/OUT and 16/03178/FUL

The results of the Sub-Committee's deliberations follow in the order in which they appeared on the printed agenda).

3 I6/03148/OUT Land West of Thornbury Road, Eynsham

The Development Manager introduced the application and reported receipt of representations from the Site Development Officer at Bartholomew School, the Highway Authority and the Eynsham Area Neighbourhood Action Committee which had been received after publication of the report of additional representations.

Mr Charles Mathew addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

The applicant's agents, Mrs Nicky Brock and Mr Tim Foxall then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Emery, Mrs Brock advised that the County Council had indicated that there was likely to be capacity within Eynsham Primary School to accommodate the additional demand generated by the proposed development and it would not be necessary to bus children to other schools nearby. Mr Emery contended that the County Council's fall-back position still envisaged having to bus children to other nearby schools.

The Development Manager then presented his report and confirmed that the County Council as Education Authority had withdrawn its objection to the application as, following a review of pupil forecasts for Eynsham, it believed that there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand generated by the proposed development at Eynsham Primary School. He also advised that the County Council had revised its requirements for developer contributions.

The Development Manager explained that he wished to make amendments to his recommendation. Whilst the development had been envisaged as a self-contained entity, it was considered that the reserved matters layout could be devised to facilitate a road connection to the land to the west should the Council consider it desirable. This would enable the access via Thornbury Road to be closed to vehicular traffic in the future and retained for cycle and pedestrian use only.

The Development Manager recommended that the Heads of Terms of the proposed legal agreement be revised accordingly. In addition, in response to concerns raised by local residents, he suggested that a traffic management condition be imposed upon any permission granted to control construction traffic during the course of development.

Mrs Crossland acknowledged that this application raised complex issues and had generated a significant level of local concern. At her request, the Development Manager explained the significance of the lack of a five year housing land supply, the consequent impact upon the Council's ability to defend refusals of permission at appeal and the associated costs.

Mr Kelland indicated that, whilst he considered the site to be suitable for development, access through Thornbury Road was not acceptable as it was not capable of absorbing the additional traffic movements that would be generated. He expressed particular concern over the potential impact of construction traffic on existing residents. In response, whilst acknowledging these concerns, the Development Manager reminded Members that the Highway Authority had not raised objection to the application. He explained that, under Government guidelines regarding traffic generation, a percentage increase of less than 5% was considered to be de minimis and any resultant harm so small as not to be a material consideration in planning terms. Whilst the Highway Authority retained absolute control in terms of highway safety, it had been confirmed that, in safety terms, the proposals met the relevant national standards.

Mr Langridge reminded Members that the Council had been unsuccessful in defending an appeal in relation to a nearby site which it had argued should form part of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme. He noted that the County Council, as Education Authority, had withdrawn its objection regarding school capacity and that there were no objections on highway grounds. He explained that the Council would not be able to defend a refusal at appeal and that, should the application be refused and determined by appeal, the Council would lose control over any associated developer funding.

Whilst Members might find it unpalatable, the Council was not in a position to refuse the application without the support of the County Council. He thanked Officers for their suggestion that the terms of any legal agreement should incorporate requirements for a layout that could facilitate a road connection to the land to the west with the potential to close the Thornbury Road access to vehicular traffic in future.

With some regret, Mr Langridge proposed the revised Officer recommendation. In seconding the proposition, Mr Haine indicated that, whilst the application was less than ideal, the Council had no alternative but to grant consent. He expressed the wish to see two points of access created to the west and endorsed the suggestion of an additional traffic management condition.

Mr Emery indicated that he was unable to support the recommendation. He wished to see the land form part of a comprehensive scheme and considered the application to be contrary to Policy CO10 which precluded development without provision of the necessary supporting infrastructure, citing the absence of a highway link to the west and lack of adequate capacity in the local primary school.

Mr Emery questioned whether the County Council was correct in withdrawing its objection on education grounds as he did not believe that their recalculation of pupil forecasts failed to take account of the impact of recently permitted residential developments in the village.

In response, the Development Manager reiterated that, not only had the Planning Inspectorate failed to accept the Council's argument for the comprehensive development of a nearby site, it had been made subject to the appellant's cost in this respect. He advised that the applicants had agreed to make financial contributions to the same extent as on a comprehensive development and reminded Members of the relevance of the lack of a five year housing land supply. In conclusion, he explained that once an application became the subject of an appeal, any developer contributions would be subject to as unilateral undertaking rather than negotiation between the applicants and the local planning authority.

Mr Handley echoed the concerns expressed over the adequacy of the access. He suggested that a 20mph speed limit should be imposed on Witney Road and pedestrian access to Bartholomew School be created off Clover Place. The Development Manager advised that, whilst the Council could not impose a speed limit through condition, it could request the County Council to utilise developer funding for this purpose. He also explained that the Council could not require the creation of a pedestrian access off Clover Place as the land was not under the control of the applicants.

Whilst expressing his sympathy for the points raised by Mr Mathew and acknowledging the concerns of local residents, Mr Good indicated that he was unable to identify any grounds upon which to base a refusal.

Mr Howard concurred He expressed his support for the creation of an alternative means of access from the west and his regret that the Council was unable to specify a timescale by which this had to be achieved. Whilst the County Council's position could be questioned, without a technical objection, the Council would not be able to sustain a refusal. Mr Howard also questioned whether a traffic management condition could be practically enforced.

The Development Manager advised that the Council could not specify a timescale for the provision of an alternative access as the application had to be determined within statutory guidelines. The County Council had been requested to review its position and confirmed that it considered the proposed arrangements to be satisfactory. The local planning authority was not in a position to challenge this technical assessment.

Mr Eaglestone suggested that, if approved, any traffic management condition should require contractors to park on site so as to avoid the difficulties experience over current construction work elsewhere in the District. The Development Manager concurred.

The recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure developer contributions as detailed in the report (revised as outlined above) and to a detailed schedule of conditions to address the issues set out at Paragraph 6 of the report, together with a traffic management condition as referred to above.

(Mr Emery and Mr Kelland requested that their votes against the foregoing application be so recorded and Mr Howard requested that his abstention from voting be also noted)

22 16/01902/OUT Land North of New Yatt Road, North Leigh

The Development Manager made reference to the report of additional representations which explained that Officers were awaiting responses from the technical consultees and were recommending that consideration of the application be deferred.

The recommendation of deferral was proposed by Mr Mills and seconded by Mr Haine and on being put to the vote was carried.

Deferred

36 16/02369/FUL Land on Stanton Harcourt Road, Old Station Way, Eynsham

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Oliver Spicer, the applicant's architect, addressed the meeting in support of the application. He explained that the application had been conceived two years previously and had been developed during continuous consultation with the Council's Officers. Mr Spicer indicated that the proposed development utilised high quality materials and design and would generate additional employment in the area.

Mr Langridge noted that one of the buildings was located close to adjoining residential properties and enquired as to its intended use. In response, Mr Spicer advised that this building was to be used for research and development with light, small scale projects. The building was to be cut in to sit lower on the site and was of a reduced scale in comparison with the remaining buildings. The building would be similar in size to units on the adjacent site and screened by a landscape buffer.

Mr Handley questioned the materials to be used. Mr Spicer replied that it was intended to use a mix of dark coloured, high quality materials of various shades and it was noted that it was intended to apply a materials condition.

The Development Manager then presented his report. He explained that the application was in line with emerging policy and advised that, in addition to securing planning permission, the applicants would have to obtain Scheduled Ancient Monument Consent in respect of the proposed access and link road. He recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on terms to be concluded through negotiation with Officers, to clarification of the line of the access/link road and to conditions based upon those issues identified at Paragraph 6 of the report and agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Development Manager advised that the applicants had indicated that the development would generate some 270 additional jobs.

Mr Langridge noted that the development was important to the economic development of the District and the proposed link road would be of benefit to the local community. He indicated that he could see no harm in the development and considered the application to be acceptable in principle. The grant of planning permission would give the applicants a degree of certainty and confidence to proceed further and proposed the recommendation of conditional approval.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Kelland.

Mr Barrett expressed his support for the application but questioned whether the highway issues could be resolved. The Development Manager advised that, whilst there were no concerns with regard to highway safety, if questions over the potential local traffic impacts remained unresolved, the application could be brought back before Members to enable the Sub-Committee to weigh these against the benefits offered.

Mr Emery expressed his support for the application and suggested that a reduction in the speed limit on the Stanton Harcourt Road could assist. In response, the Development Manager confirmed that the suggestion could be raised in discussions with the County Council.

Mr Handley noted that economic benefits ought not to be taken into consideration in determining the application and the Chairman confirmed that economic factors were not relevant planning considerations.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to the resolution of any outstanding issues, to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on terms to be concluded through negotiation with Officers, to clarification of the line of the access/link road and to conditions based upon those issues identified at Paragraph 6 of the report and agreed in consultation with the Chairman of the sub-Committee.

49 16/02723/FUL Penny Black House, High Street, Aston, Bampton

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Handley.

Mrs Fenton indicated that she considered the proposed refurbishment of the building on Ham Lane to be acceptable and would have preferred this to have been submitted as an independent application.

The Planning Officer explained that this had been suggested to the applicant but they wished the application to be determined as submitted.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Refused

55 16/02724/LBC Penny Black House, High Street, Aston, Bampton

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Handley and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

(Mrs Fenton requested that her abstention from voting on this and the foregoing application be so recorded. Mr Good left the meeting during consideration of these applications)

59 16/02588/OUT Land West of Minster Lovell/South of Burford Road, Minster Lovell

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mrs Jean King addressed the Sub-Committee in opposition to the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Good, Mrs King indicated that the proposed development represented an increase of some 14% in the population of the village.

Councillor Jonathan Stowell, the Chairman of the Minster Lovell Parish Council, then addressed the meeting on opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland, Mr Stowell advised that the local football club had no desire to move from its existing ground to the new facility proposed by the applicants as part of the development.

The Local Representative, Miss Gill Hill, then addressed the meeting in opposition to the application, reiterating the concerns expressed by the previous speakers.

The applicant's agent, Mr Mike Robinson, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A copy of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented his report and drew attention to the revised comments from the County Archaeologist set out in the report of additional representations. The Development Manager also clarified that it was the Minster Lovell Playing Fields Trust, not the Parish Council, which was responsible for the existing facilities on Ripley Avenue.

Whilst recognising the significance of the lack of a five year housing land supply, Mr Handley indicated that this did not mean that development had to be permitted in all locations. He considered the site to be inappropriate given its location in open countryside and the size of the proposed development to be too great. He noted that there was no footpath to give access to the local school and believed that it lacked sufficient capacity to cater for the additional number of children from the proposed new properties. For these reasons and having regard to the impact of the development on existing residents, he proposed that the application be refused.

The Development Manager acknowledged the concerns expressed but reminded Members that the site was allocated for residential development in the emerging Local Plan. Whilst the Council had sought to limit the extent of development, the Local Plan Inspector had not supported that position and had called for an increase to a target of some 660 properties per annum. Whilst it had sought to resist such applications in the past, the Council had now to accept sites of this nature if it was to deliver the levels of house building required by central Government.

The Development Manager drew attention to Paragraph 5.9 of the report and the applicant's offer to allow the Parish Council to connect its land to the development site at nil cost so as to enable better access to the village. He explained that, whilst it could require the developers to provide the Parish Council with the ability to link to their land, the Council could not compel the Parish Council to do so. In conclusion, he advised that the County Council, as education authority, had raised no objection to the application in terms of capacity or otherwise.

Mr Handley sought an assurance that approval of this application would not set a precedent for similar development in the future. In response, the Chairman advised that each application had to be determined on its own merits and the Development Manager explained that, under the current national guidelines, no such assurance could be given as most villages would be faced with more development than historically accepted.

Whilst sympathetic to local concerns, Mr Howard indicated that he could not see that a reason to refuse the application and, in the absence of a second to Mr Handley's recommendation of refusal, proposed the Officer recommendation. Mr Langridge acknowledged the extent of local opposition but agreed with Mr Howard. Whilst it might be unpalatable, a refusal could not be maintained at appeal and Mr Langridge seconded the proposition.

Mr Emery questioned whether approval of the current application was likely to generate pressure for further development to the west of the site. In response, the Development Manager advised that the intention was to create a strong landscape buffer between the site and the open countryside so as to discourage future development.

Mr Haine stressed that the site had been identified as one that could reasonably be developed to help meet the housing needs of the District. Mr Good indicated that the current proposal was a reflection of the requirement for more residential development and, whilst sympathetic to local concerns, was unable to see a reason to reject the application.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on terms as outlined in the report and to the following conditions based upon the issues identified at Paragraph 6 of the report.

- I. (a) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;

and

(b) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, (herein called the reserved matters) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.
Reason: The application is not accompanied by such details.
3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details and plans accompanying the application but as modified by the agents letters and revised illustrative plans.
Reason: The application has been amended by the submission of revised details.
4. Notwithstanding the generality of the above conditions the dwellings on site shall comprise a mix of 1 and 2 storey units with no units above 2 storey height and shall feature extensive planting belts to the boundaries of the site with open countryside.
Reason: To limit landscape impact, limit harm to the setting of the AONB and respect the built form context of the settlement
5. No development, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:
 - I. The parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors
 - II. The loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - III. The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - IV. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays
 - V. Wheel washing facilities
 - VI. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - VII. A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Reason: To safeguard the means to ensure that the character and appearance of the area, living conditions and road safety are in place before work starts.

6. An archaeological watching brief shall be maintained during the course of all works affecting the historic fabric and any ground works taking place on the site in accordance with a written specification that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the site/building.
7. Bat and bird boxes shall be installed in accordance with details including phasing that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.
Reason: To safeguard and enhance biodiversity.
8. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer must submit details for agreement in writing by the Local Planning Authority of evidence that every premise in the development will be able to connect to and receive a superfast broadband service (>24mbs). The connection will be to either an existing service in the vicinity (in which case evidence must be provided from the supplier that the network has sufficient capacity to serve the new premises as well as the means of connection being provided) or a new service (in which case full specification of the network, means of connection, and supplier details must be provided). The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the said agreed details which shall be in place prior to first use of the development premises and retained in place thereafter.
Reason: In the interest of improving connectivity in the District.

(NB The Council will be able to advise developers of known network operators in the area).
9. No development (including site works and demolition) shall commence until all existing trees which are shown to be retained have been protected in accordance with a scheme which complies with BS 5837:2012: 'Trees in Relation to design, demolition and construction' has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be kept in place during the entire course of development. No work, including the excavation of service trenches, or the storage of any materials, or the lighting of bonfires shall be carried out within any tree protection area.
Reason: To ensure the safeguard of features that contribute to the character and landscape of the area.
10. No development shall take place until plans of the site showing the existing and proposed ground levels and finished floor levels of all proposed buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These levels shall be shown in relation to a fixed and known datum point. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and living/working conditions in nearby properties.

11. Vision splays shown on the submitted plan shall be provided as an integral part of the construction of the accesses and shall not be obstructed at any time by any object, material or structure with a height exceeding 0.9 metres above the level of the access they are provided for.

Reason: In the interests of road safety

12. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular accesses, driveways, car and cycle parking spaces, turning areas and parking courts that serve the dwellings have been constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, construction shall only commence in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

13. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, vehicle tracking analysis shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that shows that refuse vehicles of not less than 11.4m in length can access and exit the development safely in forward gear. The vehicle tracking analysis should also show that refuse vehicles can reach a point no more than 25m away from single domestic refuse bin.

Reason: In the interests of road safety

14. A Residential Travel Plan is required for this development prior to first occupation. One has been submitted as part of the outline application which needs a small amount of work before it can be approved (Please see specific comments below). This should be updated on occupation of the 40th dwelling when adequate survey data becomes available. A Travel Plan monitoring fee of £1,240 will be required to enable the travel plan to be monitored for a period of five years.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport in accordance with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

Discharge Rates

Discharge Volumes

Maintenance and management of SUDS features (this may be secured by a Section 106 Agreement)

Sizing of features - attenuation volume Infiltration in accordance with BRE365

Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers
SUDS (list the suds features mentioned within the FRA to ensure they are carried forward into the detailed drainage strategy)
Network drainage calculations

Phasing

The drainage plans must show that there will be no private drainage into the public highway.

There must be no private drainage to discharge onto any area of proposed adoptable highway

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

16. As part of the submission of the first reserved matters application details of the following, including the timetable for provision, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the development shall only be undertaken and shall be retained thereafter in accordance with the said agreed details unless written consent is given by the LPA for any variation thereto:

a) Details of the changing room, football pitch and car park, if to be provided(see parallel section 106 agreement)

b) Details of the proposed kickabout area if they are not provided

c) The physical measures to ensure that the application site can be connected to the adjoining Parish Council playing field upon request from the Parish Council (see parallel 106 agreement)

d) The street lighting details

e) The means to ensure that the dwellings are protected from road and aircraft noise

f) A layout that provides a minimum of at least 30m back to back to the existing properties to the east of the site

Reason: Because the application was not accompanied by such details or to ensure that the reserved matters details are acceptable

76 16/02949/OUT Quarry Dene, Burford Road, Brize Norton

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Howard and seconded by Mr Haine and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

(Mrs Little requested that her abstention from voting on this application be so recorded)

81 16/03099/FUL The Cedars, 14 Moorland Road, Witney

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant's agent, Mr Jonathan Longden, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to questions raised by Mr Longden, the Development Manager advised that, whilst concerns had been raised by the Council's Drainage Engineers, the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment had not been incorporated in the proposed reasons for refusal.

He indicated that it was no longer the Council's practice to advise applicants when applications were to come before the Sub-Committee as a matter of course. This was made clear in correspondence and applicants were encouraged to monitor the progress of their applications electronically.

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Kelland and seconded by Mr Emery.

Mr Howard suggested that consideration of the application be deferred to address the issues raised by Mr Longden. In response, Mr Haine indicated that it was the Sub-Committee's responsibility to determine the application as submitted and he was satisfied that the Planning Officer's report presented an accurate reflection of the applicant's intentions.

Whilst acknowledging Mr Howard's concerns, Mr Langridge enquired whether there had been any failure in process in dealing with this application. In response, the Development Manager confirmed that there had been no abnormality in the manner in which the application had been processed.

In the absence of a second to Mr Howard's amendment seeking deferral, the Officer recommendation of refusal was put to the vote and was carried.

(Mr Kelland left the meeting at this juncture)

85 16/02723/FUL Ducklington Service Station, Ducklington Lane, Witney

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mrs Fenton and seconded by Mrs Little.

Mr Langridge concurred with the views expressed by the Parish Council, finding the loss of the pitched roof regrettable. He indicated that he would abstain from voting on the application.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted

44. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing under delegated powers together with an appeal decision was received and noted.

In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked Officers for the clarity with which they had presented some complex applications and the Members of the Sub-Committee for the manner in which they had determined them.

The meeting closed at 5:30pm.

CHAIRMAN