

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 13 February 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: Mrs M J Crossland (Chairman); R A Langridge (Vice-Chairman); M A Barrett;
P Emery; Mrs E H N Fenton; E J Fenton; J Haine; P J Handley; H J Howard; and J F Mills

Officers in attendance: Catherine Tetlow, Miranda Clark, Cheryl Morley and Paul Cracknell

58. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 9 January 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

59. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from H B Eaglestone, S J Good and P D Kelland and the Head of Paid Service reported receipt of the following resignation and temporary appointment:-

Mr E J Fenton for Mr D S T Enright.

60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to Application No. 16/03415/OUT (Land East of Mount Owen Road, Bampton) Mr Handley, Mr Howard and Mrs Crossland noted that concerns had been expressed with regard to capacity at the Bampton GP's surgery. They advised that they were registered as patients at that practice. However, as this did not constitute a disclosable interest they were at liberty to participate in the determination of the application.

There were no other declarations of interest from Members or Officers relating to matters to be considered at the meeting.

61. 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:-

16/03415/OUT; 16/03427/FUL; 16/03679/FUL; 16/03960/FUL; 16/03847/FUL;
16/03910/FUL; 16/04068/HHD and 16/04233/HHD.

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

3 I6/03415/OUT Land East of Mount Owen Road, Bampton

The Principal Planner introduced the application and drew attention to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations. She noted that the description of development as submitted made reference to the demolition of existing buildings but confirmed that no demolition was to take place as there were no existing buildings on the site.

The Principal Planner also made reference to two further letters sent directly to Members by the Parish Council and Ms Liz Thorpe and advised that these did not raise any new issues that had not been addressed in the report. Whilst the County Council's consultation response incorrectly identified the secondary school serving the catchment area as Carterton, rather than Burford, it had confirmed that no financial contribution was sought for secondary education provision.

The Principal Planner then explained that, whilst the County Council had originally requested the creation of a pedestrian footway to the east of Mount Owen Road, Officers considered that this would be detrimental in environmental terms. In consequence, it had been agreed that a pedestrian right of way would be provided within the site so as to retain the landscaped verge.

Dr Roger Preston 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.

Mr Richard McBrien then addressed the meeting on behalf of the Bampton Parish Council. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

The applicant's representative, Mr Tim Burden, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Howard regarding Thames Water's comments regarding the capacity of the existing water supply infrastructure to meet the additional demands of the proposed development, Mr Burden advised that the imposition of a 'Grampian style' condition such as proposed was a common approach in Oxfordshire. He advised that, whilst an impact study had not been carried out at this stage, informal discussions had taken place and the applicants were confident that an appropriate solution could be achieved.

As Mr Burden had indicated that there were no infrastructure deficiencies identified in the scheme independently or when considered in conjunction with the approved Cala Homes scheme currently under construction on New Road, Mr Mills enquired whether the current scheme was reliant upon improvements delivered by the Cala Homes scheme to ensure its successful delivery.

In response, Mr Burden advised that his point had been that the cumulative impact of both scheme was not such as to give rise to objections from the statutory consultees and confirmed that the application was not reliant upon any other scheme to deliver the necessary infrastructure improvements.

The Principal Planner then presented her report. In response to the concerns raised by Dr Preston she advised that the County Council, as lead drainage authority, was aware of the existing context and had raised no objections to the development. Officers did not believe that a satisfactory solution could not be achieved on the site.

With regard to the comparisons drawn between this site and those to the south of Aston Road she advised that the application site lay within Flood Zone 1 whilst those to the south of Aston Road were in Zones 2 and 3 and were subject to different constraints. The NPPF required local planning authorities to direct development towards areas of lowest flood risk. The application site was considered to be suitable and did not fall within the same constraints as those in areas of greater flood risk.

Whilst the site had not been identified within the Local Plan, it had been recognised as suitable for development during the update of the strategic housing and economic land availability assessment in November 2016. The Council was required to keep sites under review and to bring forward suitable sites when presented. This site had been proposed via the SHELAA and determined to be suitable and deliverable within a 10 to 15 year timeframe. However, given the Council's current housing land supply position, it had to keep an open mind when sites were brought forward. If, having considered the relevant constraints and potential harms, such sites were found to be acceptable; there was no justification for artificially delaying their delivery.

In the absence of a five year housing land supply, having weighed the potential harms and benefits, the constraints identified in the report and the responses from the technical consultees, Officers were satisfied that concerns raised could be addressed by conditions or through a legal agreement. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

Mrs Crossland reminded Members that the application was in outline only and that the majority of the concerns raised were issues that would be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

Mr Fenton indicated that he remained concerned that the conditions proposed by Thames Water failed to adequately address the concerns of local residents. He also suggested that, given the location of the site and the immediate local topography, any residents would be unlikely to walk into the village and proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held to give Members the opportunity to assess the application in the local context.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Mills suggested that Members should have the opportunity to assess the gradient of Mount Owen Road given concerns over the potential for surface water run-off and the high water table.

The recommendation of deferral was then put to the vote and was carried.
Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

23 16/03427/FUL 46 Acre End Street, Eynsham

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Alex Cresswell, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to questions from Mr Emery, Mr Cresswell indicated that he considered the location of the car parking to the rear of the buildings to represent an improvement over parking to the front. Whilst Mr Emery questioned the sufficiency of parking provision, Mr Cresswell confirmed that it complied with current standards and was considered appropriate by the County Council as Highway Authority.

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

Mr Emery reiterated his concern over the adequacy of the proposed parking provision. In response, the Planning Officer advised that the site was located in the heart of the settlement close to local facilities and public transport routes. The County Council considered the proposed parking arrangements to be acceptable in this sustainable location. In the absence of technical expertise, West Oxfordshire deferred to the County Council as lead authority in terms of traffic and highway matters. Mrs Crossland reminded Members that there were many examples of similar arrangements throughout the District in town centre locations.

Mr Emery questioned whether the proposed private garden area offered sufficient amenity to future residents. In response, the Planning Officer advised that many flats had no garden areas. The Council had not adopted any specific requirements in this respect and it was for the market to determine whether the arrangements proposed were satisfactory.

Whilst he took exception to the 'threat' of conversion to an HMO and was unable to support the current application, Mr Emery accepted that the site was suitable for development. Mr Howard concurred, indicating that the site visit had emphasised that the entrance to the site was problematic. He suggested that the access point should be widened and the bus stop relocated to remove the current 'pinch point'.

Mrs Crossland advised that the applicants had made an offer to widen the access and the Planning Officer explained that the relocation of the bus stop was an issue for the County Council as Highway Authority.

Mr Mills reminded Members that the possibility of relocating the bus stop had been raised during consideration of an earlier application and questioned whether funding for the necessary Traffic Regulation Order could be secured through a legal agreement.

In response, the Principal Planner advised that the applicants could offer to widen the access to the site through the submission of revised plans but the relocation of the bus stop was a more complex issue.

Given that there was no objection to the application on highway grounds she questioned whether it would be reasonable to require the relocation of the bus stop as a condition of consent and suggested that Officers be authorised to discuss the matter with the applicants to see if this could be achieved.

Mr Langridge proposed that Officers be authorised to approve the application in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee and requested to enter into further discussion with the applicants to seek to secure widening of the access point and the relocation of the bus stop in the vicinity of the site. The proposition was seconded by Mr Howard.

Mr Handley expressed his appreciation of the work carried out by Officers in developing this application and support for the recommendation. In response to a question from Mrs Fenton, the Planning Officer advised that the gate to the rear of the car parking area opened onto Back Lane Car Park.

Mr Emery noted that, as part of a previous application, the County Council had sought the improvement of the visibility splay and the designation of four parking spaces for use by residents of Acre End Street but that this had not been achieved.

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

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Head of Planning & Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee subject to the conditions set out in the report.
- (b) That Officers be requested to enter into further discussion with the applicants to seek to secure widening of the access point and the relocation of the bus stop in the vicinity of the site.

34 16/03679/FUL

Astall House, Curbridge Road Witney

The Principal Planner introduced the application and advised Members that, whilst she had been advised that the County Council's objection with regard to drainage could be resolved by condition, the need to demonstrate adequate vehicle turning circles within the site remained to be resolved. She remained confident that this could be achieved and accordingly, recommended that Officers be authorised to approve the application subject to the resolution of this outstanding issue, to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure developer contributions and to conditions as outlined in the report.

Mr David Madden, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner then presented her report.

In proposing the Officer recommendation, Mr Handley indicated that he knew the site well and noted that facilities of this nature were required within the District.

Mr Howard concurred but, in seconding the proposition, questioned whether the proposed level of parking provision was sufficient for visitors and staff. He suggested that a further condition be applied requiring the applicants to monitor usage over a six month period and to provide an additional informal parking area should demand require.

Mrs Crossland questioned whether such a condition would be achievable. In response, the Principal Planner advised that it would be inappropriate to apply a condition that could lead to infringement as any concerns should be addressed prior to the grant of permission. She noted that the County Council was satisfied with the proposed parking provision and suggested that it would be more appropriate for Officers to seek to secure the provision of an informal overspill car park at the outset. Mr Handley and Mr Howard agreed to revise their proposition accordingly.

Mr Mills expressed his support for the application but suggested that the applicants should liaise with the Director of Public Health and the Clinical Commissioning Group with regard to the additional service provision a development of this nature would require. Members concurred and it was agreed that this request be incorporated within the proposition.

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

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Head of Planning & Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to withdrawal of the County Council's holding objection, to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure developer contributions and to conditions as outlined in the report.
- (b) That Officers be requested to enter into further discussion with the applicants to seek to secure the provision of an informal overspill car park within the site.
- (c) That the applicants be requested to liaise with the Director of Public Health and the Clinical Commissioning Group with regard to the additional service provision a development of this nature would require.

44 16/03809/FUL Chervil Cottage, 29 Aston Road, Brighthampton

Members noted that this application had been withdrawn at the request of the applicants.

49 16/03847/FUL Elmwood Farm, Burford Road, Black Bourton

The Planning Officer introduced the application and reported receipt of the observations of the applicant's agent.

The applicant, Mr Edward Stewart-Wood addressed the meeting in support of to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

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

Mr Barrett advised that, whilst he could understand the objections raised by local residents given the history of the site, these related to different issues. The current application would give rise to minimal traffic movements and no retail sales were to be made from the site. He noted that the proposed operation would provide employment in this rural location and proposed the Officer recommendation.

The recommendation was seconded by Mr Haine.

Mr Fenton also acknowledged residents' concerns but believed that the current application would go some way towards addressing these. Mr Handley expressed some concern over highway safety and questioned whether the County Council could be asked to delineate a pedestrian footway. Given previous difficulties relating to the use of the wood yard he also suggested that a condition be applied to restrict the number of vehicle movements.

Mr Langridge and Mr Howard expressed their support for this project as an example of farm diversification and on being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.

Permitted

60 16/03910/FUL Westfield House, Bampton Road, Aston, Bampton

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant's agent, Mr Paul Butt, 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.

The Planning Officer then presented her report and recommended that the application be refused for the revised reason set out in the report of additional representations.

Mr Howard suggested that the proposal bore similarities with that on the land to the north of Back Lane, Aston, and proposed that the application be approved.

Mr Langridge seconded the proposition and, whilst recognising that the position was less clear cut, indicated that he believed the site related more towards the village than to the open countryside and felt that the proposal did not constitute over development.

Mr Haine disagreed, indicating that he could not support approval of the application.

Mr Emery expressed his support for the application but questioned what arrangements would be put in place for the management of the remainder of the land. In response, the Principal Planner advised that this had not been specified and acknowledged that this could give rise to problems in the future. Should Members be minded to approve the application she suggested that revised plans should be sought incorporating the land within the curtilage of the proposed dwellings.

The Principal Planner suggested that the proposals were for development in depth which could not be considered as rounding off but which

represented an incursion into the open countryside that could not be adequately screened. She expressed concern that approval of the current application would set a precedent for the development of the adjoining land which, in equity, would be difficult to resist.

Mrs Fenton indicated that, if approved, the chestnut trees to the frontage of the site should be protected. She went on to advise that the Parish Council was unwilling to assume responsibility for the maintenance of any additional land.

Mr Handley questioned whether the application would be considered acceptable if the proposed dwellings were moved to the frontage of the site. The Principal Planner advised that, in her opinion, the application would remain unacceptable.

Mr Emery acknowledged that approval of this application could set a precedent for future development and, in response to a question from Mr Fenton, the Principal Planner reiterated that it would result in pressure for incremental erosion of other green space in the vicinity.

Mr Haine stressed the status of the site as being within a Conservation Area and, in response to a question from Mr Mills, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposals would result in the loss of two chestnut trees within the site.

Mrs Crossland advised that, on balance, she considered the site to relate more to the open countryside than to the settlement. The proposal had no merit and was in the wrong location. Tree Preservation Orders were not sufficient to ensure against the loss of trees within the conservation Area.

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

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then proposed by Mr Haine and seconded by Mrs Crossland and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale, siting, form and appearance would appear as a visually incongruous feature within this part of the Aston Conservation Area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the development would unacceptably urbanise the generally low density, loose knit, rural character and appearance which would not respect the existing scale, pattern and character of development in this location. In addition, the benefits arising from the delivery of a small number of new dwellings in this case are outweighed by the adverse impacts that would result from the development. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies BE2, BE4, BE5, NE1, NE3 and H2 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, Policies OS2, H2, EH1, and EH7 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031, the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 and 134, and the West Oxfordshire Design Guide.

(Mr Howard and Mr Langridge requested that their votes in favour of this application be so recorded)

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant, Mr Phil Moss, addressed the meeting in support of to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report and recommended that the application be refused for the reason set out in the report of additional representations.

Mr Langridge indicated that, whilst he understood the underlying rationale behind the recommendation, he considered that any harm arising from the development would be minimal. He noted that the application had the support of the Parish Council and recommended that the application be approved. The proposition was seconded by Mr Emery.

The Principal Planner recognised their point of view but indicated that she believed that the application of itself would be harmful in the Conservation Area as it would be detrimental to the loose knit, rural character and appearance of the area and set a precedent for further infill development.

Mrs Fenton expressed her support for the application and, in response, the Principal Planner advised that, whilst the applicant's aspirations may be genuine, planning permission ran with the land and there would be nothing to prevent the properties from being sold on.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland the Principal Planner advised that it would not be appropriate to grant a personal permission in this instance as there were no overriding personal circumstances to warrant such a consent.

Mr Howard noted that ancillary accommodation had been permitted in similar circumstances and expressed his support for the application, suggesting that rural villages had evolved in this manner for centuries.

Mr Mills indicated that the current application highlighted the deficiencies in the planning system. Whilst a larger development could provide a level of planning gain sufficient to outweigh the resultant harm, the same was not so of small schemes such as this. He acknowledged the concerns expressed with regard to precedent and reflected that this was a particularly difficult decision to take.

Mr Haine expressed his sympathy for the applicant's position but indicated his support for the Officer's recommendation.

Mr Handley acknowledged that the Officer recommendation was in accord with Policy but advised that he could not see the harm in this application.

The Principal Planner recognised this view but explained that the cumulative effect of a series of small developments could have the same impact as a large scheme without the requirement to make contribution to offset the associated harms.

Mr Fenton concurred with Mr Handley, indicating that he too could not identify any significant detrimental impact arising from the development.

The Principal Planner urged Members to take an objective view of the application.

Mr Langridge acknowledged concerns over precedent but suggested that the application should be determined on its own particular merits. Mr Howard concurred, indicating that there was no certainty that concerns over precedent would come to fruition.

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

Permitted subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
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. That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
3. The external walls shall be constructed of stone in accordance with a sample panel which shall be erected on site and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority before any external walls are commenced and thereafter be retained until the development is completed.
Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
4. The roof(s) of the building(s) shall be covered with materials, a sample of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any roofing commences.
Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
5. Notwithstanding details contained in the application, detailed specifications and drawings of all external windows, dormer windows and doors to include elevations of each complete assembly at a minimum 1:20 scale and sections of each component at a minimum 1:5 scale and including details of all materials, finishes and colours shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before that architectural feature is commissioned/erected on site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the architectural detailing of the buildings reflects the established character of the area.
6. The means of access between the land and the highway shall be constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all ancillary works therein specified shall be undertaken in accordance with the said specification before first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved.
Reason: To ensure a safe and adequate access.

7. The car parking areas (including where appropriate the marking out of parking spaces) shown on the approved plans shall be constructed before occupation of the development and thereafter retained and used for no other purpose.
Reason: To ensure that adequate car parking facilities are provided in the interests of road safety.
8. Prior to the commencement of development, a full surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. Three tests should be carried out for each soakage pit as per BRE 365 with the lowest infiltration rate (expressed in m/s) used for design. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.
Reason: To ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and/ or to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality (The West Oxfordshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Statement 25 Technical Guidance).
9. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular accesses, driveways, car and cycle parking spaces, turning areas and parking courts that serve that dwelling has 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.
Reason: In the interests of road safety
10. A Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted and approved prior to start of construction. No site traffic should be parked on the highway adjacent to the site. No construction traffic should be permitted along Back Lane south of the site.
Reason: In the interests of road safety
11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a land contamination assessment and associated remedial strategy, together with a timetable of works, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
 - (a) The land contamination assessment shall include a desk study and site reconnaissance and shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The desk study shall detail the history of the site uses, identify risks to human health and the environment, and propose a site investigation strategy based on the relevant information discovered by the desk study. The strategy shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to investigations commencing on site.
 - (b) The site investigation shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and accredited consultant/contractor in accordance with a Quality Assured sampling and analysis methodology.

- (c) A site investigation report detailing all investigative works and sampling on site, together with the results of analysis, risk assessment to any receptors and a proposed remediation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority shall approve such remedial works as required prior to any remediation commencing on site. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. Prior to occupation of the buildings hereby permitted:

- (a) Approved remediation works shall be carried out in full on site under a Quality Assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified then the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the Local Planning Authority in writing.
- (b) A completion report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The completion report shall include details of the proposed remediation works and Quality Assurance certificates to show that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included in the completion report together with the necessary waste transfer documentation detailing what waste materials have been removed from the site.
- (c) A certificate signed by the developer shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the appropriate works have been undertaken as detailed in the completion report.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E, and G, and Schedule 2, Part 2, Classes A and B shall be carried out other than that expressly authorised by this permission.
Reason: To protect the residential amenity or existing and future occupants
14. A scheme of hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any above ground development commences and shall be implemented as approved within 12 months of the commencement of the approved development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme. In the event of any of the trees or shrubs so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within 5 years of the completion of the development, a new tree or shrub of equivalent number and species, shall be planted as a replacement and thereafter properly maintained.
Reason: To safeguard the character and landscape of the area.
15. Notwithstanding the information provided on the approved layout plan, prior to the commencement of the development a plan indicating the positions, design, materials, type and timing of provision of boundary treatment to be erected has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter prior to the occupation of the dwellings.
Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

73 16/04068/HHD Marsh Cottage, Back Lane, Aston

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

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

Permitted

77 16/04233/HHD 8 Gloucester Place, Witney

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

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

Permitted

62. 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 appeal decisions was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 5:00pm.

CHAIRMAN