

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 10 July 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: Mrs M J Crossland (Chairman); S J Good (Vice-Chairman); M A Barrett;  
H B Eaglestone; D S T Enright; J Haine; P J Handley; H J Howard; P D Kelland; Mrs L E C Little  
and K J Mullins

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Catherine Tetlow, Kim Smith, Miranda Clark, Stephanie  
Eldridge, Phil Shaw and Paul Cracknell

12. MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** that the Minutes of the meetings of the Sub-Committee held on 12 June,  
2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by  
the Chairman.

13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs E H N Fenton and Mr E J Fenton.

Mr A H K Postan attended for Mr P Emery and Mrs L E C Little attended for Mr R A  
Langridge.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to application No. 17/01618/FUL (24 Selwood Drive, Carterton) Mr Postan  
advised that the applicant's wife worked within his ward and had asked him about the  
application. He had referred her questions to the Planning Officer and had not discussed  
the application with her.

Mr Good advised that his property was in close proximity to the site at Wheelwright  
Court, Ham Lane, Aston the subject of Tree Preservation Order No. 2/2017 which was to  
be considered at agenda item No. 6. Whilst the Order would not have any impact upon his  
property, Mr Good indicated that he would not take part in the determination of the  
matter. Mr Good also advised that the site at Birchwood and Rosedale, Ham Lane the  
subject of enforcement investigation was also in the vicinity of his property.

In relation to application No. 16/04234/OUT, whilst not a disclosable interest, Mr Enright  
advised that his Father in Law served on the North Leigh Parish Council.

15. 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.

(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:-

16/03627/OUT; 16/04234/OUT/FUL; 17/00965/FUL; 17/00629/FUL; 17/00609/FUL; 17/01193/FUL; 17/01194/LBC; 17/00924/FUL; 17/01618/FUL; 17/00873/FUL; 17/01296/FUL; 17/00831/OUT; 17/01561/RES and 17/01623/FUL

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

**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:-

3 16/03627/OUT Land at Butts Piece, Main Road, Stanton Harcourt

The Principal Planner introduced the application and made reference to the report of additional representations. She drew attention to the additional ecological conditions recommended and to the observations of the Stanton Harcourt Parish Council. The Principal Planner reported receipt of the further observations of the Parish Council regarding developer contributions and advised that these had been forwarded to the applicant's agents in order that they might liaise with the parish to establish which if any of their aspirations could be met. Finally, the Principal Planner reported receipt of a further representation in support of the application.

Mr Phillip Pirouet 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.

In response to a question from Mr Howard, Mr Pirouet indicated that the majority of the accident to which he had referred had not been formally recorded.

Mr Charles Mathew addressed the meeting on behalf of the Stanton Harcourt Parish Council in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Good, Mr Mathew indicated that a Category A village was one in which new dwellings would only be permitted under the 2011 Local Plan where they constituted infilling or the conversion of appropriate existing buildings.

Mr Steven Sensecall, the Applicant's Agent, 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.

The Principal Planner then presented her report. She advised that the SHELLA assessment did not have regard to detailed development proposals but simply considered the site area. In this instance it recognised the landscape and heritage assets that were worthy of retention. The current application had acknowledged these and the revised application retained a sense of openness through the provision of sufficient open space.

In the absence of an evidenced five year housing land supply the test under Paragraph 14 of the NPPF became applicable and, whilst the withdrawal of the bus service had been noted, the provision of 40 affordable homes, together with the economic benefits associated with development, outweighed the limited heritage and landscape harms.

Mr Kelland proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to take place to allow Members to assess the potential impact of the development. He also expressed concern over the absence of reports on the monitoring of the nearby former landfill site. Mr Kelland also raised questions regarding links between this and other development sites and arrangements for pedestrian access.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Barrett questioned the degree of harm arising from development and wished to take a closer look at the site to assess whether this was outweighed by the benefits.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

22 16/04234/OUT Land north, west and east of Belclose Cottage, Witney Road, North Leigh

The Development Manager introduced the application and drew attention to the report of additional representations. He reported receipt of additional representations from Mrs Aldridge and made reference to a letter sent to Members by the applicant's agent.

Mr Harry St John, the Local Representative, addressed the meeting in opposition to the development. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Postan regarding land ownership, Mr St John indicated that the highway verge was wide enough to allow for the construction of a pedestrian footway. This would be of benefit to the village and encourage residents to cycle to the railway station.

In response to a question from Mr Good, Mr St John indicated that he would like to see the application deferred to enable discussion to take place with the County Council regarding the provision of a footway.

Ms Jollande Bowater, the applicant's representative, then addressed the meeting in support of the development. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Enright, Ms Bowater advised that there were no proposals to construct more than the 50 units applied for. The applicants were aware that Officers would not support an application for more than 50 units and the current scheme was located to the east of the site and had been designed to relate to the existing settlement and to the existing form of development in Windmill road.

The Chairman reminded Members that it was their role to consider the application as submitted.

The Development Manager then presented his report. He emphasised that, whilst development had been resisted in the past, the policy framework had changed since previous appeal decisions regarding the site. He advised that the Parish Council's suggestion of a cycle route would require further consideration to assess its impact upon the heritage asset and indicated that the grant of planning permission could secure ecological benefits by protecting the undeveloped portion of the site.

Given that the consultation period had yet to expire, the Development Manager recommended that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to no new matters being raised, to conditions to be determined in consultation with the Chairman and to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis outlined in the report.

Mr Howard indicated that, whilst he believed that the site was capable of development, he had concerns over the access arrangements and proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Enright acknowledged that the current application was an improvement upon earlier proposals but indicated that he would wish to assess the relationship between the proposed and existing dwellings.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

37 17/00629/FUL Land to the Rear of 65 High Street, Standlake

The Development Manager introduced the application.

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

Mr Chris Naylor addressed the meeting on behalf of the Standlake Parish Council in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes. In response to a question from Mr Howard, Mr Naylor indicated that he was not aware of any recent class 1 or 2 sewerage incidents but that problems had occurred and reported to Thames Water some two years ago. Mr Good indicated that he had received complaints and was aware of such difficulties through local knowledge.

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

In response to questions from Mr Kelland, Mr Webb confirmed that the application was for full planning permission for four units to accommodate family members and a further six units in outline only. Whilst the properties would be self-designed, anyone purchasing the 'outline' units would be required to use a designated builder as the applicants wished to see the development finished quickly as they were also to be living on the site.

Mr Enright made reference to the ecological study and the retention of trees and enquired how tree retention could be enforced in relation to the outline units. Mr Webb indicated that trees could be protected by condition at the reserved matters stage.

The Development Manager then presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Handley indicated that the Council would be unable to defend a refusal of consent at appeal and proposed the Officer recommendation of conditional approval.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Postan suggested that consent should be subject to a tree preservation order being made to ensure the retention of trees on the site. Mr Handley concurred and agreed to amend the recommendation accordingly. Mr Postan suggested that self-build schemes resulted in better quality housing.

Mr Enright noted that a tree survey had already been carried out making service of a Tree Preservation Order easier.

Mr Kelland questioned how the second phase of the development would be approved, indicating that he would have preferred to see a fully detailed application. The Development Manager advised that the hybrid application was valid in legal terms and that the reserved matters applications could be brought before Members for determination.

Mr Howard acknowledged the arguments in favour of development and noted that, without the support of Thames Water, the Council could not defend a technical refusal at appeal. However, he expressed his concern that Thames Water may have been wrong and therefore felt unable to support the recommendation of approval.

Mr Good indicated that both Members and Officers were in a difficult position. Planning decisions had to be founded on planning policy and law and, whilst there were genuine concerns and real problems regarding the sewerage network in the vicinity, without the support of the technical consultees, the Council could not sustain a refusal on these grounds at appeal. Whilst he was reluctant to do so and still harboured concerns over precedent, Mr Good indicated that he was compelled to support the application as there were no legal grounds upon which it could be refused.

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

Permitted subject to conditions to be determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing and to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis outlined in the report.

(Mr K J Mullins left the meeting at this juncture)

49 17/00609/FUL

Manor Farm, Eynsham Road, Cassington

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mr Nicholas Harvison addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix I to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. He drew attention to the additional conditions set out in the report of additional representations and recommended that conditions 7 and 8 be amended to refer to the provision of chimneys and timber windows and a note to the applicant regarding condition 17 requiring the provision of a bound surface.

Mr Kelland noted that the Parish Council had wished to see changes to the access arrangements and sought deferral of the application. The Development Manager advised that there had been some questions over rights of access but these had been resolved and the Highway Authority had withdrawn its objection. Access arrangements remained unchanged.

Mr Kelland also indicated that the Parish Council had sought developer contributions towards leisure facilities and the local school. The Development Manager advised that he had spoken with the Parish Council over various issues but had not yet received a definitive list of their aspirations. He confirmed that the developer was prepared to make appropriate contributions and that he would be happy to negotiate with the applicants on behalf of the parish once a formal request had been made.

Mr Kelland advised that he would be happy to support the application on this basis.

Mr Haine expressed some concern over the current use of the barns, suggesting that, if the farm was still in operation, there would be nothing to prevent the applicants erecting replacement agricultural buildings elsewhere on the estate. The Development Manager advised that, whilst there was some evidence of traffic, he had never seen the buildings, which were part of the Blenheim Estate, in agricultural use.

Mr Handley expressed concern that the County Council did not maintain the road at the access to the site and suggested that a further condition be added requiring the developers to re-surface and mark out that area. The Development Manager advised that, whilst the applicants might enjoy a right of access over the land, it was possible that this did not extend to doing works on it. Consequently, he suggested that funding could be secured through the legal agreement to enable the County Council to carry out that work.

In response to a question from Mr Eaglestone, the Development Manager advised that, whilst there was nothing to prevent residents parking along the boundary of the site, the need to do so had been designed out by the provision of on-site parking.

Mr Postan enquired whether additional funding could be secured to reduce traffic flows and the Development Manager advised that, whilst the County Council had already sought £3,000 for highway works, any request for additional funding had to be proportionate and acknowledge potential traffic generation from the existing authorised agricultural use.

In response to a question regarding contamination, the Development Manager drew attention to the conditions proposed by the Council's Environmental and Regulatory Service at page 50 of the report

The revised Officer recommendation of conditional approval was proposed by Mr Postan and seconded by Mr Haine and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report (amended as detailed above) to those conditions proposed by the Council's Environmental and Regulatory Service together with those set out in the report of additional representations, and to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis outlined in the report and incorporating the contributions sought by the Parish Council.

64 17/00873/FUL Tennis Club House, Broadwell

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

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

Permitted

69 17/01193/FUL Masonic Hall, 20 Church Green, Witney

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mrs Katherine Stout addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix J to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Bowers then addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicants. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix K to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report and recommended the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the new windows and roof lights to be fitted with obscure glazing and a mechanism to restrict their opening,

In proposing the revised Officer recommendation Mr Good indicated that the site visit had shown the rear of the building and the existing fire escape to be unsightly and opined that the current proposals represented a significant improvement.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Howard questioned arrangements for an escape route from the upper floor. The Planning Officer advised that such arrangements fell within the purview of the Building Regulations Service and that, should any changes be required, the applicants would need to obtain planning permission and listed building consent.

Mr Handley expressed his support for the application and Mrs Little indicated that the applicants had gone out of their way to address the concerns expressed by neighbouring residents.

Mr Postan indicated that he had found the site visit useful and considered that the proposed development would not impact unduly upon the neighbour's privacy. Whilst not a planning matter, with regard to concerns expressed over smoking, he noted that the applicants had adopted a no smoking policy.

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

Permitted subject to the following additional condition:-

5. Before first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the new windows and roof lights shall be fitted with obscure glazing and fitted with a mechanism that restricts the opening, details of which shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard privacy in the adjacent properties.

79 17/01194/LBC Masonic Hall, 20 Church Green, Witney

Listed Building Consent be granted.

(Mr M A Barrett left the meeting at this juncture)

88 17/000924/FUL Applegarth, 2A Holloway Road, Witney

The Planning Officer introduced the application and drew attention to the report of additional representations. Following withdrawal of the County Council's requirement for vehicle tracking analysis, she recommended that condition 19 be deleted.

The applicant's agent, Mr Steven Sensecall of Kemp and Kemp, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix L to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. She advised that, in the absence of an evidenced five year housing land supply, the provisions of Paragraph 14 of the NPPF were applicable and that, notwithstanding the proximity to the Witney Conservation Area, Officers were of the opinion that the benefits of development outweighed the impact upon the heritage asset.

In addition to the removal of condition 19, she recommended the inclusion of an additional condition preventing doors being fitted to the proposed car ports to ensure that they remained available for parking.

Mr Kelland expressed his support for the application and proposed the revised Officer recommendation. The proposition was seconded by Mr Haine.

Mr Enright expressed concern over the proposed parking arrangements and questioned whether there was sufficient on-plot parking. He also made reference to complaints received regarding site notices being removed. The Planning Officer confirmed that sufficient parking provision was to be made and advised that the application had been the subject of individual notification and an extended consultation period.

Mr Eaglestone questioned whether the proposed access was of sufficient width to accommodate emergency vehicles and refuse collection vehicles. The Planning Officer advised that the access was 5 metres in width but that, as it was to be a private road, refuse collection vehicles would only collect from the adopted highway. Mr Handley suggested that an additional condition regarding arrangements for bin storage should be included. Mr Kelland and Mr Haine agreed to amend their recommendation accordingly.

In response to a question from Mr Good, the Planning Officer advised that a number of trees had already been removed from the site which was



outside the Conservation Area. However, replacement planting could be secured through the proposed landscaping condition.

Mr Postan expressed his disappointment that the scheme did not incorporate a higher quality of design.

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

Permitted subject to the deletion of condition 19, to additional conditions regarding arrangements for bin storage and preventing doors being fitted to the proposed car ports to ensure that they remain available for parking and to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis outlined in the report.

100 17/00965/FUL Land South East of Lancott Lane, Brighthampton

The Principal Planner introduced the application and made reference to the report of additional representations. She advised that some revised plans had been received but that, as these did not address all the relevant issues, it was her recommendation that reason 3 remain unaltered.

Mr Andrew Bateson addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix M to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Chris Naylor addressed the meeting on behalf of the Standlake Parish Council in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix N to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr James Yeoman of Savills, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix O to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner then presented her report. She advised that, following discussions with the applicants, the County Council had withdrawn their drainage objection having received the infiltration data and drawings required. Accordingly, she recommended that Reason 4 be deleted.

The Principal Planner also reported receipt of additional observations received from Mr Harris and Mr Skeffington.

Mr Handley questioned the suggestion that development would give rise to pressure to prune or fell existing trees on the site. The Principal Planner advised that, whilst the plans indicated that the trees would be retained, the proposed layout was such that their proximity to residential plots was such as to give rise to pressure to prune or fell. Whilst their retention could be conditioned, the proposed layout did not accommodate existing landscape features.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was proposed by Mr Kelland and seconded by Mr Barrett.

Mr Postan sought and received an assurance that the proposed reasons for refusal were sufficiently robust.

Mr Good expressed his support for the Officer recommendation and thanked local residents for their input to the decision making process.

Mr Howard questioned why Thames Water had withdrawn their objections given that it was known that there were major problems in the vicinity.

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

Refused subject to the deletion of reason 4

122 17/01296/FUL 2 Jacks Corner, 2A The Crofts, Witney

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

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

In response to a question from Mr Enright, it was explained that the permitted development rights enabling the conversion of offices to residential use was only applicable to property that was in that use prior to 2013.

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

Permitted

127 17/00831/OUT Linden House, Kilkenny Lane Brize Norton

The Development Manager drew attention to the report of additional representations and, in particular, to the outcome of the consultant's report indicating that the proposed scheme could provide 35% affordable housing.

He advised that Members had a variety of options open to them. They could authorise the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing to approve the application subject to the provision of 35% affordable housing or, if that was shown not to be viable, to such lesser percentage as the scheme could support.

The Sub-Committee could refuse the application and enable the applicant to submit an appeal or Members could decide to defer the application for a second time.

The Development Manager explained that it had not been possible to discuss the consultant's report with the applicant's agent, nor for her to seek instruction from her clients. Under such circumstances, he suggested that the Sub-Committee might wish to authorise the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing to proceed in such a way as he considered appropriate.

It was proposed by Mr Handley and seconded by Mrs Crossland that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to proceed with such alternative as he considered appropriate.

Mr Haine concurred, indicating that the applicants and the Council's Officers appeared to be getting closer to reaching agreement on the quantum of affordable housing the scheme could support. Mr Postan agreed that negotiations should continue and Mr Howard reiterated his concerns in relation to drainage issues.

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

**RESOLVED:** that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to proceed with such alternative as he considered appropriate.

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

132 17/01618/FUL 24 Sellwood Drive, Carterton

The Development Manager introduced the application.

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

The Development Manager then presented the report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Howard expressed his support for the Officers' assessment that, whilst development was acceptable in principle, the current application appeared incongruous and unduly prominent. He proposed the recommendation of refusal which was duly seconded by Mr Kelland.

Mrs Little indicated that the existing property was a brick clad pre-fabricated dwelling dating from the 1940's which had come to the end of its useful life. Whilst welcoming the principle of re-development, Mrs Little agreed that the current proposal was too far out of context.

Mr Good suggested that this application, if approved, could encourage further re-development of these sub-standard units. Mr Enright concurred.

Mrs Crossland agreed that there was a case for replacing all these old units but considered the current application to be over ambitious. However, conscious of the Council's commitment to support the Military Covenant, she expressed the hope that a compromise could be found to enable the project to go forward and encouraged Mr Taylor to liaise with Officers in an effort to devise a more acceptable scheme.

Mr Haine concurred, suggesting that the proposed dwelling could be moved further back into the site and reduced in height.

Mr Postan indicated that he respected the Military Covenant and noted that the ridgeline of the proposed dwelling was only one metre higher than that of the existing. He also indicated that he would prefer to see a break in the building line.

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

Refused

(Mr Eaglestone left the meeting at this juncture)

137 17/01561/RES Land South of Stanmore Crescent, Carterton

The Development Manager presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

In proposing the Officer recommendation, Mr Howard indicated that it was important that the development got underway as soon as possible as the town was suffering from a poor retail offer due to a lack of footfall in the town centre. He expressed concern at the delay on the part of the Ministry of Defence in commencing the redevelopment of its remaining residential landholdings in the town.

The proposition was seconded by Mrs Little who emphasised the importance of development in supporting the viability of the town.

Mr Handley expressed some doubt as to the speed in which development would be completed and questioned whether the applicants could demolish the existing buildings and delay construction of the approved scheme. The Development Manager advised that demolition would constitute a material start but in any event, the developers were keen to proceed.

The applicant's agent confirmed that this was the case and that a tender pack was in preparation with the intention of commencing work in October.

Mr Postan suggested that a better quality of development could have been achieved through an architectural competition.

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

Permitted

142 17/01623/FUL Hardwick Quarry, Downs Road, Standlake

The Development Manager presented the report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Good and, having been duly seconded, was put to the vote and was carried.

Refused

(Mr Kelland left the meeting at this juncture)

16. 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.

17. CONFIRMATION OF TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO.2/2017 – WHEELWRIGHT COURT, HAM LANE, ASTON

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing which sought consideration of the confirmation of Tree Preservation Order No.2/2017 affecting land at Wheelwright Court, Ham Lane, Aston.

Whilst he did not intend to participate in the debate or vote on the matter, Mr Good advised that a petition had been received supporting the retention of the trees.

Mr Howard suggested that the sycamore trees were not worthy of retention and would be better replaced by some alternative species. He enquired how this could be achieved. In response, the Council's forestry Officer advised that if the Tree Preservation Order was confirmed, an application to fell could be submitted and approved subject to appropriate replacement planting. In response to a question from Mrs Crossland he advised that the replacement species could be agreed through negotiation.

Mr Haine drew attention to the report of additional representations and the comments made by the Parish Council regarding the applicant's failure to plant new trees to offset the loss of those resulting from the development. He expressed his support for the Order and proposed that the Tree Preservation Order be confirmed. The proposition was seconded by Mr Enright

Mr Postan expressed his support for the retention of the trees and confirmation of the TPO.

In response to a question from Mr Handley, the Council's Forestry Officer confirmed that an application to prune the trees could be made following confirmation of the Order which would bring such works under the Council's control.

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

**RESOLVED:** That Tree Preservation Order No.2/2017 affecting land at Wheelwright Court, Ham Lane, Aston, be confirmed.

(Mrs Little left the meeting at this juncture)

18. PROGRESS ON ENFORCEMENT CASES

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of progress in respect of enforcement investigations.

In response to a question from Mr Handley it was explained that Officers from Environmental and Regulatory Services responded to complaints about 'A' boards on receipt of complaints.

The meeting closed at 7:15 pm.

CHAIRMAN