

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2.00pm on Monday 1 August 2016

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, N G Colston, C Cottrell-Dormer, Ms E P R Leffman, T N Owen, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, W D Robinson*, G Saul and T B Simcox

(*Denotes non-voting Member)

Officers in attendance: Catherine Tetlow, Kim Smith, Abby Fettes, Joanna Lishman, Michael Kemp and Paul Cracknell

16 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that, subject to the deletion of Mr W D Robinson from the list of Members present, the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 4 July 2016, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The Chief Executive reported receipt of the following resignation and temporary appointment:-

Ms E P R Leffman for A M Graham,

18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

19 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:-

16/01353/OUT; 16/01870/FUL; 16/01676/S73; 16/01677/S73; 16/01239/FUL; 16/01240/LBC; 16/01566/FUL; 16/01819/HHD; and 16/01865/FUL

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

3 16/01239/FUL The Dragon Inn, 152 High Street, Burford

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and drew attention to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations. She noted that the County Council had confirmed that there were no objections to the development on highway grounds.

Mr Cotterill stated that it had been helpful for Members to have had the opportunity to visit the site and indicated that he believed that the works carried out to date had been beneficial. Whilst a significant amount of work remained outstanding, Mr Cotterill considered the development to be worthwhile and, whilst recognising concerns expressed regarding the competition for parking, proposed the Officer recommendation.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Owen.

Mr Postan noted that, when working in such sensitive locations, it was important not only to require that traditional materials were to be used, but also to ensure that construction techniques reflected traditional building methods. Failure to do so could result in the intended effect being lost.

The Planning Officer advised that the condition requiring works to match the adjoining original fabric of the building was intended to address this concern.

Dr Poskitt questioned why the current application had not formed part of the original development proposals but was advised that the applicant's intentions in this respect were not known.

Mr Bishop concurred with Mr Cotterill and, whilst acknowledging Mr Postan's concerns, suggested that any disparity in appearance between new and existing construction would diminish as the new materials weathered.

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

Permitted

14 16/01240/LBC The Dragon Inn, 152 High Street, Burford

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

Listed Building Consent be granted

The Planning Officer introduced the application. She advised Members of receipt of an anonymous letter, submitted by hand, the content of which she considered to be inappropriate and which she did not intend to convey to the Sub-Committee. The Planning Officer informed Members that the petition referred to at paragraph 5.43 of the report had been submitted in relation to the previous rather than the current application and advised that condition 3 should be amended to refer to plans: 14-112-002 Rev A; X-2 Rev A; D-10A; D-11A; and D-12A.

Mr Peter Newell, the Chairman of Freeland Parish Council, then 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.

Ms Becky Brown, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

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

Mr Robinson indicated that, whilst he did not consider this to be a desirable site and was sympathetic to the views expressed by local residents, it already enjoyed the benefit of planning permission for 29 units. In the absence of objections from the County Council on highways grounds, he did not believe that a refusal could be sustained on appeal.

Mr Owen concurred and, whilst cognisant of the distress that would be felt by local residents, proposed the Officer recommendation. In seconding the proposition, Mr Cotterill expressed his disappointment over the County Council's stance on additional traffic generation.

Mr Beaney agreed that there was no option but to approve the application but emphasised that conditions needed to be tightly drawn. He went on to suggest that, following the recent withdrawal of County Council subsidies, developer funding sought for improvements to bus services should be directed towards the primary school. Mr Beaney also questioned whether the extent of landscaped areas and open space shown on the indicative layout could be protected by condition at this stage.

The Planning Officer advised that she would explore the possibility of the reallocation of S106 funding with the County Council and explained that, whilst the applicants could seek to revise the layout of the site at the reserved matters stage, condition 3 required the reserved matters application to be in general accordance with the submitted plans as regards layout and landscaping.

In response to a question from Mr Postan it was confirmed that the development would deliver 50% affordable housing.

Mr Postan also noted that the A4095 had experienced the greatest percentage increase in vehicle movements in recent years and the County Council's disregard of minor increases in traffic generation failed to recognise their cumulative effect.

The Planning Officer concurred but indicated that the Council was unable to disregard the Highway Authority's technical advice.

Ms Leffman expressed concern that there was no pedestrian access to the village from the development site and questioned whether funding requested for improvements to bus services should be directed towards the provision of a footway. The Planning Officer advised that she would explore the possibility of such reallocation of S106 funding with the County Council.

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

Permitted subject to the amendment of condition 3 to refer to the plans specified above, to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and the developer contributions outlined in the report (subject to further discussion regarding the application of the sum of £1,000 per additional dwelling sought for improvements to bus services to education and/or footway provision and discussion regarding potential phasing of development in relation to the delivery of education capacity in this location).

38 16/01566/FUL Land North of Gas Lane and Ascott Road, Shipton-Under-Wychwood

The Planning Officer presented her report and suggested the following amendments to her recommendation:-

The amendment of condition 13 to refer to additional use classes D, F and G, the deletion of note 2 and its incorporation into condition 2 and the inclusion of the following additional conditions:-

14. *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.*

15. *That a scheme for the landscaping of the site, including the retention of any existing trees and shrubs and planting of additional trees and shrubs, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. This shall include an updated Tree Protection Plan. The scheme 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 ensure the safeguarding of the character and landscape of the area during and post development.

Mr Simcox indicated that the Parish Council was somewhat confused by the current application, believing that the site could accommodate a greater number of dwellings and questioning the merit of requiring the design of the proposed building to reflect a previous but long demolished structure formerly located on the site.

The Planning Officer advised that the Council's Conservation Architect considered that the proposed single, low key structure would be a more appropriate form of development, a view reflected in a previous appeal decision on the site.

Ms Leffman concurred with the Parish Council, expressing her distaste for the design and, in particular, the use of timber cladding.

Mr Owen expressed his support for the development and proposed the revised Officer recommendation. This was seconded by Mr Postan who suggested that the proposed structure would sit well in this location, much as those seen during the recent site visit to Soho House.

Mr Colston demurred, indicating that he believed that a development of greater density would be more appropriate. Mr Cottrell-Dormer expressed his dislike of the design.

Whilst indicating that it was not to her taste, Dr Poskitt considered that there were no grounds upon which the application could be refused.

The Planning Officer explained that the site represented an important open space and that any construction needed to recognise the nature of the site. The siting of the proposed development reflected that of the building previously located on the site and, as such, was more in keeping with the location than a more suburban form of development that would appear to be incongruous and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

Mr Robinson indicated that the developer was amongst the best operating within the District and was used to delivering high quality schemes in sensitive rural areas. He was convinced that the proposed building would fit well in the locality. Mr Bishop concurred.

On being put to the vote the revised Officer recommendation was carried.

Permitted subject to the amendment of condition 13 to refer to additional use classes D, F and G, the deletion of note 2 and its incorporation into condition 2 and the inclusion of the following additional conditions:-

14. 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.

15. That a scheme for the landscaping of the site, including the retention of any existing trees and shrubs and planting of additional trees and shrubs, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. This shall include an updated Tree Protection Plan. The scheme 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 ensure the safeguarding of the character and landscape of the area during and post development.

(Mr Robinson left the meeting at this juncture)

48 16/01819/HHD Glencott, 88 Lower End, Leafield

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and seconded by Mr Bishop and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The Local Representative, Mr Julian Cooper then addressed the meeting.

He expressed concern that the proposed development would place greater pressure on the main thoroughfare into the town, noting the increased traffic generation arising from various developments previously approved. Additional traffic feeding into Hensington Road added to the challenges already faced in this area and Mr Cooper made reference to earlier discussions with the County Council seeking to address these difficulties.

Whilst recognising the applicant's desire to redevelop the existing hall, Mr Cooper wished to make sure that determination of the application took account of other schemes in the vicinity that had already gained planning approval and to attempt to ensure that traffic flows in Woodstock were 'future proofed' to avoid repetition of difficulties that had been encountered in the past.

Mrs Marie Stubbs then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. She made reference to additional letters of support sent directly to Members and reported receipt of a number of further letters of support received since the publication of the report of additional representations. She drew attention to the report of additional representations and advised Members that the County Council had confirmed that it had no objection to the development on highways grounds.

Dr Poskitt indicated that the applicants had undertaken a lot of work to address concerns expressed by local residents and considered that the revisions made provided a reasonable solution to them.

The existing building was in need of replacement and a larger hall would be a valuable addition to local facilities. Whilst acknowledging Mr Cooper's concerns, Dr Poskitt considered that any difficulties encountered would not be a result of this development but of the level of development permitted in the town in general, particularly as the peak periods of use of the hall were likely to occur when the roads were otherwise quiet. Accordingly, she proposed the Officer recommendation of conditional approval.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Cotterill noted that condition 8 failed to specify the level of internally generated noise to be addressed through the provision of sound insulation and questioned the sound levels specified in condition 9. In response, the Planning Officer undertook to seek further advice on the applicable sound levels from the Environmental Health Service.

Mr Beaney noted that the condition regarding fixed lights/glazing suggested by Environmental Health (public protection) referred to at paragraph 1.3 of the report had not been included in the recommended list of conditions. Dr Poskitt and Mr Cotterill agreed to incorporate this condition in their proposal.

Mr Beaney also noted that there was a discrepancy between the number of spaces to be provided and that specified in the Design and Access Statement. The Planning Officer explained that the Statement had not been updated to reflect revised plans.

Mr Postan indicated that the specified dimensions of the car parking spaces were inadequate and suggested that spaces should be defined in a practical way to ensure that they were useable. The Planning Officer advised that, as the dimensions met the County Council's technical standard of 2.4m by 4.8m, the Council could not impose differing standards unilaterally.

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

Permitted subject to the amendment of conditions 8 and 9 to read as follows:-

8. The building shall be so constructed as to provide sound insulation against internally generated noise (of 85 dB(A)) with windows shut and other means of ventilation provided, to accord with BS. 8233:2014 'Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.
Reason: To safeguard the character of the area and living/working conditions in nearby properties.
9. Noise levels at the site boundaries, measured at 1.2 metres above ground level, shall not exceed 42 dB(A) Leq (1 hour) during hours of permitted operation and 35 dB(A) Leq (15 minutes) at all other times.

and to the following additional condition:-

10. Before first occupation of the building/extension hereby permitted the window(s) W10, W11, W12, W13 shall be fitted with obscure glazing and shall be fixed shut (without any opening mechanism) and shall be retained in that condition thereafter.
Reason: To safeguard privacy in the adjacent property.

58 16/01676/S73 Penhurst School, New Street, Chipping Norton

The Planning Officer introduced the application and made reference to the content of the report of additional representations

Mr Stephen Williams then addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Beaney questioned Mr Williams' suggestion that the Council's Environmental Health Service objected to the application. In response, Mr Williams explained that Environmental Health had objected to the original application which had subsequently been withdrawn and indicated that he was seeking further revision of the proposals.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Environmental Health Service had not objected to the current application.

Mr Saul indicated that the revised proposals placed the smoking shelter closer to the objector's property and that he would prefer to see it relocated further away. He proposed that the application be refused as he considered it to be contrary to policies BE2(c) and BE18 of the Adopted Local Plan and OS4 and EH6 of the Emerging Local Plan. The recommendation was seconded by Dr Poskitt.

Mr Haine suggested that the development could give rise to unacceptable levels of noise detrimental to the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The Planning Officer reminded Members that the area in question could be used in any event and that it was only the physical construction that fell under planning control.

Environmental Health Officers had confirmed that the distance of 18m between the shelter and adjoining properties provided adequate separation and, in response to a question from Mr Simcox, advised that there were a number of possible exits and routes by which the proposed shelter could be reached.

Mr Postan indicated that the location of the shelter was important and concluded that it would be preferable if it were to be located elsewhere.

Mr Owen indicated that, whilst he believed that the shelter would not give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance in the proposed location; it would be preferable if it was relocated elsewhere on the site. Mr Colston concurred.

In response to a question from Mr Beaney, the Planning Officer advised that the Chipping Norton Air Quality Plan only applied to Horsefair, not the town as a whole.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer expressed his support for the application whilst Mr Postan urged refusal.

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

Refused for the following reason:-

- I. By reason of its location in proximity to adjoining properties the proposal will generate unacceptable noise and activity to the detriment of the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies BE2(c) and BE18 of the Adopted Local Plan and OS4 and EH6 of the Emerging Local Plan.

63 16/01677/S73 Penhurst School, New Street, Chipping Norton

The Planning Officer introduced the application and made reference to the report of additional representations and the amended recommendation that the conditions attached to the original permission be incorporated into any consent.

Mr Jonathan Souster then addressed the meeting in objection to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report.

Mr Saul expressed his disappointment that the applicants had chosen not to relocate the air conditioning units and questioned whether the conditions proposed were adequate.

In response, the Senior Environmental Health Officer advised that BS 4142 set out the relevant applicable standard and that he had no reason to question the applicant's noise consultant's assertion that this would be met. The mitigation measures proposed were robust and the installation would have a low impact and accord with BS 4142. The proposed conditions would hold the applicants to meeting the low level of noise specified which could be measured by reference to the relevant rating system. In response to a further question from Mr Saul, he advised that any monitoring would be complaint driven and emphasised that the specified noise limits were very low.

Mr Beaney agreed with the Officers' analysis and proposed the recommendation of conditional approval. In seconding the recommendation, Mr Cottrell-Dormer questioned whether a further condition should be applied to address concerns over smells from the kitchen extraction unit and the Planning Officer advised that the appropriate standard condition could be applied. Mr Beaney agreed to amend his proposition accordingly.

Ms Leffman considered that, whilst regrettable, there were no grounds upon which the application could be refused. Mr Cotterill acknowledged the concerns expressed by local residents but reiterated that the noise levels in the conditions proposed were very low.

Mr Colston questioned whether seasonal variations should also be applied to the level of noise emissions. The Planning Officer emphasised that the specified levels were low and sought an assurance from the Senior Environmental Health Officer that these were achievable. It was confirmed that the levels proposed were considered appropriate and, in response to a question from Mr Postan, it was confirmed by Officers that the conditions proposed were sufficiently robust.

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

Permitted subject to the following conditions:-

1. That the development be carried out in accordance with the plans approved under applications 14/0754/P/FP, 15/02308/CND, 15/01519/CND, 16/00800/NMA and the approved plans listed below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
2. (i) Noise emissions attributable to the kitchen extract and condensers shall be limited to a level not exceeding a rating noise level limit (LAr) of 34 dB during daytime (07:00-23:00) and 20 dB during night time (23:00-07:00) 1m from the facade of the nearest noise sensitive receiver*

(ii) A three sided acoustic screen shall be installed around the air condensers and an attenuator shall be fitted to the discharge side of the fan (located inside the roof void) as per the design specifications given in the Chipping Norton Care Home Ramboll Environment Noise Impact assessment report (9 May 2016) Project no.1620002149.

(iii) Noise emitted at any time from the condensers and extract shall not contain any discrete continuous note, ie. whine, hiss, screech, hum etc. or distinct impulses i.e. bangs, clicks, clatters or thumps (that are repeated as part of normal operations) audible at 1m from the façade of any noise sensitive properties in the locality.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenities.
3. The installation of commercial kitchen plant, and any processes conducted thereon, shall not commence until full details of a technical scheme to filter and minimise odour and smoke emissions from the kitchen extraction/ventilation flue, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The extract/ventilation duct flue shall discharge vertically upward, unimpeded by flue terminals, at a point not less than 1 metre above the roof ridge of any building within 20 m of the building housing the commercial kitchen, in accordance with the 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems' (Defra 2005).

The scheme must include a schedule of odour abatement and flue maintenance. The use hereby permitted shall not proceed, and the condition shall not be discharged, unless and until the system as approved has been installed in complete accordance with that submission by a competent body. The plant shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specification.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

4. The window and door frames shall be recessed a minimum distance of 75mm from the face of the building unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the architectural detailing of the building reflects the established character of the locality.

5. 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.

6. The mitigation measures for the protection of bats in Monks Dene shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out in Lockhart Garratt Bat Survey Report April 2014 and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the protection of protected species.

7. The approved scheme of hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be implemented in full within 12 months of the completion of the development hereby approved or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the character and landscape of the area.

8. The scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following first occupation of the development in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping shall 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: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

9. No development shall commence until all existing trees which are shown to be retained have been protected in accordance with the details contained within the Arboriculture Report and Tree Condition Survey dated May 2014 submitted in support of the application. 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 safeguard features that contribute to the character and landscape of the area.

10. 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 (Policy BE3 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
11. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until all the roads, driveways and footpaths serving the development have been drained, constructed and surfaced in accordance with plans and specifications that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of road safety. (Policy BE3 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011)
12. No floodlighting or other form of external lighting shall be installed except in accordance with details which have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include location, height, type and direction of light sources and intensity of illumination. Any lighting which is so installed shall not thereafter be altered without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
13. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved surface water drainage details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained in accordance with the management plan thereafter.
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 the supporting Technical Guidance).
14. That the use of the site shall be limited to C2 use as described in the application details (Planning and Consultation Statement May 2014 paragraphs 7.4 and 7.5).
Reason: In the interests of highway safety, sustainable development, the general amenities of the area and for the avoidance of doubt.

INFORMATIVES:-

1. The rating noise level limit shall be assessed based on guidance contained in BS.4142:2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial noise.

68 16/01865/FUL Highfield Farm, Laughton Hill, Stonesfield

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

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Bishop who considered that the mast would be adequately screened by existing woodland and seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer. Mr Bishop noted that the 'airfield' referred to by objectors was a private landing strip that was only used on an occasional basis.

In response to a suggestion from Mr Beaney, it was agreed that a further condition be applied regarding the colour finish to be applied to the proposed boundary fence.

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

Permitted subject to the following additional condition:-

5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a detailed specification of the proposed boundary fence, including colour finish shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.
Reason: To protect the landscape character and visual amenity of the locality

20 LAND EAST OF FARLEY CORNER, FARLEY LANE, STONESFIELD - APPLICATION NO. 15/04215/FUL

The Chairman reminded Members that, at its meeting held on 29 March, 2016, it had been resolved to approve an application for 13 dwellings and land for a cemetery at land east of Farley Corner, Farley Lane, Stonesfield.

Members decided that it would be preferable if the £13,000 requested by the County Council was redirected towards the provision of affordable housing within the District. The Planning Officer also explained both in the report and verbally at the meeting that the County Council had also requested the provision of footpaths along The Ridings towards the cemetery but that this could be provided by a separate section 278 agreement. The local representative had previously expressed surprise as the requirement for footpaths on the edge of Stonesfield given the lack of footpaths within the rest of the village.

The legal agreement has now stalled as the County Council is seeking to secure the £13,000 towards bus services and insisting on the footpath to the cemetery by requiring a S278 agreement. The County is also seeking to claim a contribution to library facilities which did not form part of the officer recommendation, nor the Sub-Committee's resolution

To resolve these issues the applicant has requested that this matter be referred back to the Sub-Committee for clarification in order that the legal agreement can be completed.

RESOLVED: That it be confirmed and the County Council be advised:-

- (a) that no developer contributions are required for improvements to bus services but that the sum of £1,000 per property be required as a contribution towards affordable housing in West Oxfordshire.
- (b) that approval of the application was not conditional upon the provision of footpaths.
- (c) that no developer contributions are required towards the provision of library facilities.

21 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers together with appeal decisions was received and noted.

22 THE GRANGE, WOODSTOCK ROAD, CHARLBURY – APPLICATION NO. 16/02407/FUL

The Planning Officer advised that the local representative, Ms E P R Leffman, had requested that arrangements be made for a formal site visit to be held to enable Members to assess the potential impact of this development on the site prior to consideration by the Sub-Committee.

RESOLVED: That a site visit be held on Thursday 1 September 2016.

The meeting closed at 4:50pm.

CHAIRMAN