

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 6 February 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, N G Colston, C Cottrell-Dormer, A M Graham, T N Owen, A H K Postan. G Saul and T B Simcox

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

54 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 3 January 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The Head of Paid Service reported receipt of the following resignation and temporary appointment:-

Mr J C Cooper for Dr E M E Poskitt

56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr N G Colston declared an interest in Application Nos. 16/03302/OUT (Land North of A44 Worcester Road, Chipping Norton) and 16/03761/OUT (Land West of Quarhill Close, Over Norton) and indicated that he would leave the meeting during their consideration.

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

57 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:-

16/03761/OUT 16/01364/OUT; 16/03297/FUL; 16/03302/OUT; 16/03601/FUL;
16/04118/FUL; 16/02851/OUT; 16/00005/HHD and 16/00006/LBC.

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

3 16/01364/OUT Land East of Oxford Road, Woodstock

The Development Manager advised Members that representations had been received from Mr Sharone Parnes suggesting that the description of development as set out in the agenda was misleading and had caused confusion amongst local residents. He had contended that consideration of the application should be deferred. In response, the Development Manager advised that he did not believe that it was necessary to defer consideration of the application as the description remained accurate and sufficient to enable interested parties to identify the site.

It was apparent that there was general public awareness that the application was to be considered at the meeting and the Development Manager advised that he was satisfied that there had been no effect on the decision making process. In all other respects, Mr Parnes' comments did not raise any new planning issues not already addressed in the report.

The Development Manager indicated that, should the application be approved, the time require to finalise the terms of the proposed legal agreement would enable objectors to raise any further issues prior to the issue of a decision notice. Should any new matters be raised, the application could be referred back to the Sub-Committee for reconsideration.

Mr Haine reported receipt of further observations received since the production of the report of additional representations from Dr Robert McGurrian, Miss Kate Bailey and Councillor Ian Hudpeth.

The Principal Planner then introduced the application and drew attention to the observations of Mr Webley as set out in the report of additional representations. In response to these she advised that each application had to be considered and determined on its own merits.

Mr Sharone Parnes 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 Huw Mellor then addressed the meeting on behalf of the Woodstock Town 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 Cotterill, Mr Mellor indicated that the comments of the Local Plan Inspector to which he had made reference had been made in 2006 or 2007 whilst the refusal of planning permission had taken place a year or so ago.

The applicant's representatives, Ms Jacqueline Mulliner and Mr Dominic Hare, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their respective submissions is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. A summary of her presentation is attached to the original copy of these minutes as Appendix One.

Mr Haine made reference to the concerns expressed by the Woodstock Under Fives association and sought clarification on some of the issues raised. He enquired whether there was a timescale for the provision of alternative facilities and whether there was a need to create additional capacity. In response, the Principal Planner advised that it was intended to provide for early needs care to the north of the site. She explained that it was for the County Council, not West Oxfordshire, to assess the number of places required. The development would simply make provision for a site.

Mr Haine enquired when alternative facilities would be provided and the Principal Planner advised that this was dependent upon the arrangements made for phasing the school redevelopment. However, the terms of the legal agreement could ensure that there was no gap in provision.

Mr Cooper indicated that, whilst he was confident that there was no confusion in the minds of local residents as to the location of the site, a site visit could be beneficial. Accordingly, he proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held. The proposition was seconded by Mr Graham.

Mr Beaney indicated that the County Council's arrangements for the use of its land were an internal matter, not an appropriate planning consideration. The Principal planner advised that it was true to a great extent that this was a matter for the County Council. The application proposed the construction of an early years building in the final phase of development but this would be brought forward to a suitable time to tie in with the redevelopment at the school.

Mr Postan indicated that the development did not give rise to intrusion into the open countryside, nor were there issues of coalescence. He questioned whether there was any benefit in making a site visit.

The recommendation that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held was then put to the vote and was lost.

Mr Simcox suggested that, as the development was some distance from the centre of the town, appropriate cycle routes and footways should be created so as not to encourage residents to drive. The Principal Planner advised that the site was about one kilometre from the town and she envisaged that, whilst there were other possible routes, most people would use the A44 to gain access as it was a level walk.

Mr Cooper noted that the site was at the edge of the District Boundary. He stressed that he was happy to support development that worked and, for the most part, development permitted within the District had been of good quality and beneficial to its associated communities. However, he believed that the current proposals would have serious consequences for the town of Woodstock and Bladon. He considered that it was critical that the terms of the legal agreement were finalised and, whilst he acknowledged the developer contributions on offer, he expressed concern over the potential impact of traffic generation from the site on Shipton road, particularly during school times.

Mr Cooper sought reassurance over foul water drainage issues given the problems that had arisen at Queens Pool and the Blenheim Lake and expressed surprise that no response had been made to the consultation by Oxford Airport. He acknowledged the Town Council's objection that the site had not yet been put before the Planning Inspectorate as part of the emerging Local Plan and noted that the site had been rejected as part of a larger development.

Mr Cooper considered the application to be finely balanced but felt that there had not yet been a full and robust assessment of its impact upon the town centre of Woodstock. He also considered that there was a need to provide additional parking in the town and questioned the potential impact upon the World Heritage site given that concerns in this respect had been raised in relation to the application adjacent to Long Hanborough railway station.

Having also made reference to his concerns over the capacity of the A4095, Mr Cooper indicated that he was unable to support the scheme and proposed that the application be refused as being contrary to Policies BE4(a), H7, H11, B11 and NE3 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan.

In response, the Principal Planner advised that these issues were addressed in the report. With regard to the comparison drawn with the Long Hanborough application, she advised that the current application had to be considered in the light of the current situation and the requirements in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. In terms of the planning balance, the harms in relation to the Hanborough applications had been considered to be less than substantial in both cases. In this instance, Officers considered the benefits on offer to outweigh potential harms.

The proposition to refuse consent was seconded by Mr Graham who expressed concern over the impact upon existing residents which he considered to be substantial in terms of noise and traffic and the consequent impact upon their quality of life. He considered that it was unrealistic to expect residents to access the town on foot and believed that, at 37%, the level of affordable housing proposed was inadequate.

Mr Graham questioned the impact of commercial development on the site upon the town centre and expressed concern over the impact of additional traffic movements onto the already congested A44. He considered the proposals to be out of scale and detrimental to the rural character of the area.

The Principal Planner advised that, whilst the applicants demurred, Officers maintained their position that 50% affordable housing provision was viable on this site. However, the requirements of the NPPF and Government guidance required the Council to negotiate effectively with the applicants on this issue. The Council could not adopt a blanket approach to the affordable housing requirement but had to take the question of viability into account.

Viability was assessed by considering direct costs against sales values. In general, sales values were based upon comparable developments elsewhere but, in this instance, the construction of Phase I would provide real sales values upon which more robust calculations as to viability could be based.

In terms of phasing, whilst the plans indicated that the land to the north would be the last to be developed, there was a need to retain early day nursery provision. The need to provide access was included in the proposed conditions and the County Council needed to have sight of and agree to the Shipton Road link proposals. The timing of the expansion of the school and the provision of a replacement nursery were matters to be defined within the legal agreement between the developers and the County.

Mr Haine questioned whether there was a need for a larger nursery building to cater for increased demand. In response, the Principal Planner advised that it was not necessary to specify this now as the final uses of the community buildings had not been set in stone. There was still a degree of flexibility and detailed proposals could come forward as part of a reserved matters application.

The Development Manager acknowledged that the question of timing was a concern and advised that, if the application was approved, local Members could be kept informed of the progress of the legal agreement.

Mr Beaney indicated that he agreed with the comments made by Councillor Hudspeth and reminded Members of the constraints of the NPPF given that the Council had no Local Plan in place and was unable to evidence a five year land supply. He also drew attention to the recent appeal decision in relation to the site in Burford. However, he was concerned that there was no intention to provide affordable housing as part of the first phase of development and indicated that he felt unable to support the application until details of the phasing arrangements were known. He also questioned whether there should be a noise condition instead of an informative note.

In response, the Principal Planner advised that the detailed terms of the proposed legal agreement were not yet 100% clear. Certain aspects, such as the improvements to the school necessary to release further land for

development had yet to be finalised. This was not an unusual situation as the terms of a legal agreement often took some time to finalise and there was no reason why this development should be treated any differently. The Principal Planner also advised that concerns as to noise were addressed by both conditions and an informative note.

Mr Haine advised that it had taken some time to bring this application forward as the developers and the Council's Officers had been unable to reach an agreement as to the quantum of affordable housing. The Council's advisors maintained that the development could support the provision of 50% affordable housing whilst the applicants contended that the figure was in the region of 37%. Whilst there was no affordable housing provision envisaged in the first phase of development, this would provide actual costs and values by which the appropriate percentage of affordable housing provision could be calculated.

The Development Manager advised that this approach reflected that set out within the emerging Local Plan for calculating the provision of affordable housing and financial viability. This was an 'open book' process that allowed viability to be assessed in real terms. The objective of a Section 106 agreement was to deliver the maximum benefit from a development and achieving this objective was more of an art than a science.

By 'front loading' developer contributions the overall benefit available from a development was reduced as the applicants would be making interest payments on the 'up front' funding. Conversely, if developer contributions were made at a later stage from receipts, a better financial package could be achieved.

Mr Beaney maintained that 50% affordable housing should be required and that phasing details should be provided before the application was determined.

Mr Cotterill indicated that the application was primarily in outline with Phase I being a fully detailed application. The remainder of the site would be subject to a reserved matters application and details of phasing and affordable housing provision would be determined at that stage. The Officer recommendation was one of approval and the Council would find it difficult to defend a refusal at appeal and control over development would be lost to the Planning Inspectorate. He suggested that the loss of retail premises in the town centre owed more to the growth of the internet. Artisan style shops would attract residents from the proposed development to the benefit of the town. He also questioned whether developer funding could be utilised to improve parking provision in the town.

Mr Colston concurred and expressed his support for the application. He indicated that Blenheim Palace was a private house and the estate and the town of Woodstock were reliant on each other. He indicated that he did not consider that the proposed development would be detrimental to the setting of the World Heritage site, suggesting that this was already

compromised to a degree by the erection of marquees during the various events held at the premises.

Mr Postan indicated that the Council was constrained by its current position and suggested that the best way to protect this valuable heritage asset was by retaining control of the development by approving the application. The development would not result in coalescence and the detailed element of the application showed the proposed new dwellings to be well designed. Mr Postan considered the term affordable housing to be a misnomer and favoured the use of shared ownership mortgages.

Mr Graham questioned the use of profits from the development to secure the upkeep of the Palace and factored into the determination of the quantum of affordable housing. He believed that a decision ought not to be based upon the fear of the application being determined on appeal. In response, the Principal Planner advised that a viability assessment was based upon the assumption that a developer would make a reasonable profit; it did not take account of the use to which that profit was to be applied.

Whilst he did not like the development and felt that it would do nothing for Woodstock, Mr Cottrell-Dormer considered that there was no option other than to approve the application.

Given that 50% affordable housing provision had been secured at the recent development at Budds Close, Mr Cooper indicated that he could not understand the applicant's argument as to viability. The Development Manager advised that the same point had been made to the applicants and Officers remained of the view that the same level of provision could be achieved here.

The Principal Planner stressed that Officers had been mindful of other local examples but the applicants had contended that up-front costs were higher in this instance and that development costs were greater given the intent to create an exemplar development. Whilst Officers did not agree that this was the case, development costs could differ hence the intention to review the position on the completion of Phase I.

Mr Simcox questioned whether other low cost housing mechanisms such as a self-build scheme could be applied. The Principal Planner advised that, whilst the emerging Local Plan encouraged diversification of the affordable housing offer, the problem here was that the site required a high quality of development.

Whilst reluctant to do so, Mr Owen agreed to support the application. He believed that concerns over the potential impact upon the World Heritage Site had been over-stated and acknowledged the Estate's need to raise funds to meet the cost of future maintenance. Whilst development of the site had been resisted in the past, the planning landscape had since changed and the Council would no longer be able to support a refusal.

Mr Saul considered that Officers had put forward a strong case for approval and suggested that the affordable housing provision should be weighted in favour of homes to rent. In response, the Principal Planner advised that the respective proportions had yet to be determined and would be assessed in consultation with the Council's Housing Service as the legal agreement progressed. Mr Saul expressed the hope that discounted starter homes would not form part of the affordable housing offer in this instance. The Principal Planner advised that none were proposed at present but that the advice of the Council's Housing Service as to their applicability would be sought closer to the conclusion of the agreement.

Given the nature of the proposed dwellings, Mr Beaney questioned how Phase I of the development would inform the quantum of affordable housing on the remainder of the site. In response, the Principal Planner advised that the calculation would not be based upon individual prices but the total cost of development and sales values. The level of profit generated for the developers would indicate the appropriate quantum of affordable housing on the remainder of the site.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer suggested that profitability was dependent upon the value placed upon the land.

Mr Bishop concurred with Mr Owen, indicating that Woodstock and the Blenheim Estate were mutually reliant. The proposed development would help to support the town which needed growth to be sustained.

The recommendation of refusal proposed by Mr Cooper and seconded by Mr Graham was then put to the vote and was lost.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was then proposed by Mr Cotterill and seconded by Mr Bishop.

Mr Cooper proposed an amendment to that recommendation that condition 32 be revised to require the provision of 50% affordable housing. The amendment was seconded by Mr Beaney and on being put to the vote was lost.

The Principal Planner sought delegated authority to amend the recommended conditions as necessary, (for example, by allowing agreement of materials for each phase rather than agreeing all materials to be used throughout the whole development at the outset), such amendments to be made in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee and the local representatives.

Mr Cotterill questioned whether condition 23 should be amended to extend the period during which replacement planting should be carried out from five to 10 years. As the Blenheim Estate was to retain an interest in the project, the Principal Planner questioned whether such a requirement was warranted.

The substantive motion of conditional approval, amended as detailed above, was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis outlined in the report and to the conditions set out therein, amended as detailed above.

(Mr Cooper and Mr Graham requested that their votes against the foregoing decision be so recorded. Mr Graham left the meeting at this juncture)

59 16/02851/OUT Land South of Milton Road, Shipton-Under-Wychwood

The Principal Planner presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and drew attention to the proposed amendment to Condition 21 set out in the report of additional representations to require the inclusion of reference to a minimum number of 22 school parking spaces.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Principal Planner advised that hedgerow loss would be compensated with new planting on the site.

Mr Simcox expressed mixed views on the development proposal. Whilst he had been aware that there would be some development on the site he had not expected it to be so extensive. He drew attention to the concerns expressed by the Cotswolds Conservation Board and questioned whether sufficient parking was to be provided; expressing his concern that parking was limited and insufficient to meet local need.

Mr Haine indicated that, whilst the additional parking to be provided would be helpful, he would have preferred to have seen further additional provision. Mr Cooper expressed his concern that the development would lead to the coalescence of Milton and Shipton.

In response, the Principal Planner indicated that, whilst limited, the proposed level of parking provision was considered to be sufficient. She also advised that Officers would seek to defend against the development of other sites in the vicinity to avoid coalescence of Shipton and Milton

Mr Haine reminded Members that this was an outline application and that matters of detail could be addressed when considering the reserved matters application.

Mr Postan questioned whether a programme of tree planting such as that implemented by the Woodland Trust could be encouraged to maintain separation between the two settlements.

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

Permitted, subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis set out in the report and to the amendment of condition 21 to require the inclusion of reference to a minimum number of 22 school parking spaces.

82 16/03297/FUL Court Farm, Mawles Lane, Shipton Under Wychwood

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant's architect, Mr David Corley, 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.

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

Mr Simcox indicated that he had no objection to the application in principle and questioned whether Officers had placed too great an emphasis on the retention of trees on the site. He considered that, in order to protect existing trees, the proposed dwelling had been sited too close to Linden House where it would cast shadow onto that property. He also enquired whether the windows facing Linden House could be relocated.

In response, the Planning Officer advised that she did not consider the relationship between the properties to be harmful whilst the trees made a significant contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. Relocation of the first floor window would be problematic due to the roof slope.

Mr Cotterill noted that the trees provided a good level of screening and questioned whether they could be reduced in height. In response, the Planning Officer advised that an application could be submitted but emphasised that the scheme had been designed so as not to encourage the need to prune or fell the existing tree screen.

Mr Cotterill then proposed the Officer recommendation which was seconded by Mr Beaney.

Mr Cooper sought clarification of the relative ground levels between the two properties and it was confirmed that the ground level of the application site was slightly lower than that of Linden House.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer questioned whether the boundary fence could be increased in height so as to remove the need for the ground floor kitchen windows to be non-opening and obscure glazed. In response, the Planning Officer advised that increasing the height of the fence could be harmful to the amenity of the neighbouring residents.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the application and, on being put to the vote, the recommendation of conditional approval was carried.

Permitted

The Planning Officer introduced the application and made reference to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations. He drew attention to the revised and additional conditions and informed Members that the Highway Authority had withdrawn its objections to the development.

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

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

The Planning Officer presented his report and, whilst acknowledging that the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, recommended that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report, amended as set out in the report of additional representations.

Mr Haine expressed concern over the impact of development on this part of the town and its setting within the AONB and the precedent this application could set for future development in the vicinity. He also noted that development in this location was at variance with the Chipping Norton Town Plan.

Mr Saul indicated that, whilst there was some merit in the intention to provide land for self-build dwellings, this was outweighed by the site's lack of sustainability. The site was around a mile away from the town and, whilst there was a bus service currently in operation, this was staffed by volunteers. The developer had not offered any financial contribution to help secure the future of the service. There was also a question surrounding the affordability of the proposed dwellings as self-build properties were not necessarily 'affordable housing'.

Mr Saul acknowledged Mr Haine's concerns regarding the impact of the development upon the AONB, its urbanising effect and the precedent it could set for future ribbon development. He was not convinced that the applicant had demonstrated that there were exceptional circumstances that outweighed these harms. Whilst he accepted that there was a demand for sites for self-build projects, Mr Saul believed that there were more appropriate sites that would come forward. Accordingly, he proposed the Officer recommendation of refusal.

In seconding the recommendation, Mr Cotterill questioned how the self-build aspect of the development could be controlled to prevent the site being sold on. In response, the Development Manager advised that this could be achieved by way of a legal agreement. The Planning Officer advised that the applicants had provided supporting documentation to this effect.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the application, indicating that there was a lack of opportunity for self-build projects and suggesting that this site compared favourably with other examples. Participation in such an initiative would create a community. In response, the Development Manager advised that the similar project recently approved included provision of facilities within the development.

Mr Owen expressed his support for the application, believing that it would not be harmful to the AONB.

The Development Manager emphasised that an AONB was a national Government designation, not a local device to restrict development. Designation did not preclude development but required an applicant to demonstrate that their proposals conserved or enhanced the area. Any major development had to show that there were exceptional circumstances warranting consent. The Development Manager also reiterated concerns over the precedent set by such development.

Mr Cooper expressed his support for the Officer recommendation of refusal and contrasted this application from that at Stonesfield undertaken by a community land trust.

Mr Simcox suggested that self-build schemes were technically affordable housing. The Planning Officer indicated that this was dependent upon plot size and, in this instance, the plots proposed were substantial.

Whilst recognising the concerns over precedent, Mr Bishop expressed support for the application, indicating that there was a need for land for schemes of this nature. Mr Cottrell-Dormer noted that there was no guarantee that this would remain a self-build project and considered that any benefit was outweighed by the precedent.

Mr Postan contended that the self-build aspect was sufficient of itself to constitute exceptional circumstances.

Mr Beaney questioned the extent to which this site would set a precedent. In response, Mr Saul indicated that the site was some distance from the town on the A44 and could set a precedent for building along the north side of that road towards the town.

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

Refused for the following reasons:-

- I. The development as proposed, by reason of its siting would fail to form a logical complement to the existing pattern of development in this area of Chipping Norton and would unduly urbanise the character and appearance of the rural approach to the Town. By reason of its urbanising impact, the development would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the settlement and the

special landscape character of the Cotswolds AONB and would furthermore set a precedent for further development of adjacent sites where in equity development would be difficult to resist and where the scale of development would erode the character of the settlement of Chipping Norton and the landscape and visual qualities of the Cotswolds AONB. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies BE2, NE1, NE3, NE4, H2 and H7 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011; Policies OS2, OS4, H2 and EH1 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031; Policies MP7, MP8 and MP11 of the Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan; as well as the relevant provisions of the NPPF, in particular Paragraphs 17, 58, 64, 109, 115 and 116.

2. In the absence of an ecology survey it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not give rise to undue ecological harm. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies NE13 and NE15 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011; Policy EH2 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031; Policy MP8 of the Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan; and the relevant provisions of the NPPF, in particular Paragraphs 17, 109 and 118.
3. In the absence of any proposed provision of an off-site financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing; or the provision of on-site affordable housing, the development as proposed would fail to provide an adequate contribution to the wider community and as such the proposals would represent socially unsustainable development. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy H11 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011; Policy H3 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031; Policy BD3 of the Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan; and Paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

(Mr N G Colston left the meeting during consideration of the foregoing application)

108 16/03601/FUL Land West of Witney Road, Finstock

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

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

The project manager, Mr Nick House, and the applicant, Mr Tim Rees, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submission is attached as Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report and drew attention to the further observations submitted by Mr Turner, the Finstock Parish Council and the County Archaeologist set out in the report of additional

representations. She advised that she had relayed the concerns expressed by Mr Turner to the Highway Authority which had confirmed that it had no objection to the development proposals.

The Planning Officer also made reference to the comments made by the applicant regarding the necessity of a further ecology survey and confirmed that Officers wished to see additional work carried out in this respect. She went on to recommend that Officers be authorised to approve the application subject to the applicants satisfactorily addressing the issues raised by the Council's Ecologist, entering into a legal agreement to secure the retention of the woodland screen and provide a connection for users of the holiday lets through the woodland to public rights of way and to conditions covering the issues identified in the report and construction and drainage details of the access road.

Whilst initially cautious of the proposals, Mr Cottrell-Dormer advised that he had been impressed by the application and the Company's website and proposed the Officer recommendation.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Colston indicated that he would prefer to see the parking areas surfaced with natural materials. In response, the Planning Officer advised that it was intended to exercise control over the materials used through conditions. Mr Colston also suggested that, given that the development was only on a fraction of the land of the estate, any ecological damage was likely to be minimal.

Mr Cotterill questioned whether a deer fence could be provided and the Planning Officer advised that this could be considered through the proposed conditions.

Mr Owen expressed his support for the application and suggested that the applicants be requested to maintain a dialogue with Mr Turner. Mr Cooper indicated that he had found the site visit to be beneficial and questioned the need for a further ecological survey. In response, the Development Manager advised that the scope of the initial survey had been limited and that a wider survey was required. Mr Haine enquired whether this would give rise to unnecessary delay and the Development Manager indicated that the survey could be carried out whilst the proposed legal agreement was being completed.

Mr Bishop considered the proposals to be of good design and scale and questioned the need for a further survey. Mr Cottrell-Dormer concurred.

Mr Postan advised that he had personal experience of land designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and believed that the necessary survey could be undertaken quickly and without significant cost.

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

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to the applicants satisfactorily addressing the issues raised by the Council's Ecologist, entering into a legal agreement to secure the retention of the woodland screen and provide a connection for users of the holiday lets through the woodland to public rights of way and to conditions covering the issues identified in the report and construction and drainage details of the access road.

(Mr A C Beaney left the meeting at this juncture)

122 16/03761/OUT Land West of Quarhill Close, Over Norton

In the absence of a number of important consultation responses the Planning Officer recommended that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

136 16/03989/FUL 42 Oxford Road, Woodstock

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

141 16/04188/FUL Cuckoo Wood Farm, Eynsham Road, Freeland

The Development Manager introduced the application and drew attention to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations.

The applicant's agent, Mr Mark Chattoe, then addressed the meeting in support of 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 and recommended that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to no new substantive issues being raised during a further period of consultation with the Freeland Parish Council.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and seconded by Mr Simcox and on being put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to no new substantive issues being raised during a further period of consultation with the Freeland Parish Council.

I45 I7/00006/HHD Elm Tree Cotage, Witney Lane, Leafield

The Planning Officer presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval which, having been duly proposed and seconded, was put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted

I49 I7/00007/LBC Elm Tree Cotage, Witney Lane, Leafield

The Planning Officer presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval which, having been duly proposed and seconded, was put to the vote and was carried.

Listed Building Consent be granted

58 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISION

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

The meeting closed at 7:00pm.

CHAIRMAN