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 4 December 2017

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman), A C Beaney, R J M Bishop, C Cottrell-Dormer, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, G Saul, and C J A Virgin.

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

61 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 6 November, 2017, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mr N G Colston, Mrs M J Crossland and Mr T B Simcox, and from Mrs J C Baker who was absent of official business.

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

63 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Bishop declared an interest in application No. 17/03281/HHD (Glenrise, Churchfields, Stonesfield) as the applicant. Mr Haine declared a personal interest in application Nos. 17/03057/FUL (Land North of Gas Lane and Ascott Road, Shipton Under Wychwood) and 17/03078/FUL (High Fields, Church Road, Milton Under Wychwood) and indicated that he would leave the meeting during their consideration.

Whilst not a disclosable interest, Dr Poskitt advised that she was a member of the Woodstock Town Council which was the owner of the Community Centre adjacent to 30 New Road, Woodstock, the site considered under application reference No. 17/01911/FUL.

64 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:

4 15/03099/FUL Land South of Forest Road, Charlbury

The Development Manager introduced the application and reported receipt of additional representations from the Friends of the Evenlode Valley, the applicant, the County Council in its role as Joint Commissioning Body and a further six letters of support.

Mr Jim Clemence, representing the Friends of the Evenlode Valley, 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 Virgin, Mr Clemence indicated that proposals for a business park had been put forward by a developer the landowner in the Local Plan consultation. Asked why he believed that the proposed dementia unit would not be delivered, Mr Clemence indicated that, whilst the proposed legal agreement intended to see the unit provided, it could not guarantee its delivery and allowed for an alternative use as a general care unit. the officer's report confirmed that the applicant intended it to be a be a dementia care unit but that this could not be guaranteed because it was claimed to be an innovative concept and as a result the consent being requested was for a general care unit.

The Local representative, Ms E P R Leffman, then addressed the meeting and expressed her support for the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Ms Caroline Langridge and Mr Alistair Ross, the applicant's representatives, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Beaney, Ms Langridge confirmed that YoungDementia UK was still associated involved with the project.

The Development Manager then presented his report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. He indicated that it was for Members to judge whether or not the site was an adjacent outlier to the existing settlement.

In response to comments made by Mr Clemence, he advised that, whilst an enterprise village had been proposed by the landowner during the Local Plan consultation process, Officers had advised that this would not be supported and no application had been forthcoming. He explained that, given the nature of the current proposal, the grant of consent would not in his view 'open the floodgates' for further development. He acknowledged that the terms of the proposed legal agreement would need to be clarified and incorporate safeguards to ensure delivery of the benefits as put forward.

The Development Manager noted that the objections submitted by the Cotswolds Conservation Board had been available in full on the Council's website and had been received by Members from elsewhere.

The application retained a fall-back position through the proposed legal agreement for use as a general care home, not for general housing. However, funding and a development partner were in place for provision of the intended young dementia facility. Whilst he remained confident that this is what would be delivered, the Development Manager reiterated that the fall-back position was still that of a care use.

The Development Manager then went on to present his report in detail and confirmed that the discount market housing on the site would be retained as such through the legal agreement.

Mr Haine noted that, whilst there was significant support for the application, there had also been a lot of local opposition. He was concerned that the grant of consent could set an unwelcome precedent for further development that would be harmful to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, nearby listed buildings and the surrounding landscape.

Mr Haine was of the opinion that the Council was in fact able to demonstrate that it had a five year housing land supply hence paragraphs 14 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework were not relevant to the consideration of the current application and that paragraphs 115 and 116 did apply. Mr Haine considered the proposed scheme to constitute 'Major Development' for these purposes and made reference to DCLG guidance that defined 'Small Scale Major Development' as being between 10 and 99 units.

The Development Manager explained that this definition related to statistical returns and case law had established that it was not the applicable test for defining 'Major Development' in AONB terms.

Mr Haine indicated that he was still of the opinion that, in its context, the proposal represented major development. Whilst he was happy with the proposals for the dementia care facility, Mr Haine could not support the provision of the additional 25 housing units. He considered these to be in an unsustainable location outside the town which would result in considerable harm in planning terms.

Mr Beaney agreed with Mr Haine, indicating that, whilst he supported the principle of development, he could not support the current application as he had concerns over the efficacy of the proposed legal agreement. He acknowledged the need for housing and suggested that this site should be considered as an exception site with housing reserved for those with an immediate local connection.

Mr Beaney believed that the security of the buffer zone should be strengthened, perhaps by way of land ownership and, whilst recognising the need to construct the housing prior to the dementia care facility, wished to see greater certainty that the proposed dementia care unit would be delivered rather than a general care home.

Mr Beaney considered that condition 9 should be strengthened to ensure that an appropriate standard of construction was employed within the AONB and wished to see more detail as to how condition 17 would be met.

In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst the legal agreement relating to the earlier decision secured developer funding for the County Council, a new agreement would be required to relate to the current decision. In consequence, it would be possible to strengthen the proposed terms.

The Development Manager advised that, whilst the dementia care unit was a sui generis use in planning terms, it may be possible to restrict development to this purpose alone by condition. However, it was likely that the scheme's funders would want the security of a fall-back position in the event that the intended scheme was to fail. He explained that the self-build element of the scheme would require a local connection and would apply in perpetuity with any future sale being subject to a moratorium period during which a purchaser with a local connection could be identified.

The Development Manager also assured Members that the integrity of the proposed buffer zone could be clarified through the legal agreement.

With regard to the comments made by Mr Haine, he explained that there was significant cross-subsidy with Cottsway Housing between the two elements of the scheme and that it was not possible to isolate the dementia care unit from the housing element. In terms of a five year housing land supply, the Development Manager advised that the 37 units subject to the earlier decision were counted towards the Council's figures.

Whilst he acknowledged Members' concerns with regard to precedent, the Development Manager emphasised the range of benefits on offer. If Members considered these to be insufficient then they should refuse the application but the Development Manager stressed that, in his experience, he had not been involved with a scheme that offered such great a range of locally promoted benefits for the community.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer indicated that he could not support the application as he did not view the site as being on the edge of the settlement.

Mr Cotterill expressed his support for the application, suggesting that condition 12 should be strengthened to protect the integrity of the planting belt. Given that West Oxfordshire had fewer than half the number of care beds provided either nationally or in the rest of the County, Mr Cotterill was less concerned over the provision of a dementia care unit and believed

that the application should either be permitted or deferred for further consideration.

The Development Manager advised that concerns over materials, landscaping and noise amelioration measures could be addressed by way of conditions. It would also be possible to strengthen and enhance the buffer zone.

However, he was unable to say whether the scheme would remain viable with a restriction of use to a dementia care unit only.

Mr Cotterill reiterated that he was content to see either a dementia unit or a general care home on the site and proposed that the application be approved subject to a legal agreement and conditions revised as indicated above. The proposition was seconded by Mr Postan who stressed that the need for care facilities for dementia sufferers was essential. He expressed some concern that those in need of long term care would effectively block access for new residents, turning the unit from its intended purpose into a de facto care home.

Mr Postan agreed that the future of the buffer zone should be secured, preferably by way of land ownership rather than designation. Providing that appropriate materials were used he did not consider that the development would be harmful to the AONB but, given the location of the site, suggested that a construction traffic management plan should be imposed. The Development Manager advised that this could be incorporated by condition and Mr Cotterill agreed to revise his proposition accordingly.

Mr Saul indicated that, whilst it could be argued whether or not the application represented major development, even if it did he considered that it should be approved in view of its exceptional circumstances. He also confirmed that he was content with the fall-back position of providing a general care home.

Mr Bishop thanked Officers for their comprehensive report and indicated that he would support the current application as he had the previous decision. He recognised that this was a balanced judgement but viewed the development on the outskirts of the town to bring unique benefits in the form of the dementia care unit. Dr Poskitt concurred.

Mr Virgin stated that he considered the site to be too far out of town and felt that it could not be seen as a natural extension of the settlement and Mr Haine expressed concern over the impact of development in the AONB upon tourism within the District.

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

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement as set out in the report, revised as indicated above to incorporate the extension and clarification of the future management of the proposed buffer zone (if

possible through its transfer to separate ownership), the requirement that Discount Market Housing (at 90% of open market value) be secured for the intermediate units with a 'local connection' condition and moratorium to seek further local connection buyers before any open market sale (and with 10% discount and local connection applied on any subsequent sales in perpetuity), to the phased delivery and retention of the facilities secured through the agreement and to the first use of the care home being for young dementia care.

to the amendment of the following conditions to read as follows:-

- 9. The proposed building and dwellings shall be constructed of materials appropriate to the sensitivity of the AONB and setting of conservation area context and a schedule of such materials including samples and sample panels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to their use and development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the said samples.
- A scheme of hard and soft landscaping of the site shall be submitted 12. to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The scheme shall include the measures proposed to enhance the landscaping on the site, the retention of any existing trees and shrubs and planting of additional trees and shrubs; proposed finished levels or contours; all ground surface treatments and materials; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; minor artefacts and structure; retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant and shall be implemented as approved within 12 months of the commencement of the approved development or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme. In the event of any of the trees or shrubs so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within 5 years of the completion of the development, a new tree or shrub of equivalent number and species, shall be planted as a replacement and thereafter properly maintained.
- 17. Prior to the commencement of development details of the means to protect the occupiers of the dwellings from potential rail noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and the said agreed measures shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation and be retained in place thereafter.

The measures necessary to discharge the terms of this condition are likely to involve works to the fabric and fenestration of the buildings. External noise barriers will not be likely to be acceptable due to their impact on the AONB/Conservation Area.

and to the following additional condition:-

18. A Construction Traffic management Plan (CTMP) shall be agreed in writing by the LPA in conjunction with the Highway Authority prior to development commencing with the said CTMP aimed in particular at ensuring delivery times avoid nursery school drop off/pick up and that suitable access routes are used by construction traffic.

·

Reason: To minimise the impact of construction traffic.

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

Olivers Garage, 80-82 Main Road, Long Hanborough

42 17/00309/FUL

Mr Neils Chapman, the Chairman of the Chairman of Hanborough Parish Council, addressed the meeting in opposition to support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr David Ullathorne and Mr Andrew Haynes, the applicant's representatives, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Cotterill, Mr Haynes advised that the assertion that the proposed developer contribution of £150,000 would fund the provision of five affordable units had been calculated by comparison with a recent Cottsway scheme in Chipping Norton. Mr Postan enquired whether the applicants had considered an assisted purchase scheme and Mr Ullathorne advised that the Government's Help to Buy scheme was to be available to first time buyers.

The Principal Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal, indicating that the provision of affordable housing was the key issue for consideration.

Mr Beaney indicated that, whilst he liked the design and layout of the scheme, he considered the proposed financial contribution toward affordable housing to be inadequate. He asked how the contribution had been calculated and whether it had taken account of the existing residential properties on the site. The Development Manager advised that the contribution had been based upon the net gain in numbers but explained that, if the value of the existing properties was included in the land value, it could not then be discounted against when assessing the contribution towards affordable housing.

Mr Cotterill considered that the development should go ahead but he too found the proposed contribution unacceptable. He stressed that the site should be re-developed and questioned whether there was any merit in deferring consideration of the application for further discussion between Officers and the applicants.

Mr Cotterill acknowledged that the cost of remedial work would be high and that the value of the existing properties on the site was low.

The Development Manager cautioned that to negotiate a financial contribution without a sound evidential base would prejudice the Council's position in the future as developers would seek to use this, rather than the Council's policy as precedent.

Mr Haine indicated that he would have preferred to see affordable housing provision made on-site.

Mr Virgin considered that development should proceed but agreed that the current level of contribution was unsatisfactory. Dr Poskitt suggested that there was a need for affordable housing on-site, not just a financial contribution.

Mr Postan asked what information was required from the developer as it would be preferable for all parties if it were possible to avoid an appeal. The Development Manager advised that it was for the developer to provide information to support their case. The Council sought independent advice on the information received and in this instance; discussion between both parties' consultants had failed to reach agreement. He reiterated that, if the Council was to agree to accept a contribution at less than full value, a precedent would be set for future negotiations.

In light of this advice, Mr Postan suggested that even if the Council was to lose an appeal on this site, it would be compensated in the long term in affordable housing policy terms.

Mr Haine indicated that the application should be refused and believed that the Council would be successful in any appeal.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was proposed by Mr Beaney and seconded by Mr Postan and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

56 17/00829/FUL <u>I Hill Rise, Woodstock</u>

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Simon Newton, the applicant's agent, 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 then presented his report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Postan reminded Members that consideration of this application had been deferred pending receipt of the Landscape and Heritage Assessment

undertaken in relation to the adjacent site. This had now been received and acknowledged the sensitivity of the site. Accordingly, Mr Postan proposed the Officer recommendation of refusal.

Mr Cotterill sought clarification of the relationship between this and proposals for the adjacent site. The Planning Officer advised that there was no development masterplan but the landscape assessment envisaged this site as being within the landscaped area. Mr Cotterill then went on to second the proposition of refusal.

The Principal Planner suggested that, having regard to the impact on the setting of the Blenheim Registered Park and Garden and Blenheim World Heritage Site, the proposed reason for refusal should be revised to incorporate policy BEII of the Local Plan and Policy EWI of the emerging plan. Mr Postan and Mr Cotterill agreed to revise their proposition accordingly.

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

Refused for the following amended reason:-

١. The development by reason of its siting would result in the loss of an open space which forms an important transition between the built form and adjacent open countryside. The development of this space would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the natural environment and the character and appearance of the immediate area. Furthermore the siting of the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the Blenheim Registered Park and Garden and Blenheim World Heritage Site, which would not be outweighed by the limited public benefits of the proposed development. As such the development would be contrary to the provisions of Policies BE2, BE11, NE1, NE3 and H2 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011; Policies OS2, OS4, EHI, EH7, EWI, and H2 of the Emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031; as well as the relevant provisions of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 17, 109 and 134.

67 17/01939/FUL The Retreat, Swinbrook

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mrs Eileen Graham addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. She maintained her objection to the development in terms of its form, scale and siting and the consequent impact upon her property. Mrs Graham went on to outline a variety of alternative proposals as outlined at Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

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

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

Mr Postan indicated that Members had sought to achieve a compromise acceptable to both parties and considered that it had achieved as much as was possible in this respect. He proposed the Officer recommendation of approval, subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement to restrict the use of the annex as accommodation ancillary to the existing dwelling on the site and precluding its occupation as a separate dwelling.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Beaney who considered the proposal to be acceptable and policy compliant.

The Development Manager invited Members to consider whether a legal agreement was necessary or whether the proposed condition would suffice. In response to a question from Mr Postan he confirmed that a legal agreement would be more difficult to challenge and Members agreed to adopt that approach.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to restrict the use of the annex as accommodation ancillary to the existing dwelling on the site and precluding its occupation as a separate dwelling.

77 17/01911/FUL 30 New Road, Woodstock

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The local representative, Mr J C Cooper addressed the meeting. Whilst not a disclosable interest, he advised that he was a member of the Woodstock Town Council which was the owner of the Community Centre adjacent to the site.

Mr Cooper made reference to the impact of on-street parking in New Road and invited Members to consider deferring consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be held. He also suggested that the County Council should be asked to give a view on the impact on this Sustrans cycle route and asked the Sub-Committee to consider the impact of development on existing properties in the vicinity.

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

Dr Poskitt advised that New Road gave access to various community uses and reiterated the concerns expressed by Mr Cooper in relation to onstreet parking.

It was proposed by Dr Poskitt and seconded by Mr Cotterill that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

Mr Beaney suggested that, should the application be approved, a condition to provide the facility for high speed broadband should be imposed and questioned arrangements for bin storage. The Planning Officer undertook to address these issues.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer considered the application to represent overdevelopment and believed that it should be refused. Mr Postan indicated that flats were a good way in which to address the need for affordable housing, enabling first time buyers to access the property market. If the application were to be approved he suggested that a construction traffic management plan should be required.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

88 17/02749/RES Land South of High Street, Milton Under Wychwood

The Senior Planner (Implementation) introduced the application and drew attention to the further observations set out in the report of additional representations.

Mr Andrew Smith, the applicant's agent, 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 Senior Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Haine welcomed the work done by the Council's Officers and the applicants to improve upon the original proposals. He questioned whether the use of buff brick was appropriate on the site and indicated that he would prefer to see the use of reconstituted stone around the perimeter with brick reconstituted stone and render confined to the centre of the site. Mr Haine also wished to see the garages constructed in similar material and indicated that he was content with the use of natural slates and the proposed thatched unit. In view of concerns expressed by residents of Jubilee Lane he questioned whether it was necessary to remove some trees from the site and also expressed some concern over drainage.

The Senior Planner advised that drainage issues had been dealt with at outline stage and that the County Council would ensure that arrangements were adequate before discharging conditions. In response to further questions she confirmed that the footpath link was not to be hard surfaced and that a request for low level street lighting could be made through the County Council as this would form part of the Section 38 works.

Mr Beaney indicated that there were existing red brick buildings in the village and enquired why no footways were shown on parts of the site. The Senior Planner advised that parts of the development were to include shared pedestrian and vehicular surfaces.

Mr Postan questioned whether it was prudent to incorporate measures for the protection of badgers which could carry tuberculosis in areas easily accessible to the public. The Senior Planner advised that the areas in question were routes rather than badger setts. Mr Postan also questioned the need to screen the development.

Mr Haine proposed the Officer recommendation of conditional approval subject to the amendment of condition 4 to allow for the use of alternative materials.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Cotterill and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted subject to the amendment of condition 4 to read as follows:-

4. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, before above ground building work commences, a schedule of materials {(including samples)} to be used in the elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in the approved materials.

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

104 17/02994/S73 The Old Brewery, Priory Lane, Burford

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

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

The Planning Officer then presented her report and advised Members that since writing the report, the applicants had agreed that the communal space would be available for use by the occupiers of all the flats.

Accordingly, she put forward an alternative recommendation that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to such conditions as are considered appropriate in consultation with the Chairman.

Mr Cotterill advised that local residents were keen to see this development get underway and proposed the revised Officer recommendation. The proposition was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer.

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

RESOLVED: that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to such conditions as are considered appropriate in consultation with the Chairman.

110 17/02995/S73

The Old Brewery, Priory Lane, Burford

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Aiden Murray, the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting in support of the application. 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 explained that this application was similar to the previous scheme with the inclusion of balconies.

Once again, the applicants had agreed that the communal space would be available for use by the occupiers of all the flats and the Planning Officer put forward an alternative recommendation that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to such conditions as are considered appropriate in consultation with the Chairman.

She advised that the applicants had agreed to delete the top floor balconies from the scheme and discussions were ongoing regarding the fenestration on the second floor.

Mr Cotterill stressed the need to reduce the size of the second floor balconies and proposed the revised officer recommendation. Dr Poskitt expressed concern over the possibility of an accumulation of clutter on the balconies.

In seconding the recommendation, Mr Postan enquired whether a construction traffic management plan would be appropriate. The Planning Officer advised that this had been required under the earlier consent.

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

RESOLVED: that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to such conditions as are considered appropriate in consultation with the Chairman.

116 17/03281/HHD Glenrise, Churchfields, Stonesfield

(Mr Bishop left the meeting during consideration of the following application)

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

In response to a question from Mr Beaney she confirmed that the window to the rear elevation of the property was to be obscure glazed.

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

Permitted

121 17/03057/FUL

Land North of Gas Lane and Ascott Road, Shipton Under Wychwood

(Mr Haine left the meeting during consideration of this and the following application. Mr Cotterill took the Chair)

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

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

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

In response to a question from Mr Postan, Ms Brodie advised that the dwellings would be sunk into the ground slightly.

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

Mr Beaney made reference to comments received from the CPRE and enquired whether the advice of the Council's Ecology Officer remained unchanged. The Planning Officer confirmed that the advice remained unchanged and that there was no objection.

Mr Postan noted that during the site visit the ground had been muddy and expressed some concern over the possibility of flooding. It was confirmed that the Council's drainage engineers were satisfied that suitable arrangements could be made and the Planning Officer advised that submission of a full surface water drainage scheme was required by condition.

Dr Poskitt questioned why the building was designed to resemble a workshop and the Planning Officer advised that the Council's Conservation Officer had suggested that the new building should reflect the former use on the site.

Members acknowledged that there were no grounds upon which to refuse the application and, having been proposed by Mr Saul and seconded by Mr Bishop the Officer recommendation was put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure the undisturbed ground in perpetuity.

134 17/03078/FUL

High Fields, Church Road, Milton Under Wychwood

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

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

In response to a question from Mr Cottrell-Dormer, Ms Brodie she advised that there were no plans for a new stable building on the site.

The Planning Officer then presented his report containing a recommendation of refusal.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Beaney and seconded by Dr Poskitt and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

142 17/03161/FUL

I Four Winds, Wards Road, Chipping Norton

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

Mr Saul stated that the current proposals were a considerable improvement upon the original scheme and the new buildings fitted in well. He acknowledged the ongoing objections but considered the application to be acceptable in its current form.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Saul and seconded by Mr Cotterill.

Mr Postan expressed his support for the scheme and questioned whether a construction traffic management plan should be required. The Planning Officer indicated that a plan would not be appropriate in this instance.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer indicated that it would be preferable if the property to be retained had been included in a comprehensive redevelopment scheme.

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

Permitted

150 17/03553/S73 Bay Tree House, Cleveley Road, Enstone

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant, Mr Subhash Chadra, 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.

Ms Sarah-Ellen Wooller, the occupier of a neighbouring property, sought leave to address the meeting. With the consent of the Chairman, Ms Wooller expressed her opposition to the application.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and advised Members that the original consent only required the applicant to seek the Council's written consent to fell the trees. She confirmed that the Council's Forestry Officer was content to accept the loss of the trees.

Mr Beaney questioned whether one or two replacement trees should be provided. Mr Cotterill agreed that the trees should be felled and suggested that they could be replaced by a more suitable species such as prunus. Mr Haine questioned whether any tree would be suitable in that location

Mr Beaney proposed the Officer recommendation subject to an amendment to condition 5 to require the provision of a semi-mature tree. The proposition was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted, condition 5 being amended to require the provision of a semimature replacement tree.

65 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers was received and noted.

The meeting closed at 6:35pm.

CHAIRMAN