

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 Wednesday 6 December 2017

PRESENT

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

Denotes non-voting member

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Catherine Tetlow, Hannah Wiseman and Paul Cracknell

66 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

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

67 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Subsequently, whilst not a disclosable interest, with regard to application No. 17/00642/OUT (Land East of Barns Lane, Burford), Mr Beaney advised that he and his wife were both employed at schools in the town.

68 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:

3 17/00642/OUT Land East of Barns Lane, Burford

Prior to consideration of the applications for development, the Development Manager read a general statement of clarification for the benefit of those present, a copy of which appears as Appendix I to these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Beaney, the Development Manager advised that, in this context, 'major development' was defined as schemes for more than 10 units.

Mr Cooper expressed surprise that no written legal advice was available regarding the Cabinet's decision on the potential impact of removing the allocation at Land East of Burford as an allocated site within the emerging Local Plan and questioned whether this application should be considered prior to the conclusion of the call-in process initiated in relation to that decision.

In response, the Development Manager reiterated that the Local Plan process and Development Control were two parallel but separate processes.

The Principal Planner drew Members' attention to the report of additional representations and reported receipt of a further 31 letters and emails in objection to the development. She advised that these additional representations did not give rise to any new matters not previously addressed in the report or report of additional representations. She made reference to a letter sent to Members of the Sub-Committee by Responsible Planning in Burford.

Mr Postan expressed his disquiet over the submission of late representations, indicating that it was difficult for Members to assimilate large volumes of correspondence late in the day. He considered that those wishing to make observations on planning applications should do so in good time. In response, Mr Haine advised that this was a matter outside the Council's control and suggested that it was inevitable that late representations would be submitted.

The Development Manager went on to introduce the application.

Ms Sue Haywood addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr John White then addressed the meeting on behalf of the Burford Town Council in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Tim Burden, the applicant's agent, 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.

Mr Cotterill questioned why Mr Burden had suggested that Members of the Sub-Committee had expressed their support for the allocation of this site within the emerging Local Plan.

Mr Burden responded by stating that he believed that Members of the Sub-Committee had been in attendance at the Council Meeting when the draft plan had been approved for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.

Prior to presenting his report, the Development Manager sought to address some issues raised during public participation. With regard to the suggested inconsistency of approach, he advised that, whilst Officers readily acknowledged that the proposed development would be perceptible, this was not to say that, of itself, this rendered the development harmful.

In relation to housing need, he advised that, at present there were 173 households in housing need who had registered an interest in living in Burford. The application previously approved on appeal on the site at Shilton Road would provide 45 units of affordable housing whilst the current application, if approved, would provide a further 35 units. Together these applications would not fully meet the recorded level of need.

The Development Manager went on to present his report in detail and, on balance, made a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Haine made it clear that his proposition with regard to this site at the Cabinet meeting on 15 November had been made solely in relation to the Local Plan report. It had no bearing on his consideration of the current application which he had approached with an open mind. He had visited the site, considered numerous representations from local residents and read the Officers report without pre-judging his position.

Having now heard the presentation, he noted that there was a variance between Officers and those who had spoken in opposition to the application in relation to issues such as housing need and the impact of the proposed development.

Mr Haine reminded Members that the Officer's recommendation had been made 'on balance' and it was a matter of judgement for Members to decide whether or not they agreed with the Officer's assessment.

Mr Haine made reference to the importance of Burford to the District's economy in terms of tourism. He expressed concern over the impact of the proposals on the AONB and heritage aspects of the town. He also questioned the impact of the principal access to the site on the landscape and stressed that such matters were subjective.

Mr Haine suggested that, whilst it had yet to be formally adopted, the Council could be more robust in its view of its five year housing land supply position having provided evidence of this to the Local Plan Inspector. In conclusion, Mr Haine suggested that the town's need for affordable housing could be met to a greater degree by development to the south.

In relation to the question of housing need, the Principal Planner explained that Responsible Planning in Burford had stated that, as at 27 November there were 57 households with a local connection registered on the Housing Waiting List, seven of which were not adequately housed at present. Current figures indicated that 173 households had expressed interest in being housed in Burford, 57 of which had a local connection.

She confirmed that the Shilton Road site would provide 45 affordable units; an insufficient number to meet the needs of those 57 households with a local connection.

Officers believed that there was a substantial need for affordable housing in Burford and it was this factor that had informed their balanced judgement in terms of paragraph 116 of the NPPF

Whilst not a disclosable interest, Mr Beaney advised that he and his wife were both employed at schools in the town. He indicated that the key question was whether the application met the requirements of paragraph 116 and stated that, in his view, it did not. Whilst he acknowledged the need for affordable housing he considered that this could be better met elsewhere.

Mr Beaney suggested that the development would have a detrimental effect upon the landscape, views of the church and upon the nearby Grade I Listed Building. He suggested that the Officer's report failed to take account of views from the Stow Road and considered that the access separated the site from the remainder of the town. The proposed access would also have a detrimental impact upon the landscape and Mr Beaney expressed concern that it could set a precedent for further development.

Mr Beaney proposed that the application be refused as it failed to meet the requirements of paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, in doing so, he reminded Members of the outcome of the recent appeal in respect of development in the AONB at Milton-Under-Wychwood.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer who considered that the development would result in significant and demonstrable harm to Burford. The proposed access was a blot on the landscape that could set a precedent for further development. He considered that it was unacceptable to bus primary school children to schools outside the town and believed that the site at Shilton Road would provide sufficient affordable housing.

Mr Postan drew a comparison with recent applications in Brize Norton and Shilton. Whilst the Council was opposed to development in the AONB, it had yet to put a Local Plan in place. If it were to lose an appeal on the site the council would lose control and the benefits of New Homes Bonus. West Oxfordshire was in a difficult position constrained as it was by Central Government policy.

Mr Postan made reference to the recently application for some 700 homes in Brize Norton, development that would increase the size of a settlement of some 350 individuals threefold. He indicated that such development was not the end of the world as it enabled the Council to fund and control the provision of infrastructure and other social and community benefits. He stressed that, unless there were durable reasons for refusal, the Council would find it difficult to defend an appeal.

Mr Cooper indicated that Members ought not to consider financial matters in determining a planning application and reminded the Sub-Committee that the Council's Standing Orders made provision for Officers to withdraw an application for determination by the Development Control Committee when their recommendations were not accepted. He acknowledged that this application had been controversial and indicated that, on balance, he believed that a case had been made for refusal and that he would vote accordingly.

Mrs Crossland stated that she could understand that local residents wished to retain the beauty of their town but stressed the importance of considering the needs of future generations. She noted that the proposed development would provide 35 affordable properties for young people which was a significant benefit to the town. Mrs Crossland felt the site to be a natural, logical infill and suggested that development would bring a wider social mix to the population and more young people to the town, creating a more vibrant community. She advised that appropriate landscaping could ameliorate harm and noted that efforts had been made by the applicants to protect the key views of the church spire. The Development Manager confirmed that this was indeed the case.

In conclusion, Mrs Crossland indicated that Burford was a sustainable settlement and expressed her support for the Officer's recommendation.

Mr Beaney indicated that, whilst he believed that the terms of the Section 106 agreement would be safe at appeal, he recognised that the Council could lose control over conditions applicable to any consent.

Given house prices and rent levels in the town, Mr Postan suggested that 'affordable housing' was an oxymoron in Burford. He also considered that good design did not need screening.

Mr Saul saw the provision of affordable housing as a significant benefit and believed that the Officer's assessment was correct. Mr Bishop demurred as he did not consider that there were sufficient exceptional circumstances to overcome the significant and demonstrable harm occasioned by the development. He considered that the need for affordable housing would be met on the Shilton Road site and expressed his support for the alternative delivery method under discussion with the Blenheim Estate. Mr Bishop also considered that it was unacceptable to transport primary school children to schools outside the town.

Mr Cotterill expressed his concern over the failure to fully address heritage aspects, indicating that the site had been protected and left vacant in the past as it represented the demarcation between the historic and modern elements of the town. The site mirrored Priory Wood and represented the split between the modern and medieval layout of the settlement. The site was important from a historical and heritage point of view and in terms of the setting of the Grade I listed Paladin Great House.

In terms of affordable housing, Mr Cotterill advised that the last 11 units had just been allocated on the recently completed exception site and noted that many of those who had expressed an interest in being allocated a property in Burford had declined offers. Accordingly, he suggested that housing need figures should be treated with caution. An additional 13 units had been provided at Frethern Close with 50% reserved for local people. The Development at Shilton Road would provide 45 units for people with a local connection and additional properties were available in Tanners Lane.

With regard to the access from Witney Street, Mr Cotterill indicated that he had been advised that, whilst the proposed flood protection measures were good, there was no mention of maintenance arrangements and concern that the outflow from the pond above Roebuck Cottage could give rise to a risk of flooding.

In conclusion, Mr Cotterill made reference to the number of Listed Buildings within the town and the financial contribution of tourism to the local economy.

Mr Bishop acknowledged the Planning Officer's technical assessment but noted that there was a significant degree of opposition from local residents. He recognised that Officers had made an 'on balance' recommendation and advised that, in his view, the benefits failed to outweigh the harm.

The Development Manager indicated that, whilst it was easy to make a popular recommendation, the role of the Council's Officers was to advise Members on the merits of an application having regard to local and national planning policy, potential sanctions and current Government intentions. Whilst a legal agreement might be secure, the Development Manager advised that the Council could negotiate better terms than those put in place by a Planning Inspector who would simply assess any requirements against policy. He reminded Members that the provision of additional car parking at Tackley offered by the developer had been lost when that application had gone to appeal.

That said, the Development Manager acknowledged that the Officer recommendation had been made on balance and invited Members to focus principally on the requirements of paragraph 116 of the NPPF. He noted that there were no technical objections to the proposed development and reminded Members that the volume of local objection would not be a determining factor for a Planning Inspector who would determine an appeal on policy grounds alone.

Members had to weigh the harm occasioned by the development against the benefits that it would bring. If they considered that the harms were too great then it was legitimate to say that the requirement of exceptionality had not been met.

Mr Beaney indicated that whilst the Council was committed to the provision of affordable housing it was possible to over-provide in one area. He remained of the opinion that, in particular, the requirements of Paragraph 116 of the NPPF had not been met.

Mr Postan enquired whether the Council could maintain an objection to the access from Witney Road and the Development Manager advised that, without objection from the Highway Authority, the Council could only object to the access on grounds of impact on the landscape.

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

The Development Manager sought clarification of the refusal reason and the Sub-Committee confirmed that it considered that the harms occasioned by the development in both landscape and heritage terms were such that they ~~did not~~ outweighed the benefits provided.

Refused for the following reasons:-

1. The site lies within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty wherein the Local Planning Authority is required to give great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty. The site is prominently located in the countryside beyond the existing settlement edge of Burford. The development would encroach unacceptably into agricultural land and would fail to relate satisfactorily to the town or the existing rural environment which provides a setting for it. It would not easily assimilate into its surroundings resulting in the loss of an important area of open space that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. It would be highly prominent and visible in a number of public views. The proposal would represent major development which would not conserve landscape and scenic beauty, and no exceptional circumstances or public interest have been demonstrated to justify or moderate the harm caused. The proposal is therefore contrary to West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies BE2, BE4, NE1, NE3, NE4, and H2, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 policies OS2, and EH1, and the relevant policies of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 17, 58, 109, 115 and 116.
2. The site is a substantial agricultural field forming part of an extensive area of countryside around Burford that provides a setting for the town. The site is substantially within the Burford Conservation Area, with only the means of access sitting outside it. A large number of Listed Buildings and undesignated heritage assets are located in the vicinity. The Grade I Listed church of St John, and in particular its spire, is inter-visible with the site from a number of public viewpoints. The proposed development would significantly encroach into the countryside and would have an urbanising effect on the Conservation Area and the setting of heritage assets. This would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of

the assets which is not outweighed by public benefits. The proposal is therefore contrary to West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies H2, BE2, BE5, and BE8, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies OS2, OS4, and EH7, and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 131, 132, and 134.

3. The applicant has not entered into legal agreements to ensure that the development adequately mitigates its impact on community infrastructure, secures the provision of affordable housing, secures the provision and appropriate management of landscaping and open space, makes an appropriate contribution to public transport services and infrastructure, and provides for public art. The local planning authority cannot therefore be satisfied that the impacts of the development can be made acceptable. Consequently the proposal conflicts with West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies BE1, TLC7 and H11, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies OS2, OS5, and H3, and paragraphs 17, 50, 69, 70, 72 and 203 of the NPPF.

(Mr Virgin left the meeting at this juncture)

37 17/01082/OUT Land North of Witney Road, Long Hanborough

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Dr Stuart Brooks addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Neils Chapman, the Chairman of the Chairman of Hanborough Parish Council, 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.

Mr John Ashton, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and recommended the inclusion of additional conditions relating to the submitted plans and requiring provision of the facility for high speed broadband.

Mr Haine again suggested that the Council could be more robust in its view of its five year housing land supply position having provided evidence of this to the Local Plan Inspector. He also questioned whether 170 units was too dense a development on this site.

In response, the Planning Officer advised that this was an outline application for up to 170 dwellings hence the density of development could be regulated

at reserved matters stage. She advised that the smaller units that comprised the affordable housing element met the requirements reflected in the housing waiting list.

With regard to the comments made by Mr Chapman, Mr Haine enquired whether it would be possible to condition consent to require the expansion of the local school prior to occupation of the dwellings. In response the Development Manager advised that, in discussion with the County Council, the education authority remained adamant that sufficient school places would be made available. They had access to an off-site playing field and discussions were also taking place with the Playing Fields Trust regarding a potential land swap. It was also possible to create a second story extension to the existing building.

Mr Beaney offered an apology to local residents for the suggestion made by the Leader of the County Council in his letter in response to the Local Member of Parliament suggesting that the County Council had only a consultative role in terms of highways and education and that the District Council was the final arbiter in these respects. He advised that West Oxfordshire would not be able to sustain refusal reasons on these grounds without the support of the County.

Mr Beaney also noted that, whilst having had the opportunity of doing so, the County representative had not made any observations on the terms of the proposed legal agreement.

Mr Beaney noted that the concerns raised and potential refusal reasons put forward were the same as those applied to the site to the south which had been considered and rejected by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal. If the Council was to seek to refuse this application, the outcome would be the same. Mr Beaney considered that there was no option other than to support this application in order to retain control over the development and ensure things were done well and in the right order.

In terms of the proposed legal agreement he indicated that he would prefer to see the landscaped area protected by transfer to a management company. Whilst he had concerns over the proposals on highways grounds, Mr Beaney stressed that, without the support of the County Council, West Oxfordshire could not object. He also suggested that occupation of the properties ought not to be permitted until the necessary additional school places had been provided.

In response, the Planning Officer advised that the retained land would be protected in the legal agreement by a long term management plan through a management company.

With regard to the occupation of the properties, the Development Manager advised that any condition needed to be reasonable. Whilst it would be inappropriate to place the developers in a ransom position to the County, as the County Council had advised that there were plans in place to provide

additional school places, the Council could apply a staging process to occupation of the units.

Mr Beaney indicated that he would prefer to see ownership of the retained land transferred to the owners of the properties rather than the creation of a management company.

In response to a question from Mr Bishop, the Planning Officer advised that the length of the management arrangement would need to be specified in the legal agreement. Mr Haine considered that the land should be retained in perpetuity. The Development Manager advised that, whilst the Council could express a preference, it could not oblige the applicants to transfer ownership of their land. However, it could require that it be laid out and maintained as open space.

Mr Postan questioned what employment opportunities would be available to residents. He made reference to the covenants relating to the retention of open space employed at the Bradwell Grove development and noted that a single owner could provide a subsidised mortgage scheme.

The Development Manager advised that, whilst there was some industry in the vicinity, the majority of residents were likely to commute to Oxford to work. He reiterated that, whilst it may be possible to negotiate a transfer the Council could not oblige the applicants to handover ownership of their land. The Development Manager also advised that the new affordable housing scheme being trialled with Blenheim offered a greater discount on market rent than could be achieved by a registered social landlord (50% rather than 80% of market rent). The Council might also be able to negotiate a higher level of affordable housing.

Mr Postan suggested that affordable mortgages offered a preferable option and noted that open space at Bradwell Village was protected by covenants. Without local employment he questioned whether the development could be considered as sustainable.

Mr Haine questioned whether there was any merit in seeking deferral of the application to explore the possibility of transferring the land. The applicant's representative advised that the estate would find a transfer problematic but would be prepared to consider the possibility of covenants in similar terms to those proposed at condition 20.

Mr Cooper stated his belief that West Oxfordshire was expected to accommodate too much of Oxford City's unmet housing need. Mr Cottrell-Dormer expressed his opposition to the application, indicating that he believed that Hanborough had already taken sufficient development. Mr Cotterill concurred, expressing his concern at this 'island development' with its single access point. The Development acknowledged the concerns over access and advised that alternative options had been discussed with the applicants. However, the Council could not require revisions without support from the highway authority.

The Development Manager advised that Officers were well aware of local concerns and again, whilst it was easy to make popular recommendations, it was essential that Members were aware of the potential consequences. Whilst the Council was successful in defending planning appeals; winning some 90% of those lodged, this figure fell to only 50% in the case of major applications. In these cases, the Council was only successful where there were technical objections or objections on heritage impact. Whilst Members were perfectly entitled to refuse the application, it was important that they were aware of the danger that they could lose control of their other allocations. The Council had already lost a significant number of large appeals and, should more than 10% of appeals on major applications fail, there was a danger that the Government would intervene, enabling developers to make application direct to the Planning Inspectorate with the consequent loss of control and fee income.

Mr Saul noted that the Council had refused a number of applications in this vicinity which had gone on to be approved at appeal. He could see no grounds upon which this application could be refused and expressed his support for its innovative approach to the provision of affordable housing.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer suggested that the Local Plan would be in place before any appeal could be heard. Notwithstanding this confidence, the Development Manager advised that developers were arguing that the Council should show a 20% tolerance in its five year housing land supply rather than the 5% put forward and that this should be calculated over a five year period rather than the full plan period. Whilst there was no indication that the Inspector would not support the Council's position, there could be no guarantee. Whilst it was anticipated that the plan would be in place shortly, with the potential for legal challenge, there was no certainty this would be the case.

Mr Bishop suggested that Members needed to be pragmatic in considering the application as the danger that a refusal would be overturned on appeal was too great.

Mr Beaney indicated that there were no policy grounds on which to base a refusal and proposed the revised Officer recommendation subject to inclusion within the legal agreement of provisions to secure the phasing of occupation of the dwellings to align with the provision of school places and the retention of open space by way of covenants.

The Development Manager advised that it would be necessary to clarify the schools building programme with the County Council and to make appropriate provision for phased occupation of the dwellings.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Saul.

Mr Postan enquired whether it would be possible to defer consideration of the application pending adoption of the Local Plan. In response, the

Development Manager advised that the argument of prematurity had been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate in the recent past.

Mrs Crossland noted that the Council was subject to national constraints and was to some degree no longer master of its own destiny. She expressed her support for the recommendation and concern at the possibility of loss of control and income and the potential costs.

Mr Cooper reiterated his concern over the extent to which Oxford City's unmet housing need was falling upon West Oxfordshire and enquired whether the Council could seek developer contributions towards track improvements to the Cotswold Line. In response, the Development Manager advised that the Council could assert but not demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The housing figures applied were those included in the draft Local Plan as approved by the Council and Railtrack had raised no objection to the application.

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

Permitted, subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement on the basis set out in the report, amended as detailed above, and to the following additional conditions:-

28. That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.

29. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer must submit details for agreement in writing by the Local Planning Authority of evidence that every premise in the development will be able to connect to and receive a superfast broadband service (>24Mbs). The connection will be to either an existing service in the vicinity (in which case evidence must be provided from the supplier that the network has sufficient capacity to serve the new premises as well as the means of connection being provided) or a new service (in which case full specification of the network, means of connection, and supplier details must be provided). The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the said agreed details which shall be in place prior to first use of the development premises and retained in place thereafter.
Reason: In the interest of improving connectivity in the District.

NB the Council will be able to advise developers of known network operators in the area.

(Mr Cooper requested that his vote against the foregoing application and Mr Beaney his vote in support be so recorded)

68 17/0170/FUL Land East of Stonesfield, Woodstock Road, Stonesfield

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

69 16/01364/OUT LAND EAST OF WOODSTOCK

The Principal Planner introduced the application. She made reference to correspondence sent on behalf of the Woodstock Town Council directly to Members and advised that this did not give rise to any additional matters not addressed in the report or report of additional representations.

Mrs Trish Redpath addressed the meeting on behalf of the Woodstock Town Council in opposition to the application. She indicated that the Town Council had been unaware that the application was to be considered at the meeting and reiterated the concerns expressed in the letter sent to Members a copy of which appears as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner advised that, whilst ICAMOS had indicated that it would not wish to see this land developed, it had acknowledged that the decision rested with the Local Planning Authority.

Mr Cooper made reference to the call-in of the Cabinet's recent decision regarding modifications to the emerging Local Plan and indicated that it was open to the Sub-Committee to seek deferral of this application. He advised that the site had been considered by the Planning Inspectorate in 2004 when a refusal of consent by the Council had been upheld.

He proposed that consideration of the application be deferred pending the outcome of the call-in request, citing the absence of a buffer zone to protect the World Heritage Site. Mr Cooper also expressed concern at the relocation of the Woodstock Under Fives Association from the school and the impact of the development on the A4095 through Bladon.

Mr Beaney indicated that he had always considered the affordable housing provision to be adequate and was concerned that the revised conditions would make matters worse. In response, the Principal Planner advised that the revision was simply intended to accommodate the potential re-phasing of the development. There was difficulty in delivering the new under-fives facility early on as there was a need to put the northern spine road in at an early stage. This was inconsistent with the phasing agreed by the Sub-Committee in February but the proposed revision did not alter the intent of the original condition.

The proposition of deferral failed to attract a seconder and the Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Postan and seconded by Mr Cotterill and on being put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED: That, having regard to the information set out in the report, the Sub-Committee re-states the resolution to approve the application subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement and to the amended conditions as set out in the report.

(Mr Cooper requested that his vote against the foregoing resolution be so recorded)

70 16/02851/OUT LAND SOUTH OF MILTON ROAD, SHIPTON-UNDER-WYCHWOOD

The Principal Planner presented her report and reported receipt of two further representations. The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Beaney and seconded by Mr Haine and on being put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED: That, having regard to the information set out in the report, the Sub-Committee re-states the resolution to approve the application subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement.

The meeting closed at 5:45pm.

CHAIRMAN