

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 7 October 2019.

PRESENT

Councillors: Jeff Haine (Chairman), Geoff Saul (Vice-Chairman), Andrew Beaney, Richard Bishop, Mike Cahill, Nathalie Chapple and Nigel Colston, Derek Cotterill, Dave Jackson Neil Owen, Elizabeth Poskitt and Alex Postan.

Officers in attendance: Joan Desmond, Chloe Jacobs, Sarah Hegerty, Chris Wood and Paul Cracknell.

26. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 2 September 2019, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marilyn Davies and Ted Fenton.

Councillor Elizabeth Poskitt attended for Councillor Julian Cooper.

28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Whilst not a disclosable interest, Councillor Beaney advised that the applicant in respect of Application No. 19/00920/FUL (Corner House, Church Road, Churchill) was known to him, they both having served as Governors of Enstone Primary School. He indicated that this was not such as to preclude his participation in consideration of the application.

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

29. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, 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 and published on the Council's website.

(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:-

19/01310/FUL, 19/00991/RES, 19/00920/FUL, 19/01931/FUL, 19/01954/HHD, 19/01955/LBC and 19/01067/HHD.

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

RESOLVED: That the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Business Manager – Development Management, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

3 19/00920/FUL Corner House, Church Road, Churchill

The Planning Officer, Chloe Jacobs, introduced the application.

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

Councillor Chapple asked Mr Dunncliffe to amplify upon the environmental measures he intended to employ. He advised that he intended to install an air source heat pump and a wood pellet boiler and to source electricity from green energy providers as he did now. The property would also have disabled access. In response to a further question he advised that the hedge to the highway boundary would be planted with evergreen species to match the existing whilst those on the other boundary would be mixed. Mr Dunncliffe also advised that the 'workshop' would only be used for storage.

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

Having attended the site visit, Councillor Owen expressed his support for the application. He felt that the Officers' case for refusal was weak and did not consider that there were grounds on which to refuse consent.

Mr Owen considered the proposed development to be policy compliant and proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Haine reminded Members that the Council's Conservation Architect had suggested that a similar amount of accommodation could be provided in a less harmful form and siting by moving the development in from the boundaries.

In seconding the proposition, Councillor Cotterill acknowledged the Conservation architect's concerns but noted that there was already a building on the boundary. The height of the proposed annex and workshop was much the same as the existing building and Councillor Cotterill suggested that, with the additional landscaping proposed, there would be little extra visibility from the public domain. Councillor Cotterill also felt that the view of the church would not be compromised as it was not visible from the road at this point. He considered the design to be acceptable and the proposed development discrete and was content that it would not obscure views.

Councillor Beanery agreed that the development was policy compliant and believed that, once appropriate boundary treatment had been put in place; there would be no particular issues.

Councillor Jackson concurred but felt that the main issue was the proximity of the annex to existing trees on the site and the suggestion that this could prejudice their retention in the future.

Having viewed the site, Councillor Bishop agreed that there were no grounds for refusal. The annex simply replaced an existing building and would not be unduly visible.

Councillor Postan suggested that the workshop would be more likely to be used if it were directly linked to the residential property. He suggested that good design did not need to be hidden behind a hedge but, having visited the site, was in favour of the development.

Councillor Chapple indicated that she had been undecided over the application but was encouraged by the applicant's intention to employ environmentally friendly measures.

Councillor Saul indicated that this was a sensitive location as the land was a raised and prominent site. He had concerns and did not view the application favourably. If planning permission were to be granted he felt that it was important that appropriate conditions were applied, including conditions regarding the hedge and boundary treatment

Councillor Poskitt questioned whether the Conservation Architect's concerns had been excessive but suggested that occupation of the annex should be tied to the principal dwelling.

Councillor Colston stated that he was not keen on single storey buildings and did not believe that the annex fitted well on the site. He agreed that its occupation should be ancillary to the main dwelling.

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

Permitted subject to such conditions as are considered appropriate by the Business Manager – Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

9 19/00991/RES Land South of Oxford Road, Enstone

The Senior Planner (Appeals), Chris Wood, introduced the application.

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

Councillor Chapple noted that the frontage properties were to be constructed in natural stone and questioned what materials were to be used elsewhere on the site. Mr Frampton advised that a mixture of materials was to be employed including reconstituted stone, brick and render. He pointed out that the proposed conditions required samples of all external walling and

roofing materials to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of construction with sample panels being constructed on the site.

Councillor Chapple questioned why such a mix of materials had been proposed and Mr Frampton explained that it was to provide texture and interest throughout the site. Natural stone had been proposed for the frontage as this was the most significant aspect of the development.

The Senior Planner then presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. In terms of the concerns expressed over drainage, he reminded Members that this issue had been considered in depth during the appeal process and addressed through conditions on the outline consent.

Councillor Beaney was pleased to note that the development was set to deliver in excess of 50% affordable housing. He noted that landscaping conditions generally called for the replacement of any planting that failed within a five year period and the Senior Planner confirmed that this requirement had been addressed in the outline consent.

Mr Beaney also questioned how the question of radon protection measures was to be addressed and suggested that an appropriate condition should be applied. He also questioned whether a condition requiring garages to be retained for use as such could be applied and asked what arrangements for the maintenance of the landscaped area of the site had been put in place.

The Senior Planner advised that there was sufficient on plot parking and that maintenance of the landscaped area had been addressed through the Section 106 agreement.

Councillor Beaney also sought an assurance that the development would not disrupt water supplies to existing dwellings and the Senior Planner advised that this had been addressed through conditions on the outline consent.

Councillor Beaney then proposed that the application be approved subject to an additional condition regarding radon protection measures.

In seconding the proposition, Councillor Colston indicated that, whilst the outline application had been granted on appeal, he was pleased to see that it was to provide 50% affordable housing. He expressed the hope that the existing trees on the site would be retained so far as possible and indicated that he also shared the concerns expressed over potential flooding.

Councillor Cotterill questioned how radon protection measures would be incorporated into the properties and asked if any environmental measures such as photo-voltaic cells had been required at appeal. The Senior Planner advised that no such measures had been required.

Councillor Postan indicated that groundworks were likely to impact upon the watercourse with the result that the location of springs would be changed. He suggested that flood amelioration measures should be stepped up to cater for a 1 in 1,000 year flood event. The Senior Planner assured Members that this issue had been taken very seriously at appeal and addressed through surface water conditions on the outline consent. He did not feel that any further conditions were required.

Councillor Beaney noted that it was for the applicants to demonstrate that appropriate measures could be put in place. Councillor Poskitt suggested that there was ample land available within the green space on the site to resolve any flooding issues. Her concern related to the potential conflict between vehicles when entering the site and the use of tandem parking. The Senior Planner advised that the Highway authority was content with the access and parking arrangements hence there was nothing to warrant refusal of consent.

Councillor Chapple expressed her disappointment that no environmental features were to be provided as she believed that solar panels should be installed on all new developments. She considered that appropriate drainage arrangements should be put in place prior to the commencement of construction of the housing. The Senior Planner advised that the outline conditions required drainage arrangements to be approved prior to the commencement of development.

Beaney questioned whether condition 5 was appropriate when it had been applied but not enforced on other developments in the vicinity. The senior Planner advised that it was thought to be justified in this instance. Councillor Beaney also felt it important that appropriate colours were used on rendered surfaces.

Councillor Jackson noted that the properties had been kept well away from the trees on the site and sought clarification as to which of these were existing and which were new. He welcomed the re-building of the boundary wall and agreed with Councillor Chapple that the installation of environmental measures should be mandatory.

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

Permitted subject to the following additional condition:-

9. No construction work shall take place on any of the dwellings hereby approved until a Remediation Scheme relating to possible contamination arising from pollutants including radon and soil gases, specifying the measures to be taken to remediate the site to render it suitable for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved Remediation Scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved timetable of works and before the development hereby permitted is first occupied. Any variation to the scheme shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority in advance of works being undertaken. On completion of the works the developer shall submit to the Local Planning Authority written confirmation that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details.

If, during the course of development, any contamination is found which has not been identified in the site investigation, additional measures for the remediation of this contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation of the site

shall incorporate the approved additional measures.

Reason: To ensure safe living conditions for future residents with regard to soil contamination including risks from radon and soil gases.

22 19/01067/HHD Eleftheria, Hastings Hill, Churchill

The Planning Officer, Sarah Hegerty, presented the report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Owen expressed his support for the development. He noted that the Parish Council had no objection to the application and indicated that he considered the design to be acceptable. Off street parking would be retained and it would still be possible to gain access to the rear of the site.

It was proposed by Councillor Owen and Seconded by Councillor Postan that the application be approved.

Looking at the floor plans, Councillor Cotterill suggested that the internal layout could be revised to reduce the space taken up by the large landing. He considered the extension would be too close to the neighbouring property and questioned whether it would be possible to get vehicular access to the rear of the property.

Councillor Saul considered the Officers' assessment of the application to be correct. The extensions were not subservient to the host dwelling and created a massing effect that would be overbearing to the adjacent property. He was opposed to the removal of the front wall and the creation of on-plot parking to the frontage and indicated that he would support the Officer recommendation of refusal.

Councillor Chapple suggested that it was not only the height of the extension but its overall footprint that was of concern in this location, although the design may well be appropriate elsewhere.

Councillor Postan advised that sufficient space would remain between the extension and the boundary to enable a vehicle to access the rear of the property.

Councillor Colston noted that this and the adjoining property were symmetrical and felt that the loss of the frontage wall would be regrettable. Whilst there was scope to extend the property, he considered the current proposals to be excessive and in need of revision.

Councillor Haine indicated that he had some concern over the impact of the development upon the neighbour's conservatory.

As there would be adequate parking to the frontage, Councillor Chapple questioned why vehicular access to the rear of the property was an issue.

Councillor Haine reminded Members that the site was within a Conservation Area and Councillor Poskitt agreed that the proposed extensions were too large and would give rise to overlooking.

The recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and **WAS LOST.**

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then proposed by Councillor Saul and seconded by Councillor Colston and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

26 19/01310/FUL Land East of South Lawn, Swinbrook

The Principal Planner, Joan Desmond, introduced the application

Mr Michael Bloor, addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

Mrs Susan Meech, representing the Swinford and Widford Parish Council, 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.

In response to a question from Councillor Postan, Mrs Meech advised that the nearest mains water supply was found some 1,200 metres to the north east at Langley Farm. In response to a further question she advised that most properties in Swinbrook were served by a mains water supply with some 25 properties being on private supplies.

Mr Dominic White then addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicants in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

Councillor Jackson noted that Mr White had indicated that it was intended to connect to a mains water supply "if possible" and sought clarification of the constraints. Mr White advised that, in order to make a connection, the applicants would have to cross land outside their control. He emphasised the importance of securing a reliable water supply as supplies from springs could move.

In response to a question from Councillor Poskitt, Mr White advised that some 28 horses had previously been stabled at the site.

The Principal Planner then presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Councillor Postan acknowledged that this application had been a divisive issue within the local area. Whilst he had not hunted himself, he was aware of both the impact and delight arising from the activity. The local landscape within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was a national treasure that was essentially man made and a reflection of both agriculture and hunting.

Councillor Postan considered that there were no logical planning grounds upon which to refuse consent or successfully defend any subsequent appeal. However, the Council had to defend the rights of local residents and, to do so, needed to set clear conditions on any consent.

Councillor Postan suggested that a routeing agreement should be applied to direct the flow of traffic to the A361 and northwards. However, whilst commercial vehicles could be recognised and controlled in this way, he acknowledged that this would be difficult to enforce in relation to private

vehicles but felt that it would be appropriate to make such a request by way of an informative note.

Councillor Postan indicated that noise from the hounds would only be likely when they were being fed or exercised and, as they could delay traffic, suggested that the applicants take advice so as to ensure that their use of the roads did not become problematic.

The use of fallen stock was a traditional and useful means for farmers to dispose of fallen animals but could be unpleasant in rural areas. Councillor Postan noted that packs were mostly fed by other means and suggested that the use of fallen stock should be prohibited.

Councillor Postan noted that there were three watercourses within his own ward, all of which were experiencing reduced flow due to a combination of abstraction, changed to groundwater levels and global warming. In areas where the underlying structure was semi-permeable stone, water found its own way and springs could dry up. It was essential that a reliable water source was established either by connecting to the mains supply or through excavating boreholes and it was important that appropriate conditions were put in place.

Kennel waste had to be dealt with and the applicants needed to have an appropriate and detailed plan as to how this was to be addressed.

The introduction of kennels to this rural area would ensure that this traditional local rural employment remained within the District of West Oxfordshire and Councillor Postan concluded by suggesting that some financial contribution to the local community would be welcome.

Councillor Postan proposed that the application be permitted subject to the additional conditions referred to above. The Proposition was seconded by Councillor Colston.

The Principal Planner advised Members of the need for caution with regard to the additional conditions proposed and the Sub-Committee that any conditions had to be necessary, reasonable and enforceable. She indicated that a routeing agreement would be difficult to enforce and noted that there was no support for such a proposal from the Highway Authority. Equally, given that there were other regulations applicable to the use of fallen stock and the disposal of kennel waste; she questioned whether conditions to control such action would be reasonable.

Councillor Colston advised that he lived adjacent to the existing kennels in Chipping Norton and had never found them to be a problem. Local residents would be sorry to see them relocate but acknowledged that this was necessary as the area was becoming an increasingly urbanised environment.

He believed the current application to be sound and policy compliant and one which would retain traditional rural employment in the area. He sought to reassure concerned local residents through his own experience and reminded Members that the site had previously been used for rearing cattle which would have required a far greater volume of water. The current proposal

would also reduce the number of horses stabled at the site and Councillor Colston was satisfied that it would not give rise to issues in relation to the local water supply.

Councillor Colston considered that the accommodation proposed on the site was necessary and believed that, as the site was a mile and a half from the village with an area of woodland in-between, noise would not be an issue. He suggested that the vast majority of traffic would go to the north as it was most unlikely that anyone would take the route through Swinbrook by choice as the Hunt's territory lay to the north and north east. In conclusion, Councillor Colston indicated that, whilst as a farmer he would regret the loss of opportunity of disposing of fallen stock in this way, he recognised that this was becoming less and less common.

Whilst not opposed to the application, Councillor Beaney questioned whether all the accommodation proposed was necessary for operational reasons and whether the proposed conditions were adequately framed. He questioned the use by seasonal workers and sought clarification as to what constituted a specialist key worker. He also questioned whether the condition regarding lighting was sufficient.

Councillor Beaney recognised that a routeing agreement could not be imposed by condition but agreed that a note to that effect should be applied. He advised that he still had concerns over the water supply and considered that further details were required. Councillor Beaney asked if a condition could be applied to require the submission of details as to arrangements for the supply of water prior to any consent being implemented. He also agreed that a condition should be applied precluding the use of fallen stock.

The Principal Planner advised that the information supplied as part of the application showed accommodation for two managers plus a number of regular 'seasonal' staff who were employed for a large part of the year. Having considered the information provided, Officers were satisfied with the business case submitted by the applicants. The proposed accommodation was thought to be justified and Officers considered permanent accommodation was preferable to the use of caravans. Occupation was to be tied to the hunt yard activities.

The lighting condition proposed was intended to control the use of lights in the exercise yard and, whilst some of the buildings would have roof lights, it was not thought that this would result in light pollution.

The Principal Planner agreed that a note regarding vehicle routeing would be appropriate and advised that, whilst there were no technical objections in relation to the water supply (and the Environment Agency was the responsible authority in relation to groundwater extraction) a condition requiring the submission of details could be applied. She did however point out that this information would be forthcoming through the Environment Agency in any event.

The Principal Planner also confirmed that a condition regarding the use of fallen stock could also be imposed.

Councillor Beaney noted that this site was rather open when compared with the existing facility at Chipping Norton and asked whether this could give rise to issues in relation to its security. The Principal Planner advised that this was why it had been thought appropriate to impose a lighting condition.

Councillor Cotterill noted that the proposed accommodation did not appear particularly residential and hence was unlikely to be attractive on the open market. He also noted that the Environmental Services response had made recommendations regarding tree planting and the Principal Planner confirmed that these would be addressed through the proposed landscaping condition.

Councillor Owen expressed his support for the application but still had concerns over the water supply should the site not be connected to the mains and the private supply failed. The Principal Planner advised that a condition could be applied requiring the submission and approval of details prior to the development being brought into use. Councillor Haine considered that this would be beneficial.

Councillors Postan and Colston agreed to amend their proposal accordingly although Councillor Colston remained of the view that usage would be less than in the past

Councillor Poskitt asked whether 'grey water' could be used when washing down the yard. The Principal Planner advised that the proposed arrangements were uncertain but reiterated that there were no technical objections to the proposal.

Councillor Jackson acknowledged the concerns expressed by the Parish Council and commended the quality of their representations. He felt it regrettable that all the conditions that they suggested could not be employed but agreed that a note regarding routeing and the proposed condition regarding the water supply should be applied.

Councillor Chapple concurred and agreed that arrangements for water harvesting should be employed. The Principal Planner advised that environmental measures had been referenced in the design and access statement.

Councillor Bishop indicated that he was in favour of rural pursuits and, having regard to previous uses, believed that the application would enhance the locality. He was impressed by the applicant's knowledge of the subject and saw this application as a good example of the way in which the Council's Officers sought to address questions and concerns raised. Whilst questions surrounding the water supply remained of significant local concern, Councillor Bishop was content that these would be resolved, particularly when considering previous uses.

Councillor Cotterill expressed his support for the Principal Planner's assurance that the Environment Agency would carefully consider the applicant's proposals when processing extraction licences.

Councillor Saul sought to reassure local residents by advising them that he had never received a complaint regarding the existing kennels in Chipping Norton.

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

Permitted subject to the amendment of condition 3 to read as follows:-

3. The living accommodation hereby permitted shall only be occupied by staff and their dependants employed at the new hunt yard for The Heythrop Hunt.

Reason: Permission is granted only because of the need for the residential units in connection with the hunt yard.

and to the following additional conditions, the applicants being advised that it is recommended that traffic is directed to take the northerly route to/from the site to avoid passing through Swinbrook village:-

16. Details of the arrangements for water supply to serve the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation/use of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure adequate provision of water supply.

17. No fallen stock service shall be operated from the site.

Reason: In the interests of highway and local amenity concerns.

43 19/01931/FUL Sunny Bank, Leafield Road, Shipton under Wychwood

The Planning Officer, Chloe Jacobs, introduced the application.

The applicant, Debbie Humphry, 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 her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Councillor Beaney expressed his support for the application and general approval of the conditions proposed but suggested that a further condition should be imposed requiring the demolition of the existing property on the site prior to the construction of the new dwelling.

Councillor Beaney also suggested that condition 9 be amended to require the submission and approval of the means of access prior to the commencement of construction rather than first occupation. Joan Desmond, the Senior Planner, suggested that a condition requiring demolition of the existing property was unnecessary as the new dwelling was to be constructed on the same footprint. As the access was intended to serve the new dwelling, she considered first occupation to be the appropriate trigger.

Councillor Beaney considered his suggested conditions to be appropriate and proposed that the application be approved subject to their inclusion. The

proposition was seconded by Councillor Postan who considered the application to be of interesting and varied design.

Councillor Haine expressed some concern over the use of zinc as a roofing material. Councillor Colston also expressed concern over the proposed materials but considered the application to be an improvement upon the existing property on the site. He agreed that permission should be conditional upon the demolition of the existing property.

Councillor Chapple questioned why the applicant had chosen to use such a wide mix of materials and the Planning officer advised that this was simply a matter of personal choice.

Councillor Cotterill sought clarification as to the visibility of the zinc roof and Councillor Beaney noted that zinc and larch were both referenced as appropriate materials in the Council's design guide. The Planning Officer responded to Councillor Cotterill's enquiry and reminded Members that this site lay within a Conservation Area.

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

Permitted subject to the amendment of condition 9 to require the submission and approval of the means of access prior to the commencement of construction rather than first occupation and to the following additional condition:-

14. The existing bungalow shall be demolished within one month of commencement of the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To avoid overdevelopment of the site.

52 19/01954/FUL 48 Oxford Street, Woodstock

The Planning Officer, Sarah Hegerty, introduced the application.

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

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

Councillor Poskitt advised that the site was not visible in the public domain and, whilst it was true that it reflected the historic burgage plots, many others had been built upon. If the Sub-Committee was minded to refuse the application, Councillor Poskitt considered that Members should visit the site before doing so.

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

Councillor Beaney suggested that the Council's Conservation Officer should attend the next meeting to explain their position, particularly as a new Conservation area appraisal was underway.

The Planning Officer reminded Members that the application site lay within the existing conservation Area and that the works proposed would impact upon the fabric of the Listed Building.

In response to a question from Councillor Chapple, the Planning Officer advised that an original window opening would be lost.

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

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held in order for Members to have the opportunity to assess the impact of the proposed development on the site.

56 19/01955/LBC 48 Oxford Street, Woodstock

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held in order for Members to have the opportunity to assess the impact of the proposed development on the site.

30. PUBLIC FOOTPATH EXTINGUISHMENT APPLICATION – JUBILEE LANE, MILTON UNDER WYCHWOOD

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Business Manager-Development Management, which sought authority for Officers to make a Public Path Extinguishment Order under Section 118 the Highways Act 1980 and carry out the required statutory consultation.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to make the Order and carry out public consultation, consistent with the drafted Order attached to this report and return the application to the committee to consider the further test of prior to confirmation of the Order.

31. INSTALLATION OF FLOODLIGHTS TO PROVIDE LIGHTING TO TWO TENNIS COURTS AT BEACONSFIELD HALL, SHIPTON UNDER WYCHWOOD

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Business Manager-Development Management, inviting Members to consider whether they thought it expedient to take the opportunity of visiting this site prior to consideration of the application at the November meeting.

RESOLVED: That arrangements be made for a site visit to be held prior to consideration of the application.

32. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

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

The meeting closed at 3.40pm

CHAIRMAN