

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 10 September 2018 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.00 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillor Jeannette Matelot (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Mike Fox-Davies
Councillor Bob Johnston
Councillor Charles Mathew (in place of Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor)
Councillor G.A. Reynolds
Councillor Judy Roberts
Councillor Dan Sames
Councillor John Sanders
Councillor Alan Thompson
Councillor Richard Webber

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Liz Leffman (for Agenda Item 7)

Officers:

Whole of meeting G. Warrington & J. Crouch (Law & Governance); D. Periam (Planning & Place)

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
6.	K. Broughton (Planning & Place)
7.	N. Woodcock (Planning & Place)

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

32/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

<i>Apology for Absence</i>	<i>Temporary Appointment</i>
Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor Councillor Glynis Phillips Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak	Councillor Charles Mathew No temporary appointment No temporary appointment

33/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda No.2)

<i>Councillor</i>	<i>Nature of Interest</i>
Charles Mathew	6. Oxfordshire County Council representative on North Wessex Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. 7. Oxfordshire County Council representative on Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

34/18 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2018 were approved and signed.

Minute 31/18 – Section 73 application to vary conditions 1 and 13 of planning permission P15/v2384/CM (MW.0134/15) to allow for bunds to be retained on the site and to incorporate them into a revised restoration scheme at Wicklesham Quarry, Sandshill, Faringdon, Oxon, SN7 7PQ - Application Number MW.0084/17.

Members were informed that recent correspondence from Dr Anna Hoare on behalf of the Campaign to Protect Wicklesham Quarry from Development had been referred to the County Council’s Monitoring Officer.

35/18 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Nicholas Johnston - Applicant County Councillor Liz Leffman) Item 7 – Castle Barn Quarry –) Application No. MW.0027/18

36/18 SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION EHE/9294/1 TO ALLOW FOR IMPORT OF A SMALL AMOUNT OF INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WASTE (ILW) FROM WINFRITH TO HARWELL FOR ENCAPSULATION AND INTERIM STORAGE AT HARWELL CAMPUS, 462 RUTHERFORD AVENUE, DIDCOT - APPLICATION NO. MW.0036/18

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered (PN6) an application amending condition 2 (restricting importation of waste from elsewhere) of the existing planning permission for a Waste Encapsulation and Treatment Plant at Harwell following objections from the East Hendred and Chilton Parish Councils.

Introducing the report Mr Broughton advised that East Hendred Parish Council had notified him that morning that although it was not prepared to withdraw its original objection it was, however, prepared to agree to a small-scale movement of waste from Winfrith for encapsulation at Harwell as described in the revised application.

Responding to questions from:

Councillor Fox-Davies – he confirmed this would, if granted, be a separate permission to the box store. The fact that the site at Winfrith had been unable to meet its own needs for encapsulation and interim storage of ILW meant that proposed importation was in accord with OMWCS policy W9 and therefore consistent with national strategy for radioactive waste management. The material would be transported under strict UKAEA regulations.

Councillor Mathew – he confirmed this would be a one-off change to deal with this waste from Winfrith for a limited amount of time. Any further additional proposals would require a new application.

Councillor Johnston confirmed that currently no permanent repository existed for this type of waste but as there were strict guidelines governing transportation he was happy to support the application.

Councillor Sanders expressed some concern regarding the A34 as a proposed route because of the potential for traffic problems frequently encountered on that road but had to assume that when preparing this application, the relevant authorities would have taken that into account.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Reynolds, seconded by Councillor Johnston and carried by 10 votes to 1) that application no. MW.0036/16 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director of Planning & Place including the matters set out in Annex 2 to the report PN6.

37/18 SECTION 73 APPLICATION FOR THE VARIATION OF CONDITION 26 AND REMOVAL OF CONDITIONS 27, 28 AND 29 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 17/01172/CM (OCC REFERENCE MW.0031/7) TO ENABLE THE TRANSPORTATION OF LARGE STONE BLOCK BY HGV AT CASTLE BARN QUARRY, FAIRGREEN FARM, SARSDEN - APPLICATION NO. MW.0027/18

(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee considered (PN7) an application amending condition 26 (maximum of 44 HGV movements) and removing conditions 27 (movement of large stone blocks by tractor and trailer), 28 (tractor and trailer movements limited to 14 per day) and 29 (time restrictions on tractor and trailer movements through Sarsden) to an existing planning permission to allow for the transportation of large stone blocks by HGV and trailer.

Ms Woodcock introduced the report and responding to a question from Councillor Matelot confirmed that Lyneham parish council were fully aware of the change and had not objected.

Responding to Councillor Roberts Mr Periam could not be precise about the difference in mileage between the two routes but looking at the plan estimated it to be about 1½ to 2 times as long.

Nicholas Johnston then addressed the Committee. As the applicant he advised that the amendment would be for a relatively short period of time and on a site operated under a modern well-conditioned permission to 2020. He confirmed that there would be no intensification of work or increased traffic movements but the change would improve efficiency and importantly health and safety including for other road users. The company would ensure that the operation would be carried out sensibly and linked to the existing routeing agreement. County officers had indicated that the proposal was in accord with existing policies.

He then responded to questions from:

Councillor Johnston – the blocks of stone were between 4 and 7 tonnes.

Councillor Sanders – there was probably enough material left in the existing area to last until 2021/22.

Councillor Fox-Davies – it was intended that material for the Great Tew site which was currently moved using tractor and trailer would also be moved by lorry and trailer.

Councillor Mathew – he confirmed that flexibility had been a consideration but as tractors were agricultural vehicles it had been considered more appropriate when moving blocks of stone by road to use a lorry and trailer and as there could also be road safety issues it had been felt this helped lessen the risk to other road users.

Councillor Reynolds – a greater proportion of movements would be to Great Tew with less to Lower Buildings in Sarsden.

Councillor Leffman expressed some concerns about the proposed change and why it had been considered necessary to make it now particularly as she was not aware of any local concerns regarding the current operation. The road through Lyneham, which was in a poor state now would only deteriorate further with use by HGVs eroding the verges and, while accepting that there weren't many movements, damage was being done. She had been surprised that Lyneham parish had not responded as the road from the A361 to Lower Buildings was narrow raising concerns for 2-way traffic. There could also be knock on effects from this change for the wider area including Chipping Norton.

Responding to Councillor Webber Mr Periam referred to the reasons for the change to the operation as given by the applicant in his earlier submission. He confirmed that officers did not have a strong enough reason to recommend refusal and agreeing to it now would not prejudice any future application.

To a suggestion by Councillor Roberts he confirmed that changing the terms of the application to restrict use of lorries for movements to Great Tew only while retaining a tractor and trailer for transporting to Lower Buildings would be outside the Committee's remit.

Responding to Councillor Mathew he confirmed that the current application was subject to a S106 agreement but that would not apply to this S73 application.

To a suggestion by Councillors Johnston and Webber that the proposed/revised route resulting from the S73 application, which would include part of the A361 and an unnamed two-lane single carriageway through Lyneham be given a high priority for future maintenance having regard to the potential for damage to those roads and increased length of the revised route he suggested that the Chairman write to the Cabinet Member for Environment setting out that request. That suggestion was agreed.

Responding to Councillor Sames he confirmed that wheelwashing and road cleaning were already a requirement and that couldn't be conditioned as part of this permission.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Reynolds, seconded by Councillor Matelot and carried 10 votes to 1, Councillor Mathew recorded as voting against) that:

- (a) planning permission for Application MW.0027/18 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director for Planning and Place but to include matters set out in Annex 3 to the report PN7
- (b) the Chairman of the Planning & Regulation Committee write to the Cabinet Member for Environment on behalf of the Planning & Regulation Committee requesting that the proposed/revised route resulting from this S73 application, which would include part of the A361 and an unnamed two-lane single carriageway through Lyneham, receive a high priority for future maintenance having regard to the potential for damage to those roads and increased length of the revised route.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing