

Planning & Regulation Committee

Monday, 22 October 2012

ADDENDA

1. Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments

Apology from

Temporary Appointment

Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor Councillor Charles Mathew

Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles (Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure) is unable to attend.

4. Petitions and Public Address

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Suzi Coyne (Agent for Applicant)	5. Worton Farm, Yarnton – Application MW.0122/12
Mrs Dee Hanson-Bailey (Somerville Drive Residents' Association)	9. Bicester Children centre - Application R3.0065/12

6. Use of land for storage of empty skips at Worton Farm, Yarnton - Application MW.0122/12

Additional Representations

The applicant's agent has commented on the report and some of the conditions and considers some changes should be made accordingly. Her summary views, with an officer response, are set out below.

Condition 3 (Temporary consent)

Notwithstanding the existing condition on the 2004 composting permission requiring the removal of the concrete hard standing from the site [*referred to in paragraph 6 of the main report*], the applicant does not accept this requirement because this site was a former railway sidings in the 1960s and early 1970s and

as such was made-up ground that cannot readily be restored to agriculture. The applicant wishes to use it in the future as a waste management site (as requested in response to LDF Policy consultations) but even if it can't the hard standing could be used by the farm itself for agricultural storage.

Officer Comment: Whether or not the site will be allocated in the Allocations DPD as a waste site is a matter of speculation at present, as is whether any planning permission will be forthcoming for such a use. A similar condition was imposed on the temporary 2004 permission and there is no reason not to re-impose such a condition on this temporary permission, especially in view of all the development on the adjoining land since. Extant planning policy is to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and the restoration of this site would achieve that policy. This condition including its requirement to remove the concrete hard standing is therefore appropriate and should be attached to this permission as set out in the report.

Condition 4 (Restoration scheme requirements)

The applicant considers that the requirement to submit a restoration scheme by 31 December 2014 to be unnecessary. This would be some 3 years prior to its required implementation and may not present the most up to date scheme relevant to the circumstances of the site when the permission expires. In addition, if the site does become identified through the Oxfordshire MWDF then unnecessary work and expense would have been required, because the restoration scheme would become superseded by development of the site. She suggests a submission date of 31 December 2016, a year before the expiry of this temporary permission.

Officer Comment: This suggestion is reasonable and it is recommended this condition is altered to require the submission of a restoration scheme by 31 December 2016, rather than 31 December 2014.

Condition 8 (Tree screen requirement)

Since the report was written a satisfactory planting scheme has been submitted in the form of a 5 metre tree and shrub belt at the base of this site. This would consist of 27 no. 2.5-3.0 metre high light standard specimens of Ash, Hazel, Hawthorn, Dogwood & Guelder Rose. The applicant requests this condition be varied to require this scheme's implementation rather than the submission and implementation of a scheme. *This is obviously acceptable and the condition will be revised accordingly.*

The agent has also commented as follows on two parts of the report itself.

In regard to paragraph 5, that Hanson's aggregate washing plant was not used for recycling the material from BMW. The washing plant is currently mothballed and the sand has been dry screened using mobile plant.

Officer Comment: Yes, this is factually correct (although this fact was unclear at the time of writing the report). This does not affect the recommendation.

With regard to paragraph 6, the reason for nominating this site was not the existing concrete hard standing, but was because the principle of developing the land for waste management purposes had been established through the grant of earlier planning permissions. The site nomination area is quite a bit bigger than the concrete hard standing area and follows the footprint of the in-vessel composting area.

Officer Comment: Although this is true, and set out in the Statement accompanying the application, it is worth pointing out that the in-vessel composting permission has now expired (see paragraph 22 of the report) albeit the area the applicant wishes to be nominated in the LDF Allocations document is larger than the concrete hard standing itself. This does not affect the recommendation.

No change is required to the printed recommendation

This page is intentionally left blank