

## PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Monday, 2 December 2013 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 5.00 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Mrs Catherine Fulljames – in the Chair

Councillor Neil Owen (Deputy Chairman)  
Councillor David Bartholomew  
Councillor Mark Cherry  
Councillor Patrick Greene  
Councillor Pete Handley  
Councillor Bob Johnston  
Councillor Stewart Lilly  
Councillor Glynis Phillips  
Councillor Anne Purse  
Councillor G.A. Reynolds  
Councillor John Tanner

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor David Nimmo-Smith (for Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Richard Webber (for Agenda Item 7)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting G. Warrington & J. Crouch (Law & Culture); C. Kenneford, D. Periam and R. Nixon (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Officer Attending</b>
6 & 7	M. Thompson (Environment & Economy)
8 & 9	K. Broughton (Environment & Economy)

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

**52/13 MINUTES**  
(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2013 were approved and signed.

**53/13 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda No. 4)

Speaker	Item
Paul Brown Ian Brazier David Woodward Councillor David Nimmo-Smith Mike Pendock (Karen Dingley and Adrian Beales)	) ) ) 6. Caversham sand and gravel ) quarry – Application No. ) MW.0158/11 ) )
Sally Furze Robin Draper Mark Baker Dr Angela Jones Colin Woodward Councillor Richard Webber Paul Marsh	) ) ) 7. Sutton Courtenay Waste ) Management Centre – Application ) No. MW.0136/13 ) )

A petition in the following terms was also presented by Louise Parker on behalf of residents of Elms Road, Botley in respect of Item 8.

“This petition is being presented on behalf of the residents of Elms Road to further support the questions submitted to the Committee Chairman on Friday 29th November which were in relation to the concerns raised through the responses to the consultation process, regarding the planning application for the extension to Botley School.

The residents are not opposed to the two new classrooms being built but would like the conditions laid down in permitting the planning to address their issues more broadly and robustly than currently stipulated in the recommendations, and to be documented to ensure action and implementation. Whilst there is a proposed revised Travel Plan it is not possible to comment on whether this adequately manages the concerns as it is not available for review. Therefore we would like the additional points to form part of the conditions.

1. During the peak schoolstart and finish times for the traffic wardens to ticket unauthorised cars immediately which in itself allows a '5 minute' grace period, as opposed to the 15 minutes currently being allowed before the ticketing process is initiated.
2. Regularly enforcement of the double yellow line and 'Zig Zag' restrictions on the road
3. A new sign to be erected at the end of the road to indicate that is a no through

road.

4. Consultation with the medical centre, Janet Godden and the residents to discuss use of the car park during the school drop off and pick up times.”

#### **54/13 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATES**

(Agenda No. 5)

*Radley ROMP*

Provisional public inquiry dates set for 18 and 19 March 2014.

*Shenington ROMP*

Prohibition notice served but may need to be repeated.

#### **55/13 EXTENSION TO CAVERSHAM SAND AND GRAVEL QUARRY WITH RESTORATION TO AGRICULTURE AND FLOOD PLAIN HABITATS USING SUITABLE INERT RESTORATION MATERIAL AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ACCESS OFF THE A4155 ON LAND TO THE EAST OF SPRING LANE, SONNING EYE - APPLICATION NO MW.0158/11**

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered (PN6) an application to extract approximately 1.86 million tonnes of sand and gravel from an area adjacent to existing workings at Caversham Quarry and part restoration to agriculture and nature conservation using imported inert waste material.

Paul Brown spoke as a resident of 37 years and challenged the presentation to the Committee on the grounds that it had not adequately shown the proximity of the site to Sonning Eye. He objected to the infill restoration proposals which could exacerbate current flooding problems and tabled a graph which indicated how many additional properties could be affected by a small rise in water levels. This was a critically sensitive area at great risk. Flooding occurred through the sub strata not river flow and the results could be catastrophic if modelling proved to be incorrect.

Mr Brown then responded to questions from:

Councillor Bartholomew – he confirmed he was speaking on behalf of residents of Sonning Eye whose objections were to the backfilling element and that residents seemed happy with the extraction proposals.

Councillor Tanner – he confirmed that as water flowed through the sub strata the backfilling element was critical. Residents' concerns centred on removal of a large chunk of material with a certain permeability level and replacement with material which would not have the same permeability levels.

Ian Brazier set out his credentials in hydrology and spoke as a consultant on behalf of local residents of Sonning Eye, which was an acutely sensitive area. He had had exhaustive discussions with the Environment Agency and Oxfordshire County

Council but the applicants had been unable to provide the information requested. The National Planning Policy Framework was clear regarding development in high flood risk areas and the flood risk assessment in this case had been inadequate and fudged the main issues. There were unresolved matters and despite statements that there would be no loss of flood plain residents remained convinced that there would be increased risk of flooding due to backfill displacing flood water and reducing the ability for water to soak away. All development should pass a sequential test and areas of flood plain 3 were the most sensitive. The Atkins report had showed 5 alternative sites which had been ignored. The landfill aspect was optional but it seemed clear that that was being pursued for purely commercial reasons.

Mr Brazier responded to questions from:

Councillor Greene – he confirmed residents would have been happier with an application which had not included proposals for backfill.

Councillor Bartholomew – he confirmed he was a qualified chartered surveyor.

Councillor Cherry – he was 100% certain that backfilling would result in an increased risk of flooding. Backfill would by its very nature be less permeable than the extracted material and he compared the end result to placing a brick in bucket.

David Woodward spoke for the Parish Council. Local opposition had exposed serious defects and dangers in this application. That had resulted in the undertaking of a sequential test to evaluate the site. The site had failed that test and yet all alternative sites appeared unsuitable. He suggested that alternative sites warranted further investigation and not dismissed on grounds of proximity to housing as that also applied to the application site. He questioned the need for the extracted material bearing in mind doubts over the accuracy of the 7 year landbank, reducing demand for material, proximity of the site to residential areas, the presumption against development in the flood plain and whether this application should be considered in the absence of an agreed minerals strategy. Landfill could be diverted to more needy sites. Local residents could not accept the landfill element and yet a recommendation had been tabled to approve that in the face of all the information and concern expressed. A decision needed to be defensible and yet there were good reasons to reject it and he urged the Committee to do that.

Mr Woodward responded to questions from:

Councillor Tanner – he confirmed local residents would be happier if left to water based restoration offering more protection from flooding.

Councillor Lilly – alternative sites were detailed in the Atkins report offering less risk from flooding to local residential areas.

Councillor Handley – he considered the status quo as regards river flow rate would more chance of being maintained if no backfill was deposited.

Councillor David Nimmo-Smith supported Henley Town Council's comments with regard to traffic movements which would result from importation of material to the

site. Great efforts had been and were being made to improve air quality in Henley. That would be seriously affected by any increase in through traffic through the town.

Mike Pendock for the applicants identified this site as one which produced high quality flint gravel. No other suitable sites existed in this area. The Company had engaged with the local community throughout the process and had incorporated where possible many of their concerns and they would continue to do that. Detailed flood modelling had confirmed there would be no adverse effect on current levels and incidents of flooding and with regard to traffic the company had been encouraged to find a site which had access to the primary road network. He reassured the Committee the site would be operated to the highest standard with suitable monitoring and referred to the unique opportunity which the application presented to return best agricultural land to its original form and for some restoration to wetlands area.

Karen Dingley for the applicants confirmed that enhanced modelling had been carried out in strict accordance with best practice and verified accordingly. Analysis had shown some changes to flooding patterns and changes had been made to address that such as provision of a lagoon as part of the restoration which would provide additional storage for water. It was correct that inert backfill would be less porous than extracted material but she stated conclusively that extraction would not adversely affect the current situation with regard to flooding.

Adrian Beales spoke on behalf of the Phillimore estate who owned the site and confirmed that the estate considered the land high priority with a rich variety of habitats and since 1990 had undertaken significant new planting which would provide effective screening. The estate had been in existence since 1851 and had in that time taken a long term view for future generations. The estate would enter into a short term lease with LaFarge to extract an important mineral resource but would remain sensitive to local concerns by ensuring a high standard restoration to agriculture and wetlands and an increase in biodiversity.

They then responded to questions:

Councillor Owen – Mr Pendock confirmed that backfill material would consist of soils and excavation soil but he could not give an indication in percentage terms of its permeability. The area flooded now and that would continue but the response from the Environment Agency had indicated that that situation would not worsen.

Councillor Bartholomew – Mr Pendock confirmed the backfill element of the application had been made to ensure restoration of the best and most versatile agricultural land and increase biodiversity. To retain one big lake would be in conflict with those aims.

Councillor Cherry – Mr Pendock confirmed that as the site was close to Reading the company were confident that there would be sufficient material and as stated earlier the modelling showed no increase in flood risk because of backfilling.

Councillor Purse – Karen Dingley confirmed that monitoring had identified that ground water levels rose with levels in the Thames. The backfill material had some degree

of permeability and would, in association with the voids created provide enough storage for excess water.

Councillor Phillips – Karen Dingley confirmed there would be a net increase in flood capacity and confirmed again that she was 100% certain that there would be no increased risk.

Responding to a suggestion from Councillor Lilly regarding the possibility of the applicants setting up a bond to protect local residents particularly in view of the discrepancy in opinions from the two hydrology experts Mrs Crouch confirmed that that had not been asked for and it seemed inappropriate to do so at this stage.

Councillor Bartholomew referred to the impact from transport and vehicle movements not only from the extraction process but also from importation of backfill material. Reiterating that local people would prefer water based restoration he was perplexed why an application hadn't been submitted with that in mind as the backfill element seemed to be at the core of the concerns expressed by objectors.

Ms Nixon confirmed that the transport assessment had indicated expected transport levels from the south at 75% and 25% from the north. The applicant had not indicated where traffic would be coming from so those figures had been based on assumptions. The expected impact on Henley equated to 1.3 movements per hour and from the south to an additional 38 movements equating to 1 every 15 minutes. That had not been considered significant.

Mr Periam reiterated that backfill had been proposed to ensure restoration to best agricultural land.

Councillor Tanner considered condition 26 concerning restrictions on material that could be used for backfill was key to the application but it was a difficult one to decide. Whilst the countryside was not improved by lakes his fears regarding flooding had been allayed and he moved the officer recommendation as set out in the report. Councillor Cherry seconded.

Councillor Johnston who had arrived late for the meeting and indicated he would not vote on the application stated that the key issue was indeed permeability and whether the new low level of backfill would adequately compensate for the loss of permeability afforded by the extracted material.

The motion was then put to the Committee and –

**RESOLVED:** (by 6 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions recorded):

- (a) that the Planning & Regulation Committee indicates support for application no. MW.0158/11;
- (b) the application be forwarded to the Secretary of State to provide an opportunity for the application to be called in for his own determination, should he consider that to be necessary in view of the policy issue raised;

- (c) that in the event of the Secretary of State not intervening the Deputy Director for Environment and Economy (Strategy and Infrastructure Planning) be authorised to approve application no. MW.0158/11 subject to the applicant first entering into a Section 106 legal agreement to cover the funding and implementation of a 20 year long term management of the restored site and subject to conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & infrastructure Planning) but in accordance with those set out below:

Heads of Conditions

1. Complete accordance with plans
2. Commencement within 3 years
3. End date for extraction (12 years)
4. End date for restoration completion (2 years from completion of mineral extraction)
5. 5 year aftercare period
6. Submission of an aftercare plan including agricultural drainage
7. Standard working hours
8. Restriction of permitted development rights
9. New access to be provided in accordance with plans to be approved
10. Provision of vision splays on new access
11. No export of mineral from new access
12. Lorry sheeting
13. No deposit of mud or dust on the highway
14. Development in accordance with approved dust suppression measures
15. Development to take place in accordance with approved noise report
16. Noise monitoring
17. Noise limits
18. White noise on reversing beepers
19. No external lighting, other than in accordance with an approved scheme
20. No vegetation clearance during bird nesting season
21. Retention and maintenance of trees and vegetation shown as retained on approved plan
22. Scheme for protection of retained trees and hedgerows
23. Soil protection conditions
24. Signage on site to ensure HGV drivers were aware of permitted route
25. Display of approved plans in site office
26. Restriction on materials that could be used for backfill
27. 16 metre fenced standoff from Berry Brook
28. Submission of surface water drainage scheme for each phase of extraction
29. Submission of a surface water drainage scheme for each phase of restoration
30. Submission of scheme to show that there should be no surface water drainage to highway
31. Submission of details of flood compensation for bunds
32. Development in accordance with flood risk assessment
33. Submission of landscape and ecological management plan
34. Discharges to Berry Brook to be upstream of the active phase
35. Groundwater monitoring locations around the perimeter prior to commencement of development

36. Groundwater monitoring, including in relation to archaeology
37. Details of conveyor crossing over Spring Lane and public rights of way
38. Archaeological monitoring in accordance with written scheme of investigation
39. Works to take place in accordance with ecological mitigation scheme
40. Weed control scheme
41. Submission of a detailed restoration scheme
42. Development to be carried out in accordance with mitigation and enhancement scheme in ES
43. Local liaison committee
44. Requirement for additional otter surveys prior to each extraction phase
45. Submission of details of screening of rights of way
46. Submission of a flood management plan including details of safe access and escape routes

- (d) the Deputy Director for Environment and Economy (Strategy and Infrastructure Planning) being authorised to refuse the application if the legal agreement referred to in (iii) above is not completed within 10 weeks of the date of the Secretary of State confirming that he does not wish to call the application in for his own determination on the grounds that it would not comply with OMWLP policy PE13 and the guidance set out in paragraph 118 of the NPPF (in that there would not be satisfactory provisions for the long term management of the restored site).

**56/13 WASTE TRANSFER FACILITY TO HANDLE 60,000 TONNES PER ANNUM OF NON-HAZARDOUS WASTE AND 200 TPA OF CLINICAL WASTE; AND ASSOCIATED OPERATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING A NORTHERN EGRESS TO CORRIDOR ROAD, CONCRETE PAD, SOIL STORAGE BUNDS, PERIMETER FENCING, TRANSFORMER PAD AND TRANSFORMER, TRAFFIC (ARMCO) BARRIERS AND TRAFFIC LIGHTS AT THE CONSENTED MATERIALS RECYCLING FACILITY ON LAND TO THE WEST OF CORRIDOR ROAD WITHIN THE BOUNDARY OF THE EXISTING SUTTON COURTENAY WASTE MANAGEMENT CENTRE - APPLICATION NO. MW.0136/13**

(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee considered (PN7) an application to allow part of the MRF building at the Sutton Courtenay waste management centre to be used for waste transfer operations. The Committee also noted 2 late representations which had been set out in the tabled addenda. The application had been refused at the September meeting but then modified to overcome the objections raised and resubmitted.

Sally Furze reiterated her previous objections from the September meeting still stood. There were no visible signs of flood prevention work. Bunds at the site were higher and yet there was still light spillage. Smells were horrendous and it remained an example of planning creep. She could not accept that waste being brought in to the site in small vehicles and then loaded onto bigger vehicles to be transported away again was sustainable or efficient.



Robin Draper supported the Committee's previous decision to refuse permission which had been based on a step too far and on flawed statistics in a Minerals and Waste Strategy which was having to be rewritten as a result. He hoped the Committee would sustain that view. It was true the amended version was a considerable improvement but it left questions unanswered as to future applications. It was imperative that the 2030 end date was treated as definitive and honoured by both FCC and Oxfordshire County Council, particularly in view of FCC's record of layering planning application on application and extending its activities and the landfill site end date from 2012 to 2021 and now currently to 2030. This application was for a change of usage to meet an OCC contract and permission should therefore be restricted to meeting the terms of that contract from within the county and not from imports from across the so called catchment area. To allow that could only increase pressure for further applications. He considered the recommendation weak and that it should specifically refer to the Waste Transfer Facility and the 50,000tpa and 10,000 limits, reinforcement of the 2030 deadline and minimising the risks of FCC expanding the envelope of its activities further by deleting reference to the catchment area, and restricting its activities to transferring Oxfordshire's waste. He also suggested that conditions should be determined by the Chairman of the Planning Committee in conjunction with the Deputy Director. Clinical waste breached the non-hazardous waste status of the landfill site, which had been robustly defended in the past. That should be maintained and he could not accept the rationale for setting up a clinical waste transfer site to facilitate just one vehicle in and one out a fortnight, when that could go straight to the Maidenhead facility, unless the intention was to build on that by seeking to import more clinical waste in future. To protect the local community no extension of the hours of work to Bank holidays should be permitted although the increase of hours on Saturdays following a Bank holiday seemed reasonable. He urged that the application be rejected or at least deferred until the County Council had agreed a Minerals and Waste Strategy. However, if the Committee were minded to approve then any decision should clearly state that the waste transfer facility was only permitted until the end of 2030, be dismantled by 31 December of that year; restricted to the transfer of the 50,000tpa arising from the Oxfordshire contract and to 10,000tpa of C&I from within the county only. He also urged refusal for the importation of clinical waste as it breached the non hazardous waste status of the landfill site and finally that no working should be allowed on any Bank holidays.

Mark Baker welcomed the decision taken in September and the recommitment to the 2030 end date. However, that date fell well short of the end date of the 25 year waste contract awarded by the County Council which ended in 2035. Any further application to extend the end date at Sutton Courtenay should be strongly resisted and any such application needed to demonstrate a strong and clear specific need in accordance with paragraph 37 of the officer's report and county policies. A clear system of review needed to be arrived at to monitor the situation in the future.

Responding to a question from Councillor Lilly Mr Baker stated that there were alternative sites available for FCC to set up operations.

Dr Angela Jones stated that continual extensions to the end date for operations at this site had taken working from 2012 to 2030 and local people felt that nothing had really changed. That needed to be met head on and working on bank holidays

resisted. She considered acceptance of clinical waste to be the thin end of the wedge and that part of the application should be resisted.

Colin Woodward also considered the transfer operation of waste an additional and unnecessary operation. He was concerned that no specific firm limit had been placed on future expansion at this site. There would be an immense impact on local roads around the site and flies, dust, litter and odour continued to be a real nuisance. 47 complaints had been made of which only 2 had been non compliance. The remainder had been unsubstantiated, that was not acceptable.

Paul Marsh for the applicants confirmed that this was a resubmission of the application refused in September the Company having reviewed the reasons for refusal given at that time namely perceived impact on roads and local residents. He stated that the tonnage of waste into the facility was part of the existing volume of waste currently going into the site, there would be no additional waste. There had been no highway objections to the revised application. The MRF building had consent to handle 200,000 tonnes and the operation would be absorbed within the existing contract with no increased activity or intensification. Noise remained within acceptable limits and similarly dust and odour did not exceed permitted levels. There had been shown to be an identified need in order to maintain a level of sustainability. He reiterated the Company's commitment to removing the building in 2030 and restoring the land and they were not seeking to amend that.

Mr Marsh then responded to questions from:

Councillor Bartholomew – the company were surrendering some capacity at the site.

Councillor Tanner – it was a requirement of the contract to include an element for clinical waste.

Councillor Cherry – the operation was not expected to have any impact on current drainage issues regarding surface water drainage which were currently being investigated.

Councillor Lilly – the Company were not currently looking at an alternative site for post 2031. He reiterated the Company's intention to cease operations in 2030.

Councillor Handley – when not in use the doors into the building would remain closed. Additionally clinical waste would not necessarily go to Ardley as there were other sites available.

Councillor Fulljames – regarding the discrepancy between the contract length and this life of this site the contract was not site specific.

Councillor Richard Webber spoke as local member. He thanked those members of the Committee who had visited the site. Even though FCC had in fact addressed many of the issues raised at the September meeting there had still been 64 objections to this resubmission and a lot of local concern remained and as local member it was for him to see how that could be taken forward. There were 4 issues:

- Completion date which needed to be quoted in all notices.

- Catchment area – there was a feeling of ambiguity regarding the phrase service to Oxfordshire and unease that that area could be extended.
- Clinical waste – he could not understand the justification for this with marginal benefits when compared to potential risks. Again there was concern this could be extended and specific limits should be imposed now.
- Hours of working – extended hours should be refused.

On the basis that these four issues above could be addressed and where necessary written into decision notices he felt progress could be made.

Responding to Councillor Greene Ms Thompson confirmed that Condition 3 covered the closing date of the operation. However, there was no justification in planning terms to stop bank holiday working and limit it to when refuse was collected by the relevant district councils.

Responding to Councillor Lilly Mrs Crouch confirmed that a closing date could be embodied in a S106 agreement but could be amended after 5 years. In this instance a condition would fulfil the same purpose.

A motion by Councillor Tanner to approve the application but excluding the element for clinical waste was not seconded.

Mr Periam confirmed that the two elements could not be considered separately and the only alternative would be to refuse the whole application.

Councillor Owen, Councillor Lilly and Councillor Bartholomew had no real concerns regarding clinical waste which they considered would be controlled and well monitored.

Councillor Greene then moved that application MW.0136/13 be approved but with an amendment to the hours of operation to restrict bank holiday working to those when district councils were making collections. Councillor Phillips seconding.

Councillor Greene with the permission of his seconder accepted an amendment by Councillor Mrs Fulljames to amend the routing agreement to ensure vehicles were routed to Ardley via the A4130 and A34 and M40 (junction 10 only).

Councillor Mrs Fulljames also expressed concern regarding the discrepancy between the completion date for this site at 2030 and the end of the Ardley permission date of 2035 and also the need to prevent waste from outside Oxfordshire travelling through the county.

The motion as amended was then put to the Committee and –

**RESOLVED:** (9 votes to 0,1 abstention recorded) that subject to:

- i) a Section 106 agreement to ensure that waste imports to the waste transfer operation are only from within the catchment area (Oxfordshire, West Berkshire, Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell) secured by the Section 106 agreement dated 4 November 2008 for the landfill site and that the total waste import to the MRF and WTS building is 200 000tpa and this is part of and not additional to the 600,000 tpa limit on the landfill; and

- ii) a routing agreement to ensure that vehicles associated with the development are routed via the A4130 and A34 and M40 (Junction 10 only) as for other developments on the site;

application MW.0136/13 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) but in accordance with those set out at Annex 3 to the report PN7 and that hours of working as set out in that Annex be amended to restrict bank holiday working to reflect those days when District Councils made refuse collections.

**57/13 TWO SEPARATE CLASSROOM EXTENSIONS TO PROVIDE TWO ADDITIONAL CLASSROOMS AT BOTLEY COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL, ELMS ROAD, OXFORD - APPLICATION NO. R3.0061/13**

(Agenda No. 8)

The Committee considered (PN8) an application for two extensions at Botley County Primary School. The Committee also noted further representations from the local member, Councillor Janet Godden and Miss Louise Parker, a resident of Elms Road who had also submitted an 11 signature petition from fellow residents (see Minute 53/13 above for the specific terms of reference of the petition).

Mr Broughton outlined in detail the points raised by Miss Parker, in particular measures to mitigate exacerbation of traffic problems; inadequacies of the consultation process; inadequate signage to show Elms Road was a dead end; the inexplicable links between the congestion issues and the development and the apparent passing of responsibility to the school and residents to try and overcome these issues. He also addressed the issues raised in the petition namely responsibility for traffic wardens and enforcement of double yellow lines and zig zag restrictions; new signing and future consultation.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Cherry and carried 8 votes to 0) that planning permission be approved for Application R3.0061/13 subject to the following conditions:

- Detailed Compliance with approved plans and details
- Development to be carried out within three years
- School Travel Plan to be updated prior to occupation.
- Construction Management Plan to be approved prior to the development taking place, and then implemented.
- Drainage scheme to be agreed
- Provision of an additional no through road sign to be funded by the school.

Informative – that the school consults with the medical centre, local County Councillor and residents to discuss use of the car park during the school drop off and pick up times

**58/13 APPLICATION TO CONSOLIDATE THE EXISTING SCHOOL FACILITIES FOR THE CURRENT PUPILS: THE PERMANENT RETENTION OF THE EXISTING MODULAR BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF AN ADDITIONAL BUILDING TO ALLOW THE EXISTING OLD SCHOOL ROOM TO BE USED AS AN ASSEMBLY HALL, CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI USE GAMES AREA, REORGANISATION OF EXISTING HARD PLAY AREA TO ALLOW FOR STAFF PARKING ON THE SITE, AND THE ERECTION OF A POLYTUNNEL AT ASTON ROWANT C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE, ASTON ROWANT - APPLICATION NO. R3.0110/13**

(Agenda No. 9)

The Committee considered (PN9) an application to consolidate existing school facilities by providing a school hall and better external play areas.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Lilly, seconded by Councillor Handley and carried nem con) that application R3.0110/13 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) but to include the following:

1. Development to be commenced within 3 years of the date of permission.
2. Development to be built in accordance with the plans and details of the development.
3. Within one year of the date of this permission a School Travel plan to include within it provision for disabled parking and management of the use of the School Lane access.
4. Prior to the development taking place a drainage scheme to be submitted and approved.
5. Prior to commencement of the development a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted and approved.
6. That the MUGA should only be used as a school play area, and only during normal school times.
7. Prior to the commencement of the development. details of the polytunnel to be submitted for approval

..... in the Chair

Date of signing