

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 15 July 2019 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 6.30 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Jeannette Matelot – in the Chair
Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Nick Carter (In place of Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor)
Councillor Pete Handley
Councillor Damian Haywood
Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles (In place of Councillor Mike Fox-Davies)
Councillor Bob Johnston
Councillor G.A. Reynolds
Councillor Judy Roberts
Councillor Dan Sames
Councillor John Sanders
Councillor Alan Thompson
Councillor Richard Webber

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Lynda Atkins (for Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Lorraine Lyndsay-Gale (for Agenda Item 6)

Officers:

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

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
6	S. Whitehead (Law & Governance) & E. Catcheside (Planning & Place)
7.	G. Warrington (Law & Governance) & M. Hudson (Planning & Place)
8.	G. Warrington (Law & Governance), N. Woodcock (Planning & Place), A Elhachemi (Service Delivery Property)

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.

26/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

<i>Apology for Absence</i>	<i>Temporary Appointment</i>
Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor Councillor Mike Fox-Davies	Councillor Nick Carter Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles

27/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE OPPOSITE

(Agenda No. 2)

28/19 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

29/19 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Ian Mason (Bachport & Fullamoor Residents) Suzi Coyne (Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council) County Councillor Lynda Atkins County Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale Alan Pardoe (Hills Quarry Products Limited) Pete Andrew (Hills Quarry Products Limited) Lucy Binnie (Environmental Consultant) Katherine Evans (TLT Solicitors))))) 6 – Fullamoor Plantation –) Application MW.0074/18)))))))
Fiona Wright (local resident) Mike Wright - Shellingford Parish Meeting Gemma Crossley (Agent for the applicant)))) 7. Shellingford Quarry – Application) MW.0104/18)

30/19 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATES

(Agenda No. 5)

Worton Farm, Cassington

The Committee were informed that an appeal against the decision to refuse planning permission at Worton Farm, Cassington had been upheld

31/19 EXTRACTION OF SAND, GRAVEL AND CLAY INCLUDING THE CREATION OF NEW ACCESS, PROCESSING PLANT, OFFICES WITH WELFARE ACCOMMODATION, WEIGHBRIDGE AND SILT WATER LAGOON SYSTEM WITH SITE RESTORATION TO AGRICULTURE AND NATURE CONSERVATION INCLUDING LAKES WITH RECREATIONAL AFTERUSES AND THE PERMANENT DIVERSION OF FOOTPATH 171/15 AND CREATION OF NEW FOOTPATHS AT LAND AT FULLAMOR PLANTATION, CLIFTON HAMPDEN, ABINGDON, OX14 3DD - APPLICATION MW.0074/18

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered (PN6) an application for the extraction of sand, gravel and clay including the creation of new access, processing plant, offices with welfare accommodation, weighbridge and silt water lagoon system with site restoration to agriculture and nature conservation including lakes with recreational afteruses and the permanent diversion of footpath 171/15 and creation of new footpaths at Land at Fullamoor Plantation, Clifton Hampden, Abingdon.

Ms Catcheside presented the report along with an addenda setting out corrections to the report and points of clarification, further consultation responses and amended recommendations.

Suzi Coyne – SCP, speaking on behalf of Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council spoke against the proposed application made the following key points of objection.

Landscape character. The proposals would have a detrimental effect on the North Wessex Downs.

Amenity value. Loss of the amenity value of the existing footpaths and Thames Path route.

Harm to a scheduled monument.

There were no questions from the Committee.

Ian Mason – Bachport & Fullamoor Residents, opposed the application noting that the changes from the previous application did not address Parish Council concerns sufficiently. The reduction in bund size was marginal. The reduction in lorry movements and movement restrictions were not effective nor enforceable. Mr Mason argued that there was no need for a new quarry pointing out that production was 30% lower than forecast and the existing land bank figures ranged from 18 years to 22

years if a 10-year rolling average was used. There was clear harm to the landscape and heritage and very special circumstances are required to be demonstrated to overcome the harm to the green belt which he argued had not been shown.

Responding to a question Mr Mason explained that due to the topography of the site where the embankment looked down on the site the bunds had to be higher than normal.

Councillor Lindsay-Gale, local councillor for Berinsfield & Garsington spoke against the application on the grounds of the impact on roads and vehicular movements, damage to the green belt and the lack of need noting strong local opposition. Councillor Lindsay-Gale referred particularly to the danger posed by large vehicles causing an obstruction to children crossing at the A415 to access the school.

There were no questions from the Committee.

Councillor Lynda Atkins, local councillor for Wallingford, speaking against the application emphasised the following points: The application was for a processing plant, a huge concrete structure within the green belt. As such the regulations required that there be exceptional circumstances and she argued that there were none. There was a lack of need due to the land bank position. Councillor Atkins highlighted the traffic difficulties in the area that would be made worse by the application proposals with pollution and noise a constant problem. The mitigation referred to in the report was not satisfactory and the application was very little different to the earlier application that had been rejected.

Alan Pardoe, Chairman, Hills Quarry Products Limited speaking in support of the application highlighted his pride in being part of a successful family business. The company employed 700 people and was part of the local communities, supporting 350 community projects where the company was working. Mr Pardoe stressed that the company took their responsibilities seriously, had delivered some great landscapes and would contribute here to the local environment.

Pete Andrew, Managing Director, Hills Quarry Products Limited, speaking in support of the application addressed the technical issues set out in the report and highlighted that it was a sound proposal for local production to support local developments. Mr Andrew recognised that traffic was clearly of concern and commented that they invested heavily in their fleet meeting Euro 6 Emission standards. They were used to operating to strict routing agreements and drivers were trained and tracked. The company had won awards for its restoration of sites and the application would bring meaningful and tangible benefits.

Lucy Binnie, Environmental Consultant, spoke on behalf of the applicants highlighting the changes that had been made to address environmental/traffic concerns. Ms Binnie recognised that traffic was a concern but stated that with development there would be construction traffic. The application would save one million lorry road miles and reduce carbon emissions. She added that the land bank figures were not the whole picture referring to paragraphs 80-88 of the report. There would be a shortfall in 2022 and there was a need for increased production.

Katherine Evans, TLT Solicitors, spoke on behalf of the applicants highlighting the officer responses in the report and that in the special circumstances of need, that there was no reason to refuse the application.

The applicants then responded to questions from:

Councillor Carter – the application improved the crossing by the school and there was a 20% change in traffic levels.

Councillor John Sanders – In relation to the statement that company fleet vehicles were Euro 6 compliant, private contractors would mostly be using their own vehicles.

Councillor Johnston – Case law supported the need for aggregates constituting special circumstances. In addition, the application was for a temporary use and the site would be restored leading to gains in bio-diversity and increased public access.

Councillor Roberts – the bunds would be visible but were necessary for mitigation purposes. Although they would be visible this did not necessarily mean that the site was not open in green belt terms.

Councillors Thompson & Webber– the additional years to the proposed lifetime of the site allowed for a lower volume of traffic. The 20% reduction was about a balance between a viable level of extraction and lower traffic movements. The restoration would be done with local consultation. The proposed buildings were hypothetical at this stage.

Councillor Haywood – In response to concerns about bunching of vehicle movements between 9.15 am and 4 pm it was recognised that the restrictions would affect the rates of vehicles going out, but these had been discussed with the highway engineers.

Councillor Carter – Subject to highways approval the company was happy to add to the route fencing.

Councillor John Sanders – The quarry hours would finish at 6 pm and it was expected that most lorries would be out by 4 pm.

Ms Catcheside, Peter Day and Ian Marshall, Principal Engineer then responded by way of clarification to a number of questions from:

Councillor Hibbert-Biles – Paragraph 36 of the report makes it clear that there would be harm in the absence of the peak hour and other restrictions. If conditions are applied, then essentially those objections could be withdrawn.

Councillor Carter – Paragraphs 112 -122 assess the impact on the Grade II listed building and heritage assets and officers do not recommend that as a reason for refusal.

Councillor Gawrysiak – The figures used for the land bank are calculated using the figures in the Local Aggregate Assessment and set out at paragraph 84.

Councillor Haywood – Oxfordshire had been able to consistently maintain a land bank over the minimum figure but the amount by which it exceeded the minimum varied.

Councillor Carter – The impact on the primary school would be considered as a material consideration. Factors including emissions. Pollution, noise, dust and vibrations had been assessed and officers are satisfied that there are no harmful levels of impact. There was no expectation that a pedestrian crossing would be funded from the £20k that had been identified for footway improvements

Responding to questions from several councillors on the impact of the SODC Local Plan Ms Catchside explained the status of the emerging plan and the weight they were able to attach to it. Officers were unable to recommend the previous ground (iii) set out in the addenda relating to prejudice to the future development of a new link road and Thames crossing.

Councillor Johnston proposed refusal of the application for reasons (i), (ii) and (iv) on the addenda together with a reason based on paragraphs 21 -23 of the report relating to the impact on the Grade II Listed Fullamoor Farmhouse. He proposed that reason (iii) as set out on the addenda not be included in the grounds for refusal. Councillor Carter seconded the motion.

During discussion:

Councillor Reynolds supported reason (iv) but was concerned that with reasons (i) and (ii) the committee would be going against the advice of officers.

Councillor Sanders highlighted two issues. Firstly, he was not satisfied that the traffic mitigation was sufficient. Secondly in his view the bund was oppressive and did affect the openness of the green belt.

Councillor Carter stated that he had supported the motion refusing the application due to harm to the listed building and heritage site. He also expressed concern over routing issues.

Councillor Webber supported the motion but commented that the company had acted honourably and honestly throughout. It was simply that the application was not suitable.

Councillor Roberts in supporting the motion to refuse highlighted the impact of additional vehicle movements and also supported the inclusion of a reason for refusal linked to the impact on the landscape and the impact on heritage assets.

Councillor Handley indicated that he would be abstaining from the decision as in his view it was premature to bring the application to Committee before the consultation had been finalised and there was uncertainty around the SODC Local Plan. Officers advised that no decision would be issued on the application prior to the close of the consultation period and following consultation with the committee Chairman and

Deputy Chairman should any further responses be received. If necessary, the matter would come back to the September meeting for reconsideration.

Members voted on the motion proposed by Councillor Johnston, and seconded by Councillor Carter that the application be refused on the following grounds:

- i) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would lead to severe highways impacts contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework; would not maintain the safety of road users and the efficiency of the road network contrary to the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy C10 and would contribute to congestion, disruption and delays on the road network, contrary to Local Transport Plan policy 02.
- ii) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would worsen queuing at local junctions leading to stationary vehicles with associated air emissions, causing unacceptable adverse impacts on environmental amenity, contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies C5 and C10.
- iii) The less than substantial harm caused to the setting of, and therefore the significance of, the Grade II Listed Fullamoor Farmhouse would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal and the development would therefore be contrary to policies CON5 and CON7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, and C9 of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- iv) The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy C12, South Oxfordshire Local Plan policy GB4 and National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 143, 144 and 146 and no very special circumstances exist to justify making an exception to these policies.

RESOLVED: subject to the consultation period closing without any new material considerations arising and following consultation with the committee Chairman and Deputy Chairman Application MW.0039/16 be refused for the following reasons:

- iii) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would lead to severe highways impacts contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework; would not maintain the safety of road users and the efficiency of the road network contrary to the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy C10 and would contribute to congestion, disruption and delays on the road network, contrary to Local Transport Plan policy 02.
- iv) The additional vehicle movements arising from the development would worsen queuing at local junctions leading to stationary vehicles with associated air emissions, causing unacceptable adverse impacts on environmental amenity, contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies C5 and C10.
- iii) The less than substantial harm caused to the setting of, and therefore the significance of, the Grade II Listed Fullamoor Farmhouse would not be outweighed

by the public benefits of the proposal and the development would therefore be contrary to policies CON5 and CON7 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, and C9 of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

iv)The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt contrary to Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policy C12, South Oxfordshire Local Plan policy GB4 and National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 143, 144 and 146 and no very special circumstances exist to justify making an exception to these policies.

Councillor Handley requested that he be recorded as having abstained from the vote.

32/19 PROPOSED EXTRACTION OF MINERAL AND RESTORATION BY INFILLING WITH IMPORTED INERT MATERIALS TO AGRICULTURE AND NATURE CONSERVATION AT LAND TO THE WEST OF SHELLINGFORD QUARRY, STANFORD ROAD, STANFORD-IN-THE-VALE, FARINGDON, SN7 8HE - APPLICATION MW.0104/18

(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee considered (PN7) an application for a western extension to an existing quarry near Shellingford in south west Oxfordshire to extract limestone and soft sand from a 30-hectare area over a 22-year period with the site progressively restored to agriculture using imported inert waste and extending the current restoration date of 2029 to 2044.

Mrs Hudson presented the report along with 2 changes as set out in the addenda sheet.

Mike Wright a local resident spoke on behalf of the Shellingford Parish Quarry Sub-Committee. They considered the proposed application to extend Shellingford Quarry unsatisfactory in many respects and in support of that made the following key points:

Need - the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment, published in November 2018, had clearly stated that there was no requirement for more soft sand or crushed rock for the period to 2031 and stating that the landbank in Oxfordshire for Soft Sand was 16.4 years and for Crushed Rock 16.0 years. With local demand for this product already met by the existing landbank and even with some increased demand it was likely that this excess product would have to be transported out of County which as defined in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1, sections C1, C2, C5 and C10 would be environmentally unacceptable. The proposal was opportunistic and speculative and sought to circumvent the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 2 which was yet to be published and adopted.

Inadequate buffer zone - a 250 metre Buffer Zone between quarries and local residences was an Industry Standard, which had been relaxed in Oxfordshire in 2017. This sensible principle had helped to ensure that the amenity and health of local residents and school children were protected. Recent analysis clearly predicted that there would be increased dust experienced by residents and school children,

should an extension be permitted. Therefore, bringing the quarry closer than 250 metres was unacceptable and contrary to the distances of “approximately 250 metres” as quoted in the Council’s summary with distances to residences, school and Grade 1 listed church all substantially less than that.

Rigorous dust monitoring - At the insistence of Oxfordshire Public Health, gravimetric dust analysis had been undertaken at the Primary School during the wet month of April 2019. Official consultees have commented that measurement for one month would not be sufficient to predict annual dust levels and would not be representative of levels of dust generated during dryer summer months. Additionally, there was no dust monitoring undertaken on the adjacent A417 road, which was well known to be covered in dust and dirt generated by the cumulative effect of quarry lorries from Shellingford and the other nearby quarries of which there were 3. This dust exacerbated respiratory problems, especially for vulnerable adults and children containing carcinogenic silica.

Noise - with the wind from the North East, noise generated by the quarry was unacceptable, particularly when the hydraulic breaker was being used. Both the Council and the Applicant had acknowledged that the hydraulic breaker generated a distinguishable percussive noise and specific noise limits, as mandated by HSE and Government policy, must be imposed on this machine. They had noted that the applicant had offered to cease operation of the breaker when the wind was from a North East direction.

If permission were granted for the extension he asked that strict and clearly defined robust conditions were set for the operation, specifically when the wind was from the North East with robust systems established for both compliance, monitoring and complaints.

He then responded to questions from:

Councillor Reynolds – dust was a tangible issue often settling on car windscreens and windows some 230 meters away.

Councillor Gawrysiak – he couldn’t say specifically how often the breaker was used but he would estimate at least 20 – 30% of the time.

Fiona Wright a local resident urged the Committee not to approve the application. She felt the environmental statement could not guarantee safety for the school which was only 230 metres away. Dust would adversely affect the health of children and the elderly and the monitoring exercise carried out on a wet April day was wholly inadequate when in midsummer you could see clouds of dust. She considered it wrong to consider approval when levels of risk were unknown and the Committee should not abdicate it’s responsibility to residents asking whether approval would be given to an application to build a new school this close to a quarry. The environmental impact assessment had failed to mention a number of issues including impact of future development. There were 4 quarries along the length of the A417 and it was not right to approve something when the full picture wasn’t known. If the application were approved then conditions needed to be so tight as to remove any risk to children and other vulnerable residents.

Gemma Crossley then spoke on behalf of the applicants. The site had a long history with permitted reserves which were close to being worked out. That had led to this application with quarry output, vehicle movements etc all remaining the same. The report recognised that there was a need for the material. The western extension would move operations closer to Shellingford but measures proposed would mitigate its effect and reduce impact. There had been no adverse comments from strategic consultees. The site was well maintained and recent monitoring for noise had not identified any major issues and had, in fact, been abandoned due to traffic noise interfering with the monitoring. The application met social and environmental objectives and complied with development plans.

She then responded to questions:

Councillor Johnston – the village was some 230 metres away and there would be a bund along the boundary. There was a mature tree belt between the quarry and the village which would also help mitigate against noise and dust. Wind direction was usually south westerly which would carry dust away but if from a north easterly direction then the operator would cut down on operations as mentioned in the conditions to the report.

Councillor Carter – with regard to comments regarding the inadequacy of the environmental statement she confirmed that the statement had covered a number of issues including air quality and highway impact, had gone through a screening and scoping process and following a certain format using a baseline assessment had looked at the impact of the application above that baseline. Results had shown no significant impacts and that exercise had been reviewed by the County and District Councils. Community engagement had also been carried out before the application had been submitted.

Councillor Hibbert-Biles – regarding air quality assessment there had been objection from the health authority and Health England had been consulted. A number of monitoring localities had been included but levels had been so low as to be insignificant and well below guidelines. There was a management plan as conditioned with daily monitoring carried out and if wind direction was from the north east then work would cease until that changed.

Councillor Handley – the boundary was currently fenced as a farm but if approved then fencing would be improved in line with a duty of care.

Councillor Roberts – quarry operations would inevitably be dusty but 7 conditions were being carried over from the current permission which included sheeting of vehicles, road sweeping and damping down using a manual system. However, it would be unsustainable for water to be running continuously by installing an automated system. There was no standard policy for a 250 metre buffer zone with zones now agreed on merit and the applicants felt the zone now being proposed was sufficient in order to maintain acceptable limits.

Councillor Gawrysiak – the breaker machinery operated within the existing quarry but sometimes was sited round the edge of the site. The machinery operated within existing limits but there were conditions to help mitigate against that i.e. ceasing work when wind direction was from the north east and no Saturday am working. Condition

23 set out terms for a dust management plan. Information on dust data was on the website and monitoring would be undertaken at the school. She wasn't able to confirm information regarding Pm1s but added that the employer had a duty of care to employees so conditions would be monitored on the site and if those levels were acceptable on site then it seemed reasonable to expect that that would be the case some 230 metres away.

Councillor Hibbert-Biles – she confirmed Public Health England in their last response had stated they were satisfied with measures put forward with the application.

Responding to Councillor Hibbert-Biles Mrs Hudson confirmed that the OCC public health team had raised no objection to the proposals subject to submission and approval of a detailed dust management plan and how levels would be monitored. That had been set out in Condition 23.

Mrs Hudson then responded to a number of questions from Councillor Carter:

Condition 4 had been amended by replacing *implementation* with *extraction* as set out in the addenda in order to address an objection by the applicants

Condition 8 – officers felt that the height of bunds as proposed were high enough to mitigate against operations.

Condition 16 – the applicant would be submitting details for a liaison meeting.

Condition 23 – conditions would be regularly monitored and if breaches were identified they would be dealt with. In most cases breaches, when they occurred, were initially dealt with through negotiation with enforcement not always the best answer. Any issues raised would be investigated.

Routeing agreement – no routeing agreement was required as access was directly onto a main road/ There was no such restriction on the existing permission.

Councillor Handley supported calls for a routeing agreement and generally felt that further information was required on a number of issues.

Councillor Carter considered that any extension meant inevitable mean an increase in operations and that justified a routeing agreement to protect local villages and, therefore, should form an integral part of any new approval.

Councillor Johnston stated that as there was no history of problems on the existing site that could be considered an unreasonable condition.

Mr Periam confirmed that a routeing agreement would be a separate legal agreement which the applicant would need to enter into. That had not been raised as a requirement.

Councillor Hibbert-Biles reiterated her concerns regarding the inadequacy of information on the public health aspect and the need for further information.

Councillor Gawrsysiak felt that the report presented a fair summary of the situation. However, he would like to see a robust scheme for dust management including separate monitoring locations over an agreed and sensible length of time with agreement regarding levels when work should cease if breached. Subject to the

terms of such a condition coming back to the Committee for approval he moved the recommendation. Councillor Sanders seconded.

The motion having been put to the Committee and carried by 8 votes to 4 (Councillor Handley, Councillor Hibbert-Biles and Councillor Carter recorded as voting against) it was –

RESOLVED: that

(a) subject to the applicant signing a Section 106 agreement for the matters outlined in Annex 2 to the report PN7 that planning permission for MW.0104/18 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director of Planning and Place, to include those set out in Annex 1 to the report PN7 amended as follows:

4. No ~~implementation~~ *extraction* until such a time that the processing plant, silt ponds, stocking areas and access have planning consent until 2044, replacement of stripped soils if consent is not gained for this

15. No excavation below *the base of the Highworth Limestone or 64 AOD* or into the Lower Calcareous Grit Formation.

The detailed wording for the conditions would be drawn up following committee, should the resolution be to approve the application. If the Environment Agency indicate that the reference to 64 AOD is necessary, the full wording would include this.

(b) that Condition 23 regarding the terms of a detailed dust management plan to be submitted to Committee for final approval before work commenced having first been submitted to the public health and the environmental health teams and reflecting the comments raised by members to secure a robust and meaningful scheme.

33/19 FULL PERMISSION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW 1FE PRIMARY SCHOOL INCLUDING NURSERY AND SEN PROVISION WITH DETAILS OF VEHICLE ACCESS, HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, CAR PARKING, CYCLE AND SCOOTER PARKING, EXTERNAL PLAY AREAS, EXTERNAL LIGHTING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENTS AT LAND OF SOUTHAM ROAD, BANBURY, OX16 1ST - APPLICATION R3.0034/19

(Agenda No. 8)

The Committee considered (PN8) an application to construct a new 1FE primary school to complement the new housing development, Hanwell View which, it was anticipated would provide places for 270 pupils (60 nursery places and 210 places in reception - year 6) with 30 pupils per class.

Ms Woodcock presented the report together with a number of amendments to the report as follows:

Paragraph 45 – the report referred to “additional planting is proposed to the west of Southam Road”. That should have read “east of Southam Road”

Amendments to the fenestration arrangements to be delegated to officers.

Additional planting to address air quality concerns.

Also tabled was a statement from Bob Robinson the Agent for the application who had hoped to attend but been unable to do so. His statement also referred to changes to fenestration arrangements, confirmed further discussions would be held with Cherwell DC regarding concerns about external appearance and materials, additional planting to address air quality concerns and the terms of a community use agreement allowing the school access to additional areas for formal recreation.

Members discussed issues of air quality and design noting that changes had been proposed which would go some way to addressing issues of concern.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Reynolds, seconded by Councillor Johnston and carried by 11 votes to 0) that subject to the applicant first providing a Unilateral Undertaking for the payment of the Travel Plan monitoring fee of £1240 that planning permission for Application R3.0034/19 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 PN8 and an additional condition 15 for provision of secure cycle storage.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing