

## PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Monday, 12 September 2011 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 6.50 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Steve Hayward – in the Chair

Councillor Mrs Catherine Fulljames (Deputy Chairman)  
Councillor Alan Armitage  
Councillor Tony Crabbe  
Councillor Patrick Greene (In place of Councillor Roger Belson)  
Councillor Jenny Hannaby  
Councillor Peter Jones  
Councillor Stewart Lilly (In place of Councillor Ray Jelf)  
Councillor Charles Mathew (In place of Councillor Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor)  
Councillor David Nimmo-Smith  
Councillor Neil Owen  
Councillor G.A. Reynolds  
Councillor John Sanders  
Councillor Don Seale  
Councillor John Tanner

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Melinda Tilley (for Agenda Item 9)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting G. Warrington and J. Crouch (Law & Governance); R. Dance and D. Groves (Environment & Economy)

Part of meeting

**Agenda Item**

6 & 8

7

9

**Officer Attending**

A. Divall (Environment & Economy)

J. Duncalfe (Environment & Economy)

J. Hamilton (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.*

**29/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS**

(Agenda No. 1)

*Apology for Absence*

*Temporary Appointment*

Councillor Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor  
 Councillor Ray Jelf  
 Councillor Roger Belson

Councillor Charles Mathew  
 Councillor Stewart Lilly  
 Councillor Patrick Greene

**30/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE OPPOSITE**

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor	Item	Interest
Mrs C Fulljames	6. Construction of a household waste and commercial waste recycling centre – Langford lane, Kidlington - Application R3.0167/10	Personal. Member of Cherwell District Council Planning Committee. She advised that she had not expressed an opinion on the application in that capacity and therefore intended to participate in discussion and voting on that item.
Reynolds	6. Construction of a household waste and commercial waste recycling centre at Langford lane, Kidlington - Application R3.0167/10	Personal. Member of Cherwell District Council Planning Committee. He advised that he had not expressed an opinion on the application in that capacity and therefore intended to participate in discussion and voting on that item.
Tanner	6. Construction of a household waste and commercial waste recycling centre at Langford lane, Kidlington - Application R3.0167/10	Personal. Member of the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership. He had also submitted a motion to Council to be discussed on the 13 September which welcomed proposals for this facility. He considered that neither affected his discretion to participate in discussion and voting on this item.

Hannaby	7. Mechanical and biological treatment facility at Sutton Courtenay landfill site - Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM	She advised that after making a statement she would leave the meeting for the remainder of the item on the grounds that she had as a member of the Vale of White Horse District Council's Planning Committee predetermined the application.
Jones	7. Mechanical and biological treatment facility at Sutton Courtenay landfill site - Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM	Personal. Member of the Vale of White Horse District Council. He advised that he had not expressed an opinion on the application in that capacity and therefore intended to participate in discussion and voting on that item.
Lilly	7. Mechanical and biological treatment facility at Sutton Courtenay landfill site - Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM	Personal. Local County Councillor for Sutton Courtenay. He advised that he had not expressed an opinion on the application in that capacity and therefore intended to participate in discussion and voting on that item.
Mathew	7. Mechanical and biological treatment facility at Sutton Courtenay landfill site - Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM	Personal. He advised that he had had previous dealings with WRG with regard to another site at Dix Pit. However, he did not consider that affected his discretion to participate in discussion and voting on this item.

### 31/11 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 July were approved and signed.

**32/11 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATES**

(Agenda No. 4)

The Committee were advised as follows

Waterstock Golf Course – A three day hearing had taken place the previous week into the continued failure of the Wyatt Brothers to remove illegally tipped waste from their Golf Course situated in the green belt near the village of Waterstock, in Oxfordshire. Oxfordshire County Council had brought the case back to the Royal Courts of Justice, where Mrs Justice Thirlwall had concluded that Ron and Michael Wyatt were in contempt of an earlier Court Order issued by Mr Justice Crane in 2006. This had required the Wyatt Brothers to remove large quantities of waste materials from the golf course site. The Judge held that previously determined prison sentences for contempt of court by Mr Ron Wyatt (6 months) and Mr Michael Wyatt (4 months) should be further suspended to give them time to appoint a contractor to set out a written specification for the work they would do to remove the waste, and further to then make a start on that work. The Court would reconvene later in November of this year to examine what has then been done to comply.

The Chairman reported he had attended the Summer Planning School in Swansea.

**33/11 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda No. 5)

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Item</i>
Paul Williams Gareth Jones Andrew Pau David Mason	) ) 6. Waste recycling centre, Langford ) Lane, Kidlington – Application ) R3.0167/10
Nicola Beaumont Dr Pauline Wilson Robin Draper David Mckenzie Dr Nick Hards Dr Angela Jones Kenneth Dijksman Gervaise Duffield Alan Bulpin	) ) ) ) 7. MBT facility, Sutton Courtenay ) landfill site - ) Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM ) ) )
Daniel Hopkin Joy Farrell Jeremy Flawn	) ) 8. Aston Rowant CofE Primary ) School – Application R3.0056/1
Robert Mattock Councillor Melinda Tilley	) 9. Swannybrook Farm, Kingston ) Bagpuize – Application MW.0049/11

**34/11 CONSTRUCTION OF A HOUSEHOLD WASTE AND COMMERCIAL WASTE RECYCLING CENTRE - LANGFORD LANE, KIDLINGTON, OXFORDSHIRE - APPLICATION R3.0167/10**

(Agenda No. 6)

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of land to the north of Langford Lane, Kidlington for development as a household and commercial waste recycling centre.

Paul Williams addressed the Committee on behalf of Eskmuir properties (TV Police Headquarters). He referred to the negative impact of this bad neighbour development on neighbouring properties and workers, the quality of the environment from noise and smell and impact on the openness of the green belt. Eskmuir properties had concerns regarding the robustness of the selection process for this site and felt the process had been fundamentally flawed. To illustrate that point he highlighted an alternative site at Worton Farm, which, despite meeting all the criterion, had been discounted because a small part of the site was in a flood zone 1 area. They did not accept that Langford Lane was the only suitable site and therefore there were no special circumstances to allow this development in the green belt. All of these factors meant that any decision to approve this application would be open to challenge.

He responded to questions from:

Councillor Mathew – any delays to journey times resulting from increased traffic accessing this development would be of great concern to his clients.

Gareth Jones addressed the Committee on behalf of Inchscape properties. Endorsing the comments of the previous speaker he queried compliance with development plans and the appropriateness of this development in the green belt. Its impact on the green belt and neighbouring properties would not be satisfactorily addressed by proposed screening. Alternative sites were available and no special circumstances had been proven. There had been no balancing exercise of harm against benefit. PPS10 stated that effects of traffic, noise, smell and dust were critical in site selection and in view of the likely significant impact of this facility on neighbouring properties he urged refusal.

He responded to questions from:

Councillor Mathew – he confirmed that there were concerns regarding levels of traffic generated by the development.

Andrew Pau (Oxfordshire County Council) and David Mason (Mouchel) responded to questions on behalf of the applicants from:

Councillor Hayward – Mr Mason confirmed that Mouchel and officers from the County's planning and waste management teams had prepared the site selection criteria. These were clearly set out in the report. Although 150 sites had been listed initially there were in reality few sites that could be considered because of the constraints, which needed to be imposed, such as proximity to centres of population and the need to avoid flood zone 2 areas. As a waste site it demonstrated special circumstances for development in the green belt and could be delivered quickly.

Councillor Tanner – traffic levels had been calculated using capacities at existing junctions and the applicants were satisfied that increased traffic levels could be accommodated.

Councillor Mathew – site selection criteria had been used consistently for all sites. The process had taken into account the close margins in the final ranking of sites in addition to other issues such as deliverability.

Councillor Seale – the principal disadvantage of many of the sites had been access whereas in this regard Langford Lane had been the most suitable as access could be taken immediately off the highway. Further advantages were that it was available, deliverable and away from residential properties.

Councillor Jones - the site had been identified in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan in 1996 long before other businesses such as Mercedes Benz had relocated. It was proposed to provide a canopy in order to provide state of the art facilities and to meet the needs of the public and it was not the first of its kind to provide such a facility.

Mr Dance confirmed the need for a facility on the north side of Oxford and the opportunity which this site provided. He commended the proposal to the Committee and advised that the development was part of a strategy for the future and not an isolated proposal. County planning officers were satisfied that the search carried out demonstrated that there were no more acceptable sites for this facility than the Langford Lane site and Cherwell District Council's environmental health officer had been satisfied regarding issues of noise and dust.

Mr Groves confirmed the following projected increases in traffic levels, which had been based on existing traffic flow at existing junctions: all traffic on the Banbury Road weekday 0.2% and Saturdays 1.2%. A44 junction weekday 4.5% and Saturday 10%. It was reasonable to estimate that levels on Langford Lane would not be materially any greater than the above.

Mr Mason confirmed that some of the existing hedge would have to be removed because of its poor condition and in order to provide access but the applicants were happy to retain as much of the boundary hedge on the southern side along Langford Lane as it was possible to do.

Councillor Mrs Fulljames appreciated that this was green belt but pointed out that those offices/businesses who had objected had also been built in the green belt. A full and comprehensive search for alternative sites had been carried out and whilst loss of another green field site was to be regretted she supported the development. She moved, and Councillor Armitage seconded that the revised officer recommendation as set out in the addenda sheet to include, on a motion by the Chairman, seconded by Councillor Hannaby, an additional condition to retain the existing hedgerow bordering the southern side of the site (Langford Lane) and other planting as far as was possible to still enable a safe access be approved.

Responding to concerns from Councillor Lilly that this site might prejudice local wildlife habitats and SSSIs Mr Divall reiterated that neither the County Ecologist or Natural England had objected.

Councillor Mathew stressed the potential effect on neighbouring businesses which employed 5,000 and generated £500 million pa. In 1996 when the Minerals & Waste Local Plan had identified this site there had been no other buildings in the vicinity but that 15 year gap had seen intensive development and that should have been taken into account. There were many aspects of this proposal: threat of bird strike, screening, drainage and necessity for provision of a canopy, which needed to be reconsidered. Also the ability to deliver was now in question because of doubts regarding ownership of the strip of land between the site and Langford Lane. He considered another site should be considered or existing facilities upgraded.

Councillor Armitage referred to the benefits of this site. The grain silo was also in the green belt and numerous developments had been approved for that site. A 4% increase in traffic levels could be supported.

Councillor Crabbe felt that this facility was needed to serve this area. Bird strike would not be a problem, as evidenced at the Oakley Wood site, which was near to RAF Benson, and neither would odour. He considered the benefits far outweighed the disbenefits and he supported the proposal.

The motion by Councillor Armitage, incorporating the motion by the Chairman was then put to the Committee and –

**RESOLVED** (by 9 votes to 6): that subject to:

- (a) the development not being called in by the Secretary of State;
- (b) authorising the Director for Environment & Economy in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning & Regulation Committee to consider any comments which might be received in response to the landowner notification process to establish ownership of the strip of land between Langford Lane and the application site;

that Application No R3.0176/10 be approved subject to:

- (i) conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Growth & Infrastructure) to include the following matters:
  1. That the development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the particulars contained in the application and the plans accompanying (as amended) subject to conditions covering matters below.
  2. That the development should commence within 3 years of the date of the permission.
  3. That samples of the external materials (including roof materials) proposed to be used should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development.
  4. That the final details and location of the design of waste skip canopies should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.

5. That details of the sustainable features of the proposed building should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
6. That no development should take place until the trees, bushes and hedgerows on and immediately adjacent to the site which were to be retained and which were adjacent to or within the development area, had been protected during building operations by means of a protective fence or other suitable measures.
7. That the site be landscaped and planted with trees and shrubs in accordance with a comprehensive planting and landscaping scheme submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
8. That all planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping should be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever was the sooner.
9. The development permitted should only be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application.
10. A surface water drainage scheme should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development (in consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England). Drainage from the site should not link into any ditches or watercourses which might lead directly or indirectly to the Rushy Meadows SSSI. Measures should be secured to ensure the proposal did not cause contamination to ground water which might in turn pollute the SSSI.
11. Vegetation should only be removed between 1 September and 31 March as this was outside of the bird breeding season.
12. Ramps should be installed into any deep excavations left open overnight to ensure wildlife can escape.
13. That details of bat roost features on the proposed building should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
14. An Ecological Management Plan should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
15. A Construction Phase Management and Travel Plan should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development (in consultation with the local highway authority). The Plan should include details of measures to reduce dust from construction activities.

16. That the final details of site access from Langford Lane should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development (in consultation with the local highway authority).
17. That a scheme of directional signage for vehicles accessing the site should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development (in consultation with the local highway authority). The scheme should be implemented prior to the first use of the site.
18. That the details of the routes used by site operator heavy goods vehicles accessing the site should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development (in consultation with the local highway authority). Heavy goods vehicles should not access the site through Kidlington via the A4260.
19. Within 3 months of the first use of the site the bus stop adjacent to the site should be moved to a location approved by the local highway authority.
20. Within 3 months of the first use of the site a travel plan statement should be submitted to and approved by the local highway authority.
21. That the details of the proposed lighting columns, their cowlings and predicted light overspill levels should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
22. Details of measures to control noise from the site (as set out in paragraph 2.4.2 of Addendum to Environmental Noise Survey Report dated April 2010 – August 2011) should be submitted and agreed prior to the commencement of the development. All measures to control noise should be implemented for the life of the development.
23. Details of measures to control dust and odour from the site (as set out in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.2.4 of Air Quality Statement dated July 2010) should be submitted and agreed prior to the commencement of the development. All measures to control dust and odour should be implemented for the life of the development.
24. That the details of coverings for waste containers should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of the development.
25. The existing hedgerow bordering on the southern side of the site (Langford Lane) be retained along with other planting as far as was possible to still enable a safe access.
26. Hours of use of the site should be restricted to the following times:
  - Public opening hours to be between the hours of 8.00am to 5.00pm
  - Operating hours to be between the hours of 7.00am to 7.00pm

In addition:

- Public opening hours to be between the hours of 8.00am to 8.00pm on Thursdays (1 April – 30 September)
- Operating hours to be between the hours of 7.00am to 8.30pm on Thursdays (1 April – 30 September)

No operations on Christmas Day, Boxing Day or New Year's Day.

#### Informatives

##### Environment Agency:

- The site would require an environmental permit
- It was a legal requirement to have a site waste management plan for all new construction projects worth more than £300,000.

##### Ecological

If any protected species were found all work should cease immediately and no further work should take place until the protected species officer had been consulted.

##### Archaeological

If archaeological finds did occur during development, the County Archaeologist should be notified in order that he might visit the site and advise as necessary.

**35/11 A MECHANICAL AND BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT (MBT) FACILITY, WITH AN OPERATING CAPACITY OF 220,000 TONNES OF WASTE PER ANNUM PLUS ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT. THE FACILITY WILL INCLUDE AUXILIARY SYSTEMS SUCH AS AIR TREATMENT (BIOFILTERS), LEACHATES/CONDENSATES TREATMENT, ELECTRICAL AND AUTOMATION SYSTEMS. THE DEVELOPMENT WILL ALSO EXTEND THE USE OF RAIL SIDINGS FOR THE EXPORT OF SOLID RECOVERED FUEL (SRF) FROM THE SITE AT SUTTON COURTENAY LANDFILL SITE - APPLICATION NO SUT/APF/616/64-CM**

(Agenda No. 7)

The Committee considered (PN7) an application to construct a mechanical biological treatment facility at Sutton Courtenay landfill site.

Nicola Beaumont stated that it was not correct to describe this proposal as a new waste facility in an existing site when in fact it was a green field site and would have an immense impact on the surrounding area. It appeared that no alternative sites had been considered. The planned closure of Didcot A in 2015 presented an opportunity to reclaim this lowland area for the benefit of local communities.

Pauline Wilson considered the report did not justify the need for this development over a need to retain the landscape gap between Sutton Courtenay and Appleford. Offering unsubstantiated opinions as to the need for this type of facility the report referred to a requirement of 190,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste for

Oxfordshire, which was considerably less than the 905,000 tonnes demanded by the application and was vague and speculative as to where that shortfall would be found. Rather than meeting a local need it seemed to provide a convenient solution for London until it could deal with its own waste. There was concern that the applicants were unwilling to agree a hinterland policy and therefore traffic assessments in the report were at best a guess. There was no justification to overturn the current planning restriction on this site and if approved would be robustly challenged.

Robin Draper expressed concern that there seemed to be a bias towards the applicants position and a closeness between the County Council and WRG. There was no overriding need for the facility with a shortfall in levels of commercial and industrial waste. Ardley had been expected to accept all of that type of waste. No hinterland agreement meant that this would be a dumping ground for waste from other areas and that was unacceptable. The County Council had a legal and moral responsibility not to place commercial profits against the needs of local residents.

David Mckenzie stated that this development was a purely commercial venture for the benefit of the company's shareholders. It presented no benefit to 30,000 local residents or other Oxfordshire residents and there was no support locally for developing this green field site. Referred to hundreds of infringements by WRG which had been logged nationally he called for tighter controls to be imposed on WRG. The County Council needed to put residents first and suggested that as the great bulk of waste would be imported from London then a site closer to London should be found.

Nick Hards questioned the suitability of Sutton Courtenay for this type of development and plans to import waste from London and Berkshire. When Didcot A was closed and demolished 3,300 homes to be built west of Didcot would have open views. However, if this went ahead they would look down on this enormous facility which could not be screened effectively. There was no guarantee that the facility would be completely risk free which could put the River Thames at risk from pollution. There was uncertainty as to the source of waste and the desirability and sustainability of transporting waste 50 miles and then onwards again after processing needed to be questioned.

Dr Angela Jones questioned the environmental credentials of this process and the need to import waste from outside Oxfordshire. Appleford Parish Council had opposed proposals for a waste incinerator but this facility would be worse. No hinterland had been identified with greater movements of waste. The site had been established as greenfield and should only be developed if an overriding need had been identified – this had not been done. Original proposals had stipulated landfill should end by 2012 and returned to farmland but this had been pushed on to 2020, then 2031 and now, should this proposal go ahead, to 2036 with a massive building on open space. The original proposal had had the floor area of Heathrow's terminal 5 and, although reduced, was still  $\frac{3}{4}$  of that area. It offered no benefit to the local or wider community, had been based on a waste strategy still in draft form, was against local planning policy and no consideration had been given to finding alternative sites. She urged that the application be refused on those grounds used to reject the previous energy for waste application at this site.

Responding to Councillor Mathew she read out the Planning & Regulation Committee's reasons for refusal of the energy for waste application in October 2009.

Ken Dijksman advised that a proposal to build a facility as enormous as this needed to stand up to scrutiny. This did not. No clear evidence of need had been identified and no effort made to find potential alternative sites. The Committee were perfectly entitled to take a different view from that recommended in the report and should do so.

Responding to Councillor Owen he reiterated that this facility was proposed in this location purely for commercial reasons. There were no planning reasons for this to be sited here. Whether that would apply at other sites he couldn't say because no such investigation had been carried out but Sutton Courtenay Parish Council considered there was no justification for it to be sited here.

Gervaise Duffield stated that the Vale of White Horse District Council had been unanimously opposed to this proposal as had other local councils in the area. He highlighted 4 major concerns. Views from Wittenham Clumps would remain compromised even after the demolition of Didcot A. The opinion of County officers was that a huge regional waste site was required in south Oxfordshire. However, an application for such a site had been submitted for Chieveley, which was just over the border and could meet that need making this venture superfluous. There was no benefit to local residents only WRG shareholders and was against the principle of localism. It was a greenfield site and there was no confidence locally that WRG would ever complete its landfill operations.

With regard to Minute 30/11 above Councillor Hannaby advised that as a member of the Vale of White Horse District Planning Committee she had voted against this proposal. She endorsed all that the previous speakers had said and referred to the long term suffering by the local community. She then left the meeting for the remainder of the item.

Alan Bulpin speaking for WRG emphasised that the site was neither green belt nor an area of outstanding beauty but was remote and within an established industrial and waste site. There had been no objections from statutory consultees and although there had been local objections and concerns he was confident the scheme would meet those to a great extent. There was a need for this type of facility and stressed that its operation was not wholly dependent on the continuing importation of London waste. By diverting waste from landfill the proposal supported the aims of PPS10 by using residual waste, which would otherwise go to landfill as a resource/fuel and would help reduce the carbon footprint. For 20 years Oxfordshire had been net self sufficient for commercial and industrial waste. The building would contain all waste treatment and the environmental impact had been fully assessed and described in the report along with flood risk proposals. The proposal was for a temporary facility on a remote site. The operation, which would be regulated by the Environment Agency under its permit regime, formed an important element of the draft waste strategy. Although it was not an easy decision there was an identified and clear need for this facility and therefore a balance needed to be reached between that and the needs of the local area. WRG considered this proposal did that. Solid recovered fuel was classified as a renewable energy form and the facility would operate to the highest environmental standards.

He responded to questions from –

Councillor Greene – the application was for 25 years and although he could not foresee what conditions would prevail in 2036 any decision to extend that time would need to be the subject of a further application and ultimately, therefore, a decision for the County Council to make.

Councillor Tanner - this was the only site considered in Oxfordshire although other sites had been assessed details of which were in the planning application. The company had felt this was the best option for a site in the south of England. There were a number of schemes nationwide and it was sensible to locate these facilities within existing sites. It was a speculative development insofar as it was a commercial venture but waste was currently coming to Sutton Courtenay and this proposal looked to deal with the commercial and industrial element. It was a biological process which included a drying stage. The proposal was for a throughput of 220,000 tonnes. The current limit was 905,000 tonnes with a road limit of 504,000 and the rest by rail. There was no increase over current landfill levels proposed.

Councillor Mathew – the site could provide a facility to deal with waste from Oxfordshire, Berkshire and London. However the estimated need was for Oxfordshire and Berkshire's waste and it was possible that levels of waste from London could fall away over the next 2/3 years.

Mr Duncalfe presented the report, referred to additional information set out in the addenda sheet and a further letter received from Ed Vaizey MP, which had been tabled. In response to members' questions he set out as a comparison the existing permitted and proposed activities which indicated there would be no overall increase in waste throughput to the Sutton Courtenay site.

Councillor Lilly commended the points raised by the previous speakers. There was no direct benefit to Oxfordshire ratepayers and certainly not to local residents. In the 1970s it had been proposed to restore this area by 2000 now, if this goes ahead, that would extend to 2036. He could not understand why increased levels in traffic on A34 was considered to be acceptable. He chaired the local liaison committee and referred to a constant stream of complaints. Conditions imposed on current operations at the site were not enforceable so it seemed unrealistic to expect this facility to be conditioned any more effectively. Didcot A was to be demolished and with Didcot itself expanding there was a need to retain open space and although the original scheme had been revised it was not, in real terms, that much smaller. There was huge opposition to this from Milton Park neither would the facility support the Science Vale UK LEP initiative. The promise of more night rail activity was appalling and the County Council needed to echo the opposition expressed by all local councils and support the needs of local communities.

Councillor Tanner agreed. The application was for a large building in a rural area and questioned its temporary nature. He felt there was little choice but to refuse.

Councillor Mathew felt need had not been substantiated and proposals to move waste around in this fashion were extraordinary. If permission was granted then

waste should be restricted to the Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire region with working hours restricted and restoration plans agreed.

Councillor Crabbe had visited the site which prompted him to conclude that the impact of the facility would not be as great as some felt. He questioned the impact on the Western Park housing development and referred to continuing development at Milton Park. The application site was not his idea of a green field site and he felt that pylons across the site were more visually intrusive than this facility, which was a processing building for a waste operation, which would be entirely enclosed within the building with the site itself well screened.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Armitage, seconded by Councillor Mathew and carried by 9 votes to 4): that Application SUT/APF/616/64-CM be refused for the following reason:

The proposal was for a large building in the countryside. The need for a waste management facility in this location had not been demonstrated such as to justify overriding the conflict with Countryside and Landscape policies GS2, NE9, NE10 and NE11 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 and harm to the landscape and countryside in this immediate area.

**36/11 CHANGE OF USE OF LAND FROM PASTURE TO SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD, INTRODUCTION OF LAND DRAINAGE SYSTEM, FENCING, LANDSCAPE PLANTING AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS FOR MAINTENANCE AND EMERGENCY PURPOSES AT FIELD TO THE NORTH OF ASTON ROWANT C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE, ASTON ROWANT, WATLINGTON - APPLICATION R3.0056/11**

(Agenda No. 8)

The Committee considered (PN8) an application to change the use of land from agriculture to a school playing field.

Daniel Hopkin understood the school's desire for a soft play area but felt the amount of land in question to be disproportionately large for the school's requirements. The field offered privacy for his property. Preliminary proposals for planting were not enough and he sort assurances that the western portion of the field would be retained as it was, the football pitch kept to minimum size, screening between pitch and the rest of the field, a restriction on the number of matches and hours of use to weekdays until 5 pm with no weekend use.

Joy Farrell confirmed that the school had applied for the whole site in order to secure access. It was not intended to use the whole site for playing field purposes and therefore there seemed room for compromise. The school were willing to include hedge planting behind the Old School House property.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Mathew, seconded by Councillor Mrs Fulljames and carried by 9 votes to 0) that Application No. R3.0056/11 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Growth and Infrastructure) to include the following matters:

1. The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the particulars contained in the application.
2. The development should commence within 3 years.
3. Submission of details for the protection of retained trees and hedgerows.
4. Submission of a planting and landscaping scheme.
5. Implementation of landscaping scheme.
6. Submission of details of the location and type of fencing to include proposals for hedge planting alongside that section of the application site which was adjacent to the Old School House.
7. The school should update their Travel Plan.
8. Submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan
9. The playing field should only be used by the school as a school playing field and/or recreational/teaching space.
10. Submission of a surface water drainage scheme.
11. Submission of details of the type and location of storage sheds.
12. Submission of details of the new footpath link between the two sides of the school.

**37/11 CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURE TO SITE FOR THE IMPORT, STORAGE AND SCREENING OF WASTE SOILS TO CREATE TOPSOIL AT SWANNYBROOK FARM, KINGSTON BAGPUIZE - APPLICATION NO MW.0049/11**

(Agenda No. 9)

The Committee considered (PN9) an application to change the use of land from agriculture to a site for the import, storage and screening of waste soils.

Robert Mattock spoke in support of the application which would be for a small scale grading and screening operation with no crushing carried out on site. He lived 650 yards from the site and was happy to accept the results of assessments which showed that noise and dust levels would be within acceptable levels.

Responding to Councillor Mathew he confirmed that the applicant had previously operated on another site without planning permission.

Councillor Tilley referred to a number of complaints which had been received to a previous operation but the monitoring officer had confirmed that that operation had ceased and there would be no crushing on site. She asked that if permission was granted then conditions should be strictly monitored and enforced.

Officers were asked to make representations to the Vale of White Horse District Council to try to secure improvements to the general appearance of the Swannybrook Farm complex.

**RESOLVED:** (on a motion by Councillor Mrs Fulljames, seconded by Councillor Nimmo-Smith and carried 9 votes to 0) that planning permission be granted for the development proposed in Application number MW.0049/11 subject to conditions to be determined by the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Growth & Infrastructure) to include the matters set out below:

1. Complete compliance-detailed plans.
2. Commencement date- 3 years.
3. Operating hours (8am-6pm Monday- Friday, 8am-1pm Saturday, no public/bank holiday working).
4. No hazardous substance to be brought onto the site.
5. No crushing or grinding on site.
6. Additional planting to be carried out along the northern boundary of the site.
7. Detail of the planting to be submitted and agreed.
8. Existing vegetation to be retained and protected.
9. Effective silencers to be used.
10. Noise level not to exceed agreed level.
11. Maximum 6 HGV movements per day. Records of HGV movements to be maintained and accessible for inspection.
12. No reversing beepers or other means of warning of reversing vehicles to be fixed or used on site.
13. No floodlighting to be erected.
14. Internal access road to be kept free from mud and debris.
15. The access road to be sprayed with water to ensure that the passage of lorries does not cause dust to rise into the air.
16. No material to be deposited or stockpiled to height exceeding 3 metres.
17. Access to the site only via access road serving Swannybrook Farm.
18. Signs to be installed and maintained to inform the vehicle drivers about the Rights of Way.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....