

PLANNING & REGULATION COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Monday, 17 July 2023 commencing at 1.00 pm and finishing at 5.50 pm and Tuesday, 18 July 2023 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 3.52 pm.

Present:

Voting Members:

Councillor Geoff Saul – in the Chair

Councillor Richard Webber (Deputy Chair)

Councillor Robin Bennett

Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE

Councillor Imade Edosomwan

Councillor Mohamed Fadlalla

Councillor John Howson (In place of Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak)

Councillor Ian Middleton (In place of Councillor David Rouane)

Councillor Judy Roberts

Other Members in Attendance:

Councillor Charlie Hicks (Registered Speaker)

By Invitation:

Officers:

David Periam, Development Management Team Leader

David Mytton, Solicitor

Nicholas Perrins, Head of Strategic Planning

Rachel Wileman, Director of Planning, Environment and Climate Change

Owen Jenkins, Director of Place, Transport Policy and Infrastructure

Jonathan Hill, Planning Consultant, AECOM

Dan Townsend, Application Team, OCC

Anna Savage, Air Quality Lead, AECOM

Sean O'Connell, Transport Planner, AECOM

Kt Hamer, Transport Officer, OCC

John Disley, Head of Transport Policy, OCC

Victoria Sykes, Climate Change Lead, OCC

John Lee, Public Health, OCC

17/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Felix Bloomfield, Stefan Gawrysiak, David Rouane, Les Sibley and Ian Snowden.

Councillor John Howson substituted for Councillor Gawrysiak and Councillor Ian Middleton substituted for Councillor Rouane.

18/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE BELOW

(Agenda No. 2)

Councillor Constance felt it important to make her position clear on the Committee. Councillor Constance was, until May 2021, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responsible for promoting the HIF1 scheme. Councillor Constance continued that case law showed that even Members who had expressed clear views historically could and should take part in the consideration of planning applications, unless they were unable to exercise their decision making with an open mind and to weigh all considerations in the light of the debate having not predetermined how to exercise their vote with an open mind. Councillor Constance confirmed that she was attending with an open mind and therefore intended to take part.

Councillor Bennett declared that he has a role as Deputy Leader for South Oxfordshire District Council and some of the portfolio included some responsibility for Didcot Garden Town. Councillor Bennett was attending the meeting with an open mind.

19/23 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

Resolved: that the minutes of the meeting held on 5th June 2023 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

20/23 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

There had been 26 requests to address the Committee and two written statements, which had been published on the Council website.

The speakers were as follows:

Mr Charlie Hopkins
Mrs Gwendolyn Mockler
Councillor Emily Kerr (Oxfordshire City Council)
Ms Vicky Johnson
Mr Ng Chien Xen
Dr Angela Jones
Councillor Charlie Hicks (Attending on a personal level)
Mr Nick Fielding
Mr Mark Beddow
Dr Caroline Baird
Mr Robin Draper
Mr Greg O'Broin
Councillor Sarah James (Vale of White Horse District Council)
Ms Zuhura Plummer
Mr Chris Hancock

Mr Roger Williams
Sam Casey-Rerhaye
Mr Chris Church
Mrs Frances Reid
Mr Richard Tamplin
Mandy Rigault
Mrs Victoria Shepherd
Ms Debbie Davies
Mr Emmanouil Mavrikis
Mr Owen Jenkins

Councillor Duncan Enright could not attend the meeting.

The written statements had been received from Mr Andy Holding and Mr Ian Palmer.

21/23 DIDCOT GARDEN TOWN HIF 1 SCHEME

(Agenda No. 5)

The Director of Planning, Environment and Climate Change, Rachel Wileman, introduced the report and provided a presentation which included plans and photographs relating to the planning application for a major highway development, comprising four parts:

- The dualling of the A4130 to the east of Milton Gate towards Didcot
- The construction of a bridge, known as Didcot Science Bridge, and a single carriageway road that will connect the A4130 to Collett Roundabout via a route that crosses the former Didcot A Power Station Site
- A new, single carriageway road between Didcot and the A415 which would include a bridge over the Appleford Rail sidings and a bridge and viaduct over the River Thames and Bridge Farm Quarry, and
- A Bypass for Clifton Hampden, which would connect the A415 with the B4015 via a new route to the northwest of Clifton Hampden

The proposed development also included a new, continuous walking and cycling network along its length as well as related highway infrastructure such as roundabouts, bus stops, lighting, and drainage infrastructure and landscaping.

Further points raised by the Director of Planning, Environment and Climate Change included the following:

- The delivery of the HIF1 Scheme, if permitted, would be part-funded by a £240 million Housing Infrastructure Fund grant from Homes England. However, Members were reminded that the availability of the grant was not a material planning consideration. Members were therefore advised to disregard the availability of the funding in their consideration of the planning application.
- The nature of the application as one submitted under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, as amended. This meant that the County Council was both the applicant and the planning authority determining the application. The 1992 Regulations require that the planning

application must not be determined by the committee, sub-committee or officer of the council who was also responsible (wholly or partly) for the management of the land or buildings concerned. Members were advised that only officers and their advisors on the regulatory side of the Environment and Place Directorate had been involved in carrying out the planning functions of the County Council in gathering information, assessing the application, and producing the report. Legal officers had also kept a separation of functions, so some had been involved in advising the local planning authority and different officers had advised the applicant.

- The application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement, and therefore fell under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment (or EIA) Regulations 2017, as amended.
 - The application and Environmental Statement were originally submitted in November 2021 and were subject to a statutory 30-day consultation period, ending on 11th December 2021.
 - A request for further information under the provisions of Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations were issued by the officers in April 2022 and that further information was subsequently submitted in November 2022. This information was subject to publicity and consultation ending on 24th December 2022.
 - The applicant voluntarily submitted further information in December 2022 in response to advice that had been provided directly to them by the Environment Agency.
 - In March 2023, the officers issued a second request for further information under the provisions of Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations. Further information in response to that second request was submitted in April 2023 and was subject to publicity and consultation ending on 12th June 2023.
 - The application and Environmental Statement had therefore been subject to three formal periods of publicity and consultation. In each of these periods, the application was advertised by multiple site notices, a newspaper advert, notifications to statutory and non-statutory consultees, and letters to residents in close proximity to the site or who had previously commented on it.
 - Whilst the consultation period was formally published as 30 days each time, all comments received over the 20-month determination period had been accepted and considered by planning officers in their consideration of the application. No comments had been turned away or disregarded.
 - Nearly 400 comments had been received in total from local residents and interested parties. Some of these had expressed support for the development, however the majority had expressed concern or stated objections to it.
- The EIA Regulations required that the Environmental Statement, together with any other information which was relevant to the decision, and any comments and representations made on it, must be taken into account by the local planning authority in deciding whether or not to grant consent for the

development. A summary of the conclusions of the Environmental Statement was included in Annex 3 of the committee report. A summary of the main points raised through consultation responses was included in Annex 4 and a summary of the main points raised through third party representations was included in Annex 5.

- Planning Officers had been working closely with the applicant to address comments and concerns raised by third parties and consultees. In particular:
 - Amendments had been achieved to ensure that tree loss was reduced as far as possible and to protect all notable and veteran trees, some of which were originally proposed to be removed or impacted by the development.
 - The landscaping proposals had also been improved in response to concerns raised, and the development before members included more extensive planting and screening than was originally proposed. Planning Officers and their advisors were now satisfied that all reasonable opportunities to increase planting had been taken to screen the development as far as possible and to help integrate it into its surroundings.
 - The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment had been amended through the determination process, to enable a robust understanding of the impact of the development on habitats. As a result, the development would now provide a substantial net gain in biodiversity amounting to a 23% increase in habitat units, a 40% increase in hedgerow units and a 10% increase in river units, some of which would be provided via an offsetting provider outside of the application site.
 - The application had also been amended to improve the flood mitigation proposals, which had enabled the initial objections from the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to be overcome.
 - Additionally, further information had been provided to ensure that the application properly and robustly assessed the effects on noise, heritage assets, minerals and waste developments, recreational facilities, the local highway network, climate, and landscape, amongst other things.
- The planning application was supported in principle by the Vale of White Horse (VoWH) Local Plan and the South Oxfordshire Local Plan, which taken together were the principle documents that set out the spatial strategy for the application area. The proposed development was required to address existing severe congestion, poor access and air quality issues in Science Vale, which had arisen because the existing highway infrastructure had failed to keep pace with housing and other development. These impacts affected all modes of travel, including walking, cycling, public transport and private car use. They were also difficult to address due to the severance caused by the Great Western Mainline and the River Thames.
- However, the proposed development would cause localised harms and impacts that were of concern to affected residents and communities. The proposal would cause significant harm to the occupants of some individual properties, schools, and commercial developments through adverse noise effects that, for some, would not be fully mitigated and this would be a permanent harmful effect.

- The landscape and character of the local area would be changed, and this would cause localised harmful effects through changes to views, urbanisation, loss of trees and other vegetation, and the impact of associated infrastructure such as lighting. Whilst the applicant had sought to minimise these effects as far as was practicable, it remained the case that there were aspects of the development where there were limited opportunities available to soften its impact and to integrate it fully with its surroundings.
- The development would also cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade I Nuneham Courtenay Registered Park and Garden, the Nuneham Courtenay Conservation Area, the Sutton Courtenay Conservation Area, and the Grade II Listed Fullamoor Farmhouse due to changes to the asset's settings. The development would also cause less-than-substantial harm to the significance of the Scheduled Monument 1006345, due to changes within its setting. The harms to designated heritage assets should be given great weight and importance when weighed against the public benefits of the development. There would also be harm to non-designated heritage assets, including Hill Farm and New Farm as well as to archaeological deposits.
- Finally, the proposed development would cause harm to the Green Belt by way of its inappropriateness and impact on openness. This harm should only be allowed in very special circumstances and where the harm to the Green Belt and all other harms were outweighed by the benefits of the scheme. It was the advice of officers that very special circumstances were present in this instance and therefore that the development was in accordance with national and local policies that seek to protect the Green Belt. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Regulations 2021, should members be minded to approve the application, it would first need to be referred to the Secretary of State to consider whether the application should be called-in for their own determination.
- Turning to the benefits of the development, both the VoWH and South Oxfordshire District Councils and the Highway Authority were clear that the development underpinned the spatial strategy for the Science Vale area, and was essential for the delivery of homes on allocated land adjacent to Culham Science Centre, at Berinsfield Garden Village, and in and around Didcot in South Oxfordshire; and land at East of Sutton Courtenay, Milton Heights, Valley Park and North West of Valley Park in the VoWH. The development would enable jobs growth and would support the social and economic prosperity of the Science Vale area.
- As was set out in the committee report, the proposed development was the cornerstone of mitigation that was required to enable planned growth to occur without severe harm being caused to the highway network. Without the development, planned housing and employment development may be unlikely or less likely to come forward, or otherwise would be delayed. Refusal of the application therefore had the potential to undermine the spatial strategy for both South Oxfordshire and the VoWH. Members were advised that this in-principle support for the development should carry very strong weight in the decision-making process.
- Other benefits of the development would include the delivery of a high quality, near continuous, segregated footway and cycleway route that would provide a genuine alternative to private car travel. The beneficial impacts on the road

network in terms of improved connectivity across the Great Western Mainline and the River Thames would ease congestion and reduce journey times and reliability for bus travel. Additionally, there would be reductions in traffic volumes through some local villages including Clifton Hampden and Appleford which would improve the quality of the environment and bring associated reductions in noise levels to some properties.

- Taking all of the above into consideration, it was clear that members would need to balance the planning merits of the proposed development in reaching a decision on the application. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF stated that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-making, the NPPF stated that this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. The officer advice to Members, as set out in the report, is that, notwithstanding the conflict with some policies in relation to noise, the proposal accords with the development plan when read as a whole.
- Therefore, it was recommended that, subject to the application first being referred to the Secretary of State to consider whether they wish to call it in for their own determination, planning permission should be granted subject to the recommended conditions including those listed in Annex 1 of the report.

The Development Management Team Leader, David Periam, presented and explained the plans in detail and informed the Committee of what was proposed as part of the application.

The Head of Strategic Planning, Nicholas Perrins, updated the Committee on the addendum to the reports since the report had been published. Members were informed that sixteen further representations had been received, raising concerns on a range of issues, which had already been covered in the published Officers report. A representation had also been received from Councillor Charlie Hicks setting out objections to the proposal in respect of compliance with the County Council Local Transport Connectivity Plan and the recent advice to the government from the Climate Change Commission. Councillor Hicks representation had been sent to the Committee Members and published on the Council's website. A further representation had also been received from the neighbouring parish councils joint committee, setting out concerns with the Officers report, this had also been summarised in the addendum report including clarification where required. This had also been sent to the Committee Members and published on the Council's website. The addendum also reported that FCC, owners of the Sutton County Landfill had withdrawn their objection subject to working further with the applicant going forward and also amendments to three conditions which were acceptable to Officers and in the addendum report with amended wording for consideration and an amendment to paragraph 2.30 of the Officers report to provide further clarification on the County Council's declaration of the climate emergency.

The Committee were addressed by the following registered public speakers:

- Mr Hopkins representing the Joint Committee of the neighbouring Parish Councils that are most affected by the scheme. These included Appleford, Burcot, Clifton Hampden, Culhum, Nuneham Courtenay and Sutton Courtney. The combined total of population from these areas was 4200 residents. Mr

Hopkins referred to the report with the detailed responses at Paragraphs 112 to 154, pages 145 to 158 and then to the response to the Officers report that had been published with in the addendum, pages 25 to 38. The residents needed a solution but one that was fit for the future, that met the vision, aims, objectives and the targets of the Council's recently adopted Local Transport Plan (LTCP), which represented the most up-to-date material considerations, that did not carry as much weight as the adopted local plan. The Parish Councils had fully participated at all stages of the development of this scheme from preapplication through to three rounds of public consultation of the application. All of the concerns that had been expressed to the Council had been ignored. Two leading transport policy professors and other specialists had also inputted to the responses. The report set out 17 key priorities but gave Members no information of which ones carried more weight. Mr Hopkins concluded by asking Members to refuse the application.

Councillor Constance asked if the 17 key issues were correct and was informed that they were and commented that at paragraph 243, Officers commented that although it would not reduce private car travel, it did lead to overall carbon reduction because of the reduction in congestion. Mr Hopkins agreed that Officers were seeking to reduce carbon emissions but felt it would not.

Councillor Bennett asked a question about the transport modelling that had been carried out, had other travelling modes been factored in as the model used by Officers had not factored these in. Mr Hopkins informed the Committee that no transport modelling had been carried out, only critiques of the modelling had been provided by experts in the field.

- Mrs Mockler addressed the Committee with Mr Anthony Mockler's statement as he was unable to attend. Mr Mockler owned and managed the family trust of the land bordering the A4130 between Valley Park and almost up to the Middleton interchange. Mr Mockler was requesting that the application be refused or at least be deferred until after the inspector's inquiry into the Compulsory purchase order.
- Councillor Emily Kerr from Oxford City Council raised the following points:
 - That more people were now working from home.
 - The traffic forecasts used were out of date.
 - There was limited ambition for active travel when the scheme was initially developed.
 - People now wanted good public transport, strong rails links and walking and cycling routes.
 - Many relevant new policies had been adopted by the County since the start of the application.
 - Cycle routes were cheaper to put in than the HIF1 scheme and would cover a larger area.
 - With the current inflation concerns, would the housing be built in the relevant timeframe.
 - The assumptions and modelling appeared to be very out of date.
 - LTCP 5 and the Climate Change Committee report were both material considerations, which would be reasons to reject this proposal.

- LTCP 5 stated specific goals for reducing car use, which HIF1 was in direct contravention.
- The adopted decide and provide approach had not been followed and failed to provide reasonable alternatives.
- The effect of additional traffic on Abingdon had not been adequately considered.
- Further work was required on the alternatives within the HIF1 scheme.
- This was the wrong use of money to build the wrong road in the wrong place and it repeatedly breached County policy.

Councillor Constance commented that she was more persuaded that buses would function effectively and both, more economically and more immediately than trains would on this route but Councillor Kerr didn't feel that enough robust research had been done.

- The following detrimental impacts were raised by a concerned resident of Appleford, Ms Vicky Johnson:
 - Noise and pollution during construction and when completed.
 - Air pollution risks to public health.
 - The health and welfare of residents had not been considered.
 - Local transport plan had not been considered.
 - The new roads were not a long-term sustainable solution for Oxfordshire, to alleviate congestion.
 - Climate Change carbon neutral policy had not been followed.
 - There was potential detrimental effect on quality of life.
 - How was the Council going to meet the cost of this road and would there be an increase in the Council tax with all other cost of living concerns.
 - Reject the plan and look for alternatives and to follow Council's made policies and commitments.

Councillor Constance provided clarification that the scheme was not being funded out of Council tax, it was being funded by government support and Homes England. The funding of the scheme was not a consideration for the Committee.

- Ng Chien Xen, a transport economist who had previously advised on large projects such as HS2 and the Northern Powerhouse Rail and was currently advising Oxford Friends of the Earth on a voluntary basis. The following points were raised:
 - The Officers report explained that if the HIF1 scheme was not built, there would be severe traffic congestion problems and that the scheme would alleviate the problems.
 - The report also explained that if the scheme was built, there would be no significant impacts on climate and air quality, so the benefits were high, and the impacts were low.
 - Traffic modelling – it was a well-known fact that people travelled if there was a financial and time cost reduction. If a new road was built, more people would take the car than would otherwise. This was known as induced demand. The traffic modelling had not taken account of this induced demand, assuming that the same number of car trips for having the scheme compared to not having the scheme. Research had repeatedly

shown that new roads did generate traffic. This would produce 13000 tonnes of carbon emissions per year.

- The Officers report had concluded that the vehicle emissions would be lower because congestion would be lower, but this did not account for there being more cars on the road.

Councillor Howson asked if the size of the car had been taken into account and was informed that there was no reference to this in the report.

Councillor Constance asked what modelling the speaker had carried out and was informed that he had taken a sample of 50 past delivered road schemes and calculated the carbon emissions using the size of the road scheme and calculated a high-level estimate. The modes of transport would change going forward using the Department of Transport's predictions for future travel. The speaker informed the Committee that only much smaller schemes tended to have some reductions of carbon emissions and they did induce more traffic.

Councillor Bennett asked about modal change and was informed that private travel tends to make travel slower including buses. By putting private road space side by side with public road space, the change would probably not happen because people needed an active nudge to make the change to use public transport.

- Dr Angela Jones addressed the Committee as a retired GP and resident of Appleford. Dr Jones commented that she with other villagers had attended the exhibition for the first consultation in 2018 and it had been immediately obvious that the option to build a huge flyover behind the houses in Main Road, Appleford and over the Appleford sidings would have a massive impact on the residents of Appleford visually and a source of noise and air pollution and it was difficult to see what mitigation could be applied. The residents of Appleford had responded to the consultation and proposed an alternative alignment, which would take the proposed road slightly further west in the key section close to the village. Dr Jones also commented that she was very surprised that a health impact statement had not been provided to assure the Council and Committee that the proposal did not risk the health of the residents. The impact on traffic locally was also highlighted.

Councillor Bennett asked what noise and air pollution was currently being experienced as a result of the operations of the sidings and was informed that since the sidings had been expanded, the levels of noise had increased, and the proposal would increase the levels of noise further. Dr Jones believed that there had been no assessments made.

Councillor Howson asked about the proposed barriers and if that would make sufficient difference and was informed that adding another 9-10 feet onto the already 37 feet, made it an even bigger and imposing structure and had seen no evidence to show this would be sufficient and would be interested to hear if the Officers had a response to the question.

- Councillor Charlie Hicks addressed the Committee with the material planning reasons to reject the application, some of which were as follows:

- The HIF1 application did not align with the LTCP policy 36, parts B, D and E, road schemes and provide traffic modelling.
- Did not align with the assisted documents to the LTCP called implementing decide and provide requirements for transport assessments.
- The Council would overshoot the LTCP 2030 targets to reduce car trips by 25% by 2030, instead the trips would increase by 42% by 2034.
- The recommendations of the UK government Climate Change Committee Progress report to Parliament was to get the UK surface transport on track with the Paris Agreement, all UK road schemes were to undergo net zero roads review, including for new road schemes to not increase the capacity for cars, which the scheme did.

Councillor Constance asked if the Committee could decide to provide transportation for 15-18000 more houses in the area and the roads could provide buses as well as private car travel. Councillor Hicks responded that the Council needed to reduce car trips by one in four by 2030, the buses would be slowed down by the congestion that would be created and that there needed to be a multiple approach of walking, cycling and public transport, especially as there was an existing railway line and the already looked into tram-train option.

Councillor Hicks agreed with Councillor Edosomwan that if the application was approved, it would not be consistent with the Council's policy on climate change that all Members unanimously voted for in 2022 and would go against it.

Councillor Hicks agreed with Councillor Bennett that many of the issues he had raised had been sufficiently addressed by Officers in the addenda. However, there was no referencing to parts D and E of the policy 36. Many other points needed to be considered for a modal shift to take place.

- Mr Nick Fielding addressed the Committee on behalf of Burcot and Clifton Hampden Parish Council. Mr Fielding addressed the impacts on the Parish and then the road. The points raised by Mr Fielding were as follows:
 - The environmental heavy impacts would include serious damage to the Green Belt status with the destruction of more than 130 trees out of 169 that were due to come down and significant damage to the hedgerows. There would be major atmospheric and noise pollution.
 - The Parish was in favour of a by-pass to reduce the traffic and long queues in the village. The mitigation plan for the atmospheric and noise pollution suggested by the Environmental Officer was supported to provide a construction noise and vibration management plan be submitted and approved before the start of the development. The 3m high noise barrier that had been proposed was an unsuitable solution to the problem of noise and would be very unsightly.
 - The destruction of the trees would result in the loss of habitat of birds, insects, mammals and the destruction of the badger set. The bats would be seriously affected.
 - The footpaths and walkways would be affected with residents having to cross an extremely busy road to get to the open countryside to the north of the village.

- The road itself started as a motorway, then a B road, ending at the Golden Balls Roundabout and going nowhere from there. This would increase the traffic at all the roadways around the Golden Balls roundabout, causing traffic everywhere else.
- Mr Mark Beddow addressed the Committee representing East Hendred Parish Council, opposing the proposed application. The points raised included the increase in CO2 emissions, Increased traffic, entirely on Green Belt land and in a flood plain. This was not a sustainable application.
- Dr Caroline Baird addressed the Committee and objected against the application as a resident of Culham Village. The points raised by Dr Baird were as follows:
 - The majority of responses to the three consultations had been negative.
 - The five rural Parishes most affected by the application joined forces to represent their constituents. Huge amounts of time and locally raised funds had seen the commissioning of expert reports. Research pointed out the numerous flaws in the application including traffic modelling, conflict with policies, health and wellbeing, air quality and financial viability.
 - The site area for these roads covered 155 hectares of agricultural land including wetland habitat. The proposed route of the interconnected roads would ruin the rural footpaths connecting the villages. As well as crossing the River Thames and the Thames National Path, the route crossed 13 footpaths, bridle ways and would involve some permanent closures and diversions to the public rights of way.
- Mr Robin Draper, representing Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, made the following comments to the Committee:
 - The Parish council had been very optimistic about the aims of HIF1 of ensuring that the impact of increasing housing on the traffic network was acceptable, whilst future proofing local infrastructure provision, reducing congestion and providing value for money. The scheme failed to meet any of its aims. The scheme did not meet the NPPF, District and County Council policies, and this reason alone was sufficient to justify rejection of the application.
 - The traffic modelling had not taken into account the impact of the scheme or the allowance of the induced traffic. The modelling did show there would be a 42% increase in travel by private cars which was not compatible with reducing traffic. The congestion levels would reach significant levels by 2034. The impacts on Abingdon and the Golden Balls roundabout had not been fully considered.

Councillor Bennett asked about the concern of induced traffic and if the traffic through Sutton Courtenay would be from Abingdon, travelling to use the road and joining it at the new roundabout. Mr Draper commented that these questions had been asked to the County Council and no response had been received so the Parish Council were highly concerned.

- The Chair of Appleford Parish Council and neighbouring Parish Council Joint Committee, Parish Councillor Greg O'Broin addressed the Committee. The points raised included the following:
 - The Environmental Statement was not robust enough.
 - Public Support – 97.5% of consultation responses had expressed concern with the HIF scheme. The neighbouring Parish Councils within the Joint Committee and others represented 13000 residents. There was no public support for the scheme.
 - HIF1 required two Regulation 25 requests, many of the submissions were inadequate and required further clarification on the scheme.
 - The heavy reliance on contractors would impact delivery.
 - There was no health impact assessment included and the information was not in the report.
 - The scheme was contrary to OCC policies, the 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration, the Framework and the LTCP.
 - The impact to Abingdon and the Golden Balls roundabout had been scoped out of the analysis.
 - The Appleford flyover and the elevated road were close to and overlooking the village and would damage it irreparably, resulting in the loss of amenity of homes and gardens from excessive noise vibration, pollution, air quality and visual outlook.
 - The amount of HGV's and commercial traffic would increase exponentially with every HGV and large goods vehicle in the area travelling north and south over Appleford village at 40-50 feet high. Parish Councillor O'Broin asked how Officers could conclude that Appleford would have no adverse impact on residential amenity. The modification to close windows was not acceptable.
 - It seemed as though the benefits could not be balanced against the harm to public health of the residents of Appleford.

Councillor Constance commented that the impact on Appleford Village was a major issue and a suggestion had been put forward to move the application 250m to the west to be further away from the village. Parish Councillor O'Broin agreed and added that two sets of technical architectural drawings had been submitted and this was referenced in the report but due to the slightly increased cost implications, the moves were not feasible. This small change would make a huge impact on visual impact and noise. The move would be in the distance, on the edge of the village. Councillor Constance commented that the application could not be moved as the land was not suitable and it was suggested that the land had not been examined in sufficient detail. The current Ramp Road that went around the lake, currently used by the HGVs, could have been used and that could cross at the railway sidings. Therefore, the elevation could be lowered and the trees in front of the Appleford railway line would not have to be destroyed.

- District Councillor for Hendreds Ward, Sarah James commented that this was at the southern end of the scheme and the other side of the Milton interchange. The concerns raised were about the traffic and congestion impacts that would arise from the HIF1 scheme in neighbouring areas and the inadequacy of the environmental statement in addressing this and that the alternatives considered being very limited as with the considerations for

climate change impacts. The OCC Local Transport and Connectivity Plan quotes that new road schemes generate new demand and quickly reach capacity again; it was therefore not a sustainable long-term solution for Oxfordshire's transport network. The roads in the ward were regularly congested during peak times and the scheme would just add to this strain. It had been stated in the report that the HIF1 scheme had a positive impact on the A34 as the new road would take away traffic from the Milton interchange more quickly, however the traffic in the other direction had not been considered.

- Ms Zuhura Plummer addressed the Committee with the statement that new roads did not solve congestion, they increased it. If it was made easier for people to drive, then people would drive, and traffic would fill whatever space was made available. Also, people tended to take up walking, cycling, and using the bus if driving was made inconvenient. The new road and additional bus stops were not enough if the buses would be stuck in traffic on the new roads and the result would be that the buses would not be used. The increasing budget of the scheme would impact other schemes that were planned.
- Mr Chris Hancock, an Appleford resident, addressed the Committee about two issues, noise and air quality. With respect to the noise, it was recommended that strong weight was applied to the adverse noise impacts, undertaking the balancing exercise. The full extent of the noise harm had not been presented in the report. Part of southern Appleford had been designated by Defra as a noise important area, one of four, around Didcot. Defra stated that for rail noise, the population of these locations were likely to be at the greatest risk of experiencing a significant adverse impact to health and quality of life as a result of their exposure to noise. The main rail line ran alongside Appleford. The noise from the already existing aggregate handling site at Appleford rail sidings, adjacent to the village, caused distress. A combined analysis of noise from the railway, industrial site and HIF1 had not been undertaken. Mr Hancock continued to address the air quality and the report stating that there were no adverse impacts for human health. No pollution monitoring had been carried out close to and facing the HIF1 route in Appleford. There had been no health impact assessment carried out as required by the LTCP and therefore the Environment Statement was not compliant in regard to noise, air quality, immunity and health.
- Mr Roger Williams addressed the Committee in an independent capacity. Mr Williams used to be the Head of Transport Planning at the Council some years back. Mr Williams did not live in Oxfordshire and had no involvement with Didcot or any of the villages. Mr Williams had got involved in the proposals as they seemed fundamentally wrong and would lead to further problems and cost for the Council and the Oxfordshire environment. Mr Williams commented as follows:
 - The Council were going to considerable lengths to restrain traffic in Oxford with road closures and restrictions, yet these proposals in Didcot would have the opposite effect, increasing and encouraging car use. The cycle routes and public transport suggestions would have marginal effects when

- considering the additional road capacity and the removal of traffic bottlenecks.
 - There would be traffic jams to all other surrounding areas around Didcot.
 - The traffic in Abingdon and the traffic, east of Didcot would increase.
 - There was no information on the improvement of the Golden Balls roundabout, including no costings and no other information of how it was going to be provided and whether it was environmentally accepted and the traffic leading to and from the roundabout function.
 - There was a lack of considerations of alternatives to this road building solution. Mr Williams asked about the master plan that had been instructed by Cabinet and asked where it was, what had been considered within it, who had seen it and commented on it and judged it against the proposals in the report.
 - Mr Williams would have included all the wider impacts including costs, had he still been the Head of Transport Planning.
- Parish Councillor Sam Casey-Rerhaye, Culham Parish Council and the District Councillor for South Oxfordshire addressed the Committee on the following three points:
 - Ecology and the ecological emergency and the effects on fauna and flora and major consequences on river ecology.
 - Very Special Circumstances – this meant that alternatives had been considered and deemed unsuitable. This was the higher test for building in the Green Belt.
 - The application should not have been considered as one application to offer Members the opportunity to scrutinise better how and whether the LTCP could be applied.
- Mr Chris Church, representing Oxford Friends of the Earth addressed the Committee, objecting for the following reasons:
 - The objectives 5,6,7 and 8, within the LTCP which states reduce the need to travel, reduce the number of car journeys, reduce carbon emissions and the answer for these was not to build new roads.
 - Evidence had been submitted in January on traffic modelling highlighting the flaws that had significant implications such as the traffic flows, noise and carbon emissions.
 - The building of the road was assumed to save on carbon emissions, but this does not take into account the induced traffic. The predictions showed that it would take many years to pay for this in terms of carbon. The Council's Climate Action Framework, that was a material consideration, was about aligning key strategies and policies with climate action commitments to get to net zero and integrating climate considerations into decision making. This application would not accelerate the transition to zero carbon across transport and connectivity.

Members asked some clarification questions to Mr Church about the figures stated.

- Mrs Frances Reid addressed the Committee as a resident of Appleford, objecting to the application. Mrs Reid commented that over the last two years, residents of Appleford had experienced an increase in noise levels with a

mainline railway to the west of Main Road and to the west of that, the Appleford Sidings, Hanson's aggregates and asphalt plant, a cement plant, a recycling plant and a landfill site. All of these adding to the pollution problem and adding to the misery of the residents, not being able to enjoy the garden and when indoors, having to close windows and still being affected by low resonance noise, vibrating through the house. It seemed that the true extent of the severity of the noise in Appleford had not been properly examined in the environmental statement and would be more harmful than quoted. Therefore, the balance of harm to Appleford versus the benefits elsewhere may not have been properly shown to the Committee. Mrs Reid commented that paragraph 185 of the report suggested that all options of noise reduction had been exhausted or were not available as they could not reduce the noise further. The benefits would not outweigh harmful landscape and visual effects. The true mental and physical impacts on the residents of Appleford had not been adequately investigated.

- The Committee was addressed by Mr Richard Tamplin, a planning inspector before retirement, who had dealt with a wide range of planning applications, appeals and developments that required an environmental statement. Mr Tamplin commented on, what he thought was the biggest issue, the failure of the environmental statement to not assess the impacts on the roads on Abingdon. Abingdon was of a similar size to Didcot and the major settlements of Oxfordshire. The additional traffic generated by the proposed scheme on Abingdon town centre had not been assessed in the Environmental Statement in terms of volume, nature, emissions, air quality, noise, vibration and impacts on human health as the environmental statement regulations required. All the traffic to the west of Culham would pass through the town centre. All the housing and employment along the A415 and the new road would add to the traffic load in Abingdon town centre which was already at gridlock at peak times. The centre was subject to an air quality management area due to the existing harmful effects of traffic passing through it. It was already at 88% of capacity and beyond at peak times, yet no environmental assessment of the effects of the additional traffic load generated by the proposed road was made. It was a failure not to include the town in the scoping, in the environmental statement and not to provide any environmental assessment of the effects was fatally flawed and invalid.

Councillor Howson asked what distance should be covered, in Mr Tamplin's professional experience, for a scheme like this and was informed that there were two towns, Didcot and Abingdon, these towns were not very far from each other so for the assessment to end at Abingdon Bridge and not include the town when the traffic along the A415 must pass through the town centre was completely unreasonable.

Councillor Bennett asked if the scheme was being determined by Mr Tamplin as the Inspector, would it have been refused and was very clearly informed that Regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations which were headed Prohibition on granting planning permission or subsequent consent for EIA development, stated the relevant planning authority or SOS or an Inspector must not grant planning permission or subsequent consent for EIA development, unless an EIA had been carried out in respect of that

development. This is because the effects of the new road would affect Abingdon town centre significantly.

- Mandy Rigault addressed the Committee, speaking on behalf of the residents of Nuneham Courtenay and the Parish Council. Nuneham Courtenay was a historic village of national importance, one of two of the preserved removed villages in the UK, in a conservation area with both the grade one listed house and garden landscape with all the original cottages along the main road having a grade two listing. Despite this, the traffic and its impact passing these cottages had not been investigated. The noise, pollution and vibration had also not been investigated. The existing air quality in the village was poor and already exceeded three WHO limits for pollutants PM2.5, PM 10 and nitrogen dioxide. Once again it was pointed out that no health impact assessment had been carried out.
- Mrs Victoria Shepherd addressed the Committee as a resident of Appleford and the Vice Chair of the Parish Council, representing residents and local wildlife that couldn't attend. There were many harms of the scheme that did not outweigh the benefits to the local populations and the environment. The transport options that would be put into place would not benefit Appleford residents or promote the suggestions of active transport.

Councillor Howson asked about where the new 18 bus stops would be located in relation to Appleford and was informed that the current bus stops were not serviced and as far as she knew the new bus stops would be a significant walk up and over a railway crossing, across a shared cycle path and footpath, which would be a hazard.

- Debbie Davies, representing the Oxfordshire Roads Action Alliance addressed the Committee. The Alliance was a community alliance and campaign group that supported local residents who had concerns about climate and ecological crisis. The three concerns raised by Ms Davies were in respect to:
 - There was not much information on HGVs and how they would use the new road. The traffic modelling was based on volume of vehicles and not the size of vehicles.
 - The responses from the Transport Development Control to the late submissions particularly addressed the local transport and connectivity plan was not part of the development plan but was a material planning consideration. The District Council development plans contained policies to support measures in the LTCP.
 - The traffic modelling had already been raised and why a number of communities had been scoped out. It would be interesting to understand why.
- Emmanouil Mavrikis addressed the Committee as a Parish Councillor for Appleford. Mr Mavrikis asked his children, whilst waiting to address the Committee and since many of the points he had, had already been raised, he decided to share the views of his three children. The points included building on the Green Belt and the effects on nature, the trees and people's gardens and that would affect oxygen levels. The cycling route to nearby villages to visit friends by bike and from what he had heard from the discussions, the new

road was promoting car travel and therefore increased pollution. The scheme was not promoting public transport and reducing the carbon footprint. Mr Mavrikis highlighted that sustainable transport needed to be at the forefront of the planning process.

- Mr Owen Jenkins, Director of Place, Transport Policy and Infrastructure, addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant. There were plenty of technical Officers available to answer questions. Mr Jenkins highlighted to the Committee that the principle of the HIF1 scheme was firmly established in policy and was compliant. The scheme was the cornerstone of enabling works for the planned growth proposed within the Vale of White Horse District Council and South Oxfordshire District Council local plans, and that would bring significant environmental and economic benefits to the area. Land had been safeguarded in the SODC local plan and the Vale of White Horse District Council local plan for the delivery of the HIF1 scheme and planning inspectors had proven the local plan sound on three separate occasions. Mr Jenkins referred the Committee to the Planning Inspectorate's report. Mr Jenkins commented that the bulk of the funds for the HIF1 Scheme had been secured from central government and could only be used for HIF1.

Day 2 – Tuesday 18 July 2023

Councillor Constance asked about the status of the meeting and the reference to the Secretary of State calling the application in and where the decision ultimately sat. The Development Management Team Leader, David Periam, informed the Committee that the application would only be referred to the Secretary of State if the Committee were minded to approve the application.

The following questions were asked to the applicant and the technical Officers, Jonathan Hill, Aecom, Planning Consultants for the application and Dan Townsend, OCC, application team:

- Councillor Webber commented that speakers had asked about why such a large application was being considered as one application and not split into sections. Was it because there was only one solution to where to have the new road, hence it was one application covering the entire scheme. Mr Owen Jenkins reported that the report covered all the options and that the suggested scheme was the most suitable and was the best option to go forward on and hence this was the one that had been developed for the planning application. Councillor Webber asked if the Committee had seen all the options and it was reported that there was a design and access statement, of which Appendix A commented on all the different options considered. This was on the Council's website but did not form part of the report pack. There were 17 options considered that included bus and rail. Once the preferred option had been found, sub options had been investigated of individual parts of the development.
- Councillor Bennett asked for clarification if the entirety of the scheme in South Oxfordshire was on the South Oxfordshire DC Plan safeguarded land and was informed that most of it was but there had been some minor changes.

- Councillor Constance was interested in the alternatives and asked how closely the recommended scheme was aligned to rail provision and secondly was the full extent of the route provided with footway and cycleway. The Officer reported that the rail provision had been fully considered in the report. The footway and cycleway were provided along the entire route from Milton Exchange to Culham. They were not segregated along the entire route, some would be shared but whilst designing, the pedestrians and cyclists had priority. Councillor Constance asked if the footway and cycleway would be delivered at the same time as delivering the road infrastructure and was informed that it would.
- Councillor Fadlalla asked why the induced demand had not been included in the traffic modelling even though the effect was acknowledged in the LTCP and secondly, why did the road increase capacity for private cars and not for buses. Officers informed the Committee that the traffic modelling was in phases and phase 1 was in the Oxford strategic model which was a variable demand model so that included induced demand. The outcomes from that model then fell into a microsimulation model and then to the final stage of local junction modelling. Mr Jenkins added that the decide and provide methodology had been used as part and parcel of this assumption and the modelling and the design work that had been done for this scheme to bring to this stage, the decide and provide would be both utilised for the developments, the 16000 homes that were planned for the area and those extra employment sites and therefore the traditional approach would not be used, looking for conversion of people into active travel modes or public transport modes within those sites and at the same time, there was an assumption within the modelling that there would be significantly reduced trips from the developments and that people would use active travel and walking infrastructure. This was the reason that this scheme that had been put forward had a modest amount of road infrastructure supported by high quality of active infrastructure.
- Councillor Howson asked what the strategic highway infrastructure was, what further documentation was available on the website and what discussions took place at the Advisory Cabinet Committee for the HIF1 bid and if the discussions impacted the application. It was pointed out that the full documentation over time was available on the website for HIF1 and the Committee report provided a comprehensive overview of the issues. The Legal Officer advised the Committee that Members did not need to know anything about what the Cabinet Advisory Group had said and only had to take the application before them into consideration to make their decision. The strategic highway infrastructure referred to in the report was that it had been classified as to deliver strategic allocations in the local plans.
- Councillor Middleton asked why there was not more information in the report about induced demand as the little reference to induced demand was not sufficient. The Officer on behalf of the applicant commented that they had had no input into the report, and it had already been explained that induced demand had been considered.
- Councillor Roberts commented that she had been informed, as was in the report, that there had been no modelling for Nuneham Courtenay, Abingdon, East Didcot and the other side of the A34 even though all of those areas were going to be massively impacted. Councillor Roberts was also concerned that vehicles arriving at the Golden Balls roundabout had nowhere to proceed.

Councillor Roberts asked why the decision had been made to not carry out the modelling for these areas. The Applicant's technical Officers commented that the project had been scoped with the Transport Development Control, throughout the early stages of the project and this was in addition to being scoped with National Highways. The scheme was a mitigation to the planned growth and the allocation.

- Councillor Constance asked if the county would grind to a complete halt if the scheme was not taken forward and was advised it would with the planned development.
- Councillor Bennett asked why the County Council's advice hadn't changed, since there had been a complete change in policy environment, the promoters had changed, the climate change committee report had come out. It was noted for the Planning Authority Officers to respond to.
- Councillor Howson suggested that there seemed to be three lots of traffic, housing traffic, business traffic and through traffic. Was the intention to divert through traffic from the A34 to use the new road? Officers responded that the A34 was a strategic road which was direct into Oxford and had grade separated junctions. Mr Jenkins added that the scheme was based around the decide and provide approach and effectively provided good cycling and walking infrastructure that allowed people to connect between villages where there were currently no provisions.
- Councillor Constance asked about the timing that had been reduced from 36 months to 30 months and why this had been agreed. Mr Jenkins reported that there had been a change in approach in the planning and delivery as the utilities and the main construction work had been overlapped. The timetable for delivery was under constant review. Councillor Constance continued to ask what local air quality monitoring was considered to be necessary. Anna Savage, Air Quality Lead on the scheme, AECOM, commented that air quality monitoring had been carried out from the four elements of the scheme in late 2019 and early 2020, to provide a baseline of concentrations in the area and used to verify AECOM's model. The monitoring was done along the route, including in Appleford, for nitrogen dioxide. Councillor Bennett asked if there were any areas that exceeded WHO air quality limits. Ms Savage commented that air quality was assessed against air quality objectives which were in UK legislation and there were no exceedances with or without the scheme. In terms of the WHO guidelines, the PM2.5 was around 10 around Oxfordshire instead of 5, from natural rural sources, not from vehicle emissions.
- The noise at Appleford had been mitigated as much as possible. Where levels were already being exceeded; benefits would need to be weighed up against the harms. Since the EIA already had the information, with the agreement of Officers, standalone health impact assessments were not required.
- Councillor Fadlalla commented that the UK Climate Change Committee had recommended that the UK undergo a net zero road review like Wales had done and how much more capacity for additional cars did the new road create. Mr Jenkins informed the Committee that the provision of the scheme allowed for other things to occur in the area, such as other traffic and area improvements.
- Councillor Roberts commented that it was a shame that there were no visuals of the two new bridges, it would have been great to see all the information in report shown on a visual diagram. The Committee agreed. The Officers

commented that many criteria were dictated by National Rail and the Environment Agency.

- Sean O'Connell, Transport Planner for AECOM, responded to Councillor Constance on the accuracy of the traffic modelling that had been challenged many times, he commented that the modelling was carried out by another consultant and that information and then used for the transport assessment. The outputs had been reviewed by AECOM, who were satisfied with the results.
- The induced demand had been brought up by many speakers and Members, there were many definitions for induced demand. The model used had come from the Oxfordshire Strategic Model, this was multimodal, so took into consideration any changes in mode due to changes in conditions. The modelling included 5-6 vehicle types including cars, light goods vehicles, heavy goods vehicles, articulated vehicles, coaches, and buses. The model indicated that by 2034, with the growth planned in and around Didcot, the existing highway did not have the capacity to cope, it would become gridlocked. With the addition of the scheme, the traffic would start moving again, simply accommodating the traffic that would be generated.
- Councillor Fadlalla asked again why the traffic impacts to Abingdon town centre had not been assessed in the EIA and was informed that it had been agreed at the scoping phase that Abingdon town centre would not be included as the traffic was generated at other parts of the scheme.
- The report stated that the traffic modelling carried out was from 2020, the traffic survey data used had been collected in late 2016-2017 and that data was used to create the 2020 model.

OCC Transport Team

Kt Hamer, OCC Transport Officer in the South and Vale locality team, had the responsibility to assess the planning application made the following points:

- The traffic data used was from 2016-17 was used to produce a 2017 model. However, before the planning application was submitted in November 2021, the model was updated to 2020 and this was done using the housing completions obtained from the local planning authority for all submissions received between 2017 and 2020, to create another base model.
- Abingdon was not included in the modelling and the rationale for not including this was provided by the applicant in the submission for the Regulation 25 consultation in October 2022, this was agreed and accepted and therefore Abingdon was not required to become part of the modelling, of which the outputs remained acceptable. There would be potential changes and flows in Abingdon in the future, but it would be for the transport assessments for all of the allocated growth and the sites coming forward in and around the Abingdon area that would have to be assessed for their impact on the highway network in Abingdon. It would not be the HIF1 scheme that would be the generator of the traffic, it was more about the reassignments of trips.

- The HIF1 scheme aimed to put the active travel in place for the planned growth. The active travel provision had all been designed in accordance with the guidance.

John Disley, Head of Transport Policy at OCC, commented that the Local transport connectivity plan made it clear that schemes of this type were required including the need to access new developments planned in the area. A number of options had been explored and this scheme seemed to address all the needs.

Victoria Sykes addressed the Committee on the review on the climate assessment undertaken by the applicant on behalf of OCC. With respect to the induced traffic and carbon emissions, the calculations showed that there would be a reduction in carbon emissions with the scheme. The FOE figures seemed overestimated.

Rachel Wileman addressed the Committee about the spatial strategy, the proposed development was in accordance with local plans, both of Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire. The proposed development was the cornerstone of mitigation that was required to enable the planned growth to occur without severe harm being caused to the highway network. Without the development, the planned housing development and the employment development may be unlikely to come forward or would be delayed. It was up to the Committee to decide to approve the application with conditions or refuse the application with the reasons why. The spatial strategy was set out in a number of points within the report.

Mr John Lee, Public Health, OCC, provided the following comments.

- At the time of the scoping review for the EIA in 2020, there was no requirement for a separate full health impact assessment to be undertaken for major infrastructure schemes. Today, one would be required. A number of concerns identified from a public health perspective such as air quality and that it was essential that monitoring was undertaken to ensure that the noise and vibration management plan and the dust management plan were fully implemental and adhered to. The most vulnerable receptors to noise and dust pollution was that there was a nursery and pre-school in the vicinity of the noise and dust impacts and therefore asked for mitigations from the applicant. Physical activity was also looked into and access to blue and green open spaces and concluded that the levels of planting vegetation that needed to be enhanced. A noise and management plan was to be submitted if the application was to be approved, before the works commenced.

The Legal Officer commented that the HIF funding, the separate compulsory purchase order process going on, good use of funds and value for money and the cost to the Council of carrying out this scheme were not material considerations. However, the County Council's Climate Action Framework, the Climate and natural environment Policy, the Climate Change Committee Annual Report and the Local transport and Connectivity Plan were all material planning consideration.

The Legal Officer read out points from a statement received from an objector who was not aware of the meeting but had submitted their formal objections which included the scheme failed to provide an appropriate access to their land, however,

they had provided an alternative, which they felt should be included in the planning proposal.

The Development Management Team Leader, David Periam, presented the Committee with the modelled fly-through of the development during which members asked further questions, particularly with regard to the location of the proposed road in and around Appleford and the River Thames and that further advice was provided by the LPA's landscape advisor with regard to interpretation of photomontages from the application and ES documentation which was shown to the committee.

Councillor Constance formally proposed the recommendation that subject to the application first being referred to the Secretary of State to consider whether they wish to call it in for their own determination, planning permission for R3.0138/21 be approved subject to conditions to be determined by the Director of Planning, Environment and Climate Change, to include those set out in Annex 1. This motion was not seconded, hence the motion, fell.

Councillor Webber formally proposed the recommendation that planning permission be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Bennett. The reasons for the refusal were as follows:

- The Climate Change Committee's June 2023 Report to Parliament had not been properly taken into account in the application.
- Lack of Very Special Circumstances for the development set against Green Belt policy.
- The impact of traffic on Abingdon and Didcot had not been assessed in the application.
- The noise impacts on Appleford.
- The absence of a Health Impact Assessment.
- The harm to landscape.
- The Science Bridge was not of adequate design for a gateway feature to Didcot.
- Conflict with policy of the Council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan 2022-2050 (LTCP)

A named vote was carried out. Councillors Bennett, Edosomwan, Fadlalla, Howson, Middleton, Roberts and Webber voted for the motion. Councillors Constance and Saul voted against the motion.

RESOLVED: that the Planning application for Didcot Garden Town HIF 1 Scheme be **REFUSED** for the reasons set out above.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing