



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

11 February 2021

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
15	Page 1	Public Speakers
15	Pages 2 - 5	Written Updates

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Lesley Farrell, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221591

Planning Committee 11 February 2021 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Ward Member	Speaker – Objector	Speaker - Support
8	20/01933/F	Barn In OS Parcel 0545 West Of Withycombe Farm, Wigginton	None	Mr Ian McArdle – Wigginton Parish Council Mr R Fazey – Local Resident	Mr Rob Hughes - Agent
9	20/02653/F	The Chesterton Hotel Bicester Road Chesterton OX26	None	Christopher Messum – Local Resident	Simon Sharpe and Kaven Gill Chesterton Hotel
10	20/02859/F	Straw Barn College Farm, Main Street, Wendlebury, OX25 2PR	None	None	None
11	20/03199/F	Axis J9 Phase 1 OS Parcel 4200 Adjoining Middleton Road and Howes Lane, Bicester	None	None	Emma Lancaster - Agent
12	20/03426/F	3 The Green Barn Stoke Lyne Road Stratton Audley Bicester OX27 9AT	None	Christina Honsinger – Local resident	None
13	20/02446/F	Glebe Farm Boddington Road Claydon, Oxon OX17 1TD	No Public speaking - public speaking has already taken place.		

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

11 February 2021

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 8

20/01933/F – Barn in OS Parcel 0545 West of Withycombe Farm, Wigginton

The drone site visit took place on 9th February 2021 at 1:30pm. The footage shall be shown to members during the committee meeting.

Additional information received

None.

Additional Representations received

An objection has been received from CPRE. The objection is on the basis of the harm the development would cause to the character and appearance of the area and potential light pollution.

An objection has been received from a member of the public on the basis of the harm that the development would cause to the character and appearance of the area and they have requested that a site visit is undertaken in person.

Officer response

The comments of both parties are noted. However, the officer report sets out that officers consider that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Environmental Protection Officer has commented that the lighting report is considered acceptable.

On the issue of a site visit being undertaken in person, at present this is not possible, and it would be unreasonable to defer the application until a time that this is possible.

Change to recommendation

Following clarifications from the Councillor's solicitor, the recommendation should read 'planning obligation' where it reads 'unilateral undertaking'.

Agenda Item 9

20/02653/F – The Chesterton Hotel, Bicester Road, Chesterton

Additional information received

None.

Additional Representations received

An additional letter has been received from Chesterton Parish Council. The letter does not raise objections to the application but does raise concerns over the applicant's choice to not to discuss the changes with the LPA during the lockdown period. The letter states that the

development will support the employment at the hotel and that the changes would not be clearly visible from the public domain. The Parish Council state that a site visit should be undertaken.

A letter has been received from the applicant's planning agent. The letter sets out the financial situation of the applicant and why they consider the development to be acceptable. The planning agent states that a site visit should be undertaken.

Change to recommendation

No change.

Agenda Item 10

20/02859/F – Straw Barn College Farm, Main Street, Wendlebury

Additional information received

None.

Additional Representations received

None.

Change to recommendation

No change.

Agenda Item 11

20/03199/F – Axis J9 Phase 1 OS Parcel 4200 Adjoining Middleton Road and Howes Lane, Bicester

Additional information received

Officers have noted the reference to 'Phase 1' in the description – this should be removed as the location is the same as that considered through the original outline application.

An amended version of the Development Parameters Plan has now been submitted which corrects some matters and provides the correct parameter plans (no changes to the conditions are required to reflect this because the correct plans were already referred to).

Additional Representations received

The applicant has requested a small amendment to the wording of Condition 13 to refer to the actual floorspace allowed for by the 80% Class E(g)(iii)/B2 uses to provide absolute clarity.

Members have also been contacted directly by the Applicant's agent regarding the proposals. Officers have not repeated this in this update.

Officer response

Officers agree with the applicant's suggestion and have recommended an update to the wording of Planning Condition 13 below.

Change to recommendation

Recommended change to the wording of Condition 13 to refer to the actual floorspace allowed for by the 80% Class E(g)(iii)/ B2 uses only as requested by the Applicant's Agent:

13. No more than 53,000sqm of employment floor space shall be constructed on the site, which shall be used for uses falling within Class B8 or Class E(g)(iii) or B2 (with no more than 80% utilised for Class E(g)(iii) or B2 – 42,400sqm) (including ancillary uses) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or their equivalent in subsequent enactments or re-enactments) only and for no other purposes whatsoever, including no other categories of Class E.

Reason: In order to retain planning control over the use of the site, to ensure that the significant environmental effects arising from the development are mitigated, as set out in the Environmental Statement and in accordance with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Agenda Item 12**20/03426/F – 3 The Green Barn, Stoke Lyne Road, Stratton Audley, Bicester****Additional information received**

None.

Additional Representations received

None.

Change to recommendation

No change.

Agenda Item 13**20/02446/F – Glebe Farm, Boddington Road, Claydon****Additional information received**

None.

Additional Representations received

Representations have been received from local residents to query why the application is being returned to Planning Committee and requesting permission to speak at Planning Committee.

Officers have responded to apologise for any confusion caused by the automated notification letter that has been sent out; the wording isn't perhaps as clear as it could be though it does seek to highlight that if the application is being heard at Committee for a second or further time, then Public Speaking is not permitted. Officers have also responded to recognise that this is an unusual situation but that since the application is not being reconsidered, and because committee has already made a resolution, no further public speaking for this application is permissible.

This application is only being referred back to the committee to agree the final wording for the reasons for the refusal, to ensure they best reflect the Committee's resolution to refuse at the January meeting.

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) has commented on recommended Reason for Refusal 4.

Their original consultation response regarding highways highlighted that the s106 agreement is required to cover:

1. A contribution of £10,000 to fund improvements for the footpath to Claydon; and
2. Off-site highway improvement works including identifying places within the highway to provide at least three passing places along Boddington Road.

Paragraph 7.15 of the January report to Committee (Appendix 1) identifies these s106 requirements and they were then reflected in the original recommendation of officers.

In light of the refusal, OCC has asked that the wording of Refusal Reason 4 is amended to include reference to this need for off-site highway improvement works.

Officer response

Officers agree with OCC's suggested changes.

Change to recommendation

Amended wording for Refusal Reason 4:

In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 legal agreement the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development provides for appropriate footpath improvements **and off-site highway improvement works** required as a result of the development and necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms, to the detriment of both existing and proposed residents and contrary to Policies SLE4, ESD1, ESD15 and ESD16 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, and saved Policy TR1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.