

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION****Planning Committee****9 September 2021**

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
13	(Page 2 )	Public Speakers
13	(Pages 3 – 5)	Written Updates

*If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Lesley Farrell, Democratic and Elections [democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk), 01295 221591*

# Planning Committee 9 September 2021 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Ward Member	Speaker – Objector	Speaker - Support
8	20/02405/F	Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester, OX26 6AU	None	None	None
9	21/02260/F	Treetops, 28 Dashwood Road, Banbury, OX16 5HD	Councillor Matt Hodgson	Michael O’Connell Local Resident	Simon Marshall and Alan Coleman - Marshall Oakwood Developments Ltd.
10	21/02423/DISC	Land adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury (2423)	None	None	None
11	21/02424/DISC	Land adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury (2424)	None	None	None

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**9 September 2021**

**WRITTEN UPDATES**

**Agenda item 8**

**20/02405/F**

**Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester**

**Additional Representations received**

Two additional representations have been received. The comments are summarised as follows:

- The path alongside the proposed development is a key connection between Bicester town and Bicester Village.
- Thought needs to be given to ensuring that this route remains safe and attractive in order to encourage visitors to Bicester Village to visit Bicester town and vice versa
- Widening the path a little would be very beneficial.
- Would hope to see off-road parking as it is hard to park at times

**Officer comments**

The path is to remain unaffected by the development and is to remain of the same width as currently. However, it is considered that the reduction in the built footprint will help to improve the experience of the users of the footpath as it will feel more open than currently.

No off-street parking is proposed but a space per dwelling is to be provided within the car park area to the east of the site. Given the central, sustainable location, this is considered to be sufficient.

**Recommendation**

As per the published Agenda.

**Agenda Item 9**

**21/02260/F**

**Treetops, 28 Dashwood Road, Banbury**

**Additional representations received**

Two additional representation has been received and the comments are summarised as follows:

- The applicant makes mention in response to community objections of the fact that they will be 'raising the standards' within the Banbury market, and yet the density of individual rooms in the plans as they stand means that bedroom space will be undeniably cramped and access to amenities (e.g. the kitchen) severely restricted. Would 'raising the standard' not mean improving significantly on the minimum in both cases?
- Adaptations are needed to be made to the basement and ground floor rooms. I also believe that one bedroom on the first floor is not of the approved minimum size, and that the kitchen would required to have 2 complete sets of kitchen facilities to accommodate the number of occupants proposed. Given that my house overlooks the kitchen area I have huge concerns for the amount of people and noise, that this

number of people will create in such a small space and so affecting our property as well as seemingly being unethical for those who live there.

- It's not clear from the response if 24-hour access to landlords would be available should it be needed.
- Given the issues raised by the police in their objection, and the understaffing they are experiencing, this should be much clearer in my view. (Residents made significant reference to safety in their responses.) I'd also like to query the fact that the objections and issues raised by the police were not mentioned in the planning statement.
- Unclear to see how the property will be protected from crime.
- The impact this has on the community and the fear of crime. As a resident for 9 years with a young family I already feel that we have had to protect ourselves and our families from violence on the streets outside our home, most notably in 2017 when although already highlighted a drug dealing issue led to the deaths of 2 young men. We have also been witness to events that have led to my husband giving evidence in court for violence that happened directly outside our house. Although I am not claiming that the residents occupying the HMO will bring these issues the increase in single occupancy multiple living does have evidence of showing an increase in crime.
- The parking issue is still not addressed satisfactorily. There is currently space for 2 cars safely to enter and exit the hard standing.
- The Highway Authority has not opposed the plans, but it is still not clear as to why they opposed plans previously when the current owners made these plans. As far as I am aware there has been no major changes to the parking provisions locally since their application, and therefore deemed that the same objections would apply.
- Residential parking has been requested before on more than one occasion by local residents. It was turned down. It would of course be undemocratic if this decision was affected by the views of one residence.
- The statement has been made that the residents will be "single residents" - can we understand how this is monitored, what this means regarding overnight "guests" and also what happens if someone becomes a couple - do they automatically get removed from this property.
- Despite this being a central town location this community is built up of families, and individuals who thrive together. We are keen to grow the community and pride ourselves on being an inclusive and supportive neighbourhood. It is important to us that whatever happens to this property that it supports the community and in no way puts strain on it.
- The planning statement notes that decisions 'should not be made solely on the basis of the number of representations', whether for or against. It's my understanding that there were no statements in support of this planning application, and 10 against. Were I able to attend the meeting tomorrow I'd have asked what proportion of the decision should be made on the basis of this disparity.
- The important arguments around, for example, the need for social housing, for social responsibility, for community living, and for diversity are ones that many members of this community would understand and appreciate.
- The planning application as it stands could in my view far better fulfil these needs, it could meet many of the objections residents have raised, and it could address the impacts and sustainability issues raised by the planning statement if there were simply fewer planned residents.
- Feel strongly that the application does not in my view appreciate the needs of the individuals who would be living in the property.

- Nine unrelated people, sharing one kitchen, in one household which is the size of a large family home cannot be a successful way to meet those standards or needs.

#### **Officer comments**

The issues raised in the representation have been discussed in the published report.

- Issues regarding the standards of the accommodation to be provided are covered by separate legislation and a licence will be required in order to operate the HMO. Any restrictions on the occupancy will be made and policed by the owner of the property. A condition is recommended however restricting the premises to no more than 9 bedrooms; if more bedrooms are created further planning permission will be required.
- Concerns have been expressed by Thames Valley Police (TVP) regarding security, crime and anti-social behaviour and a condition is recommended in line with the recommendations of TVP.
- Due to the central, sustainable location of the site it is considered that the parking provided on site is adequate. The parking requirement for the proposed use is similar to the existing use.
- The issue of residents parking in the area is not a matter that can be considered in the context of this application.
- Whilst there have been a number of representations made objecting to the proposal, planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, rather than based on the number of objections.
- The Council has to determine the application proposal before it rather than a proposal that the local community may prefer to see.

#### **Recommendation**

As set out in the published report

#### **Agenda Item 10**

**21/02424/DISC**

**Land adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury**

#### **Additional representations received**

None received.

#### **Recommendation**

As set out in the published report

#### **Agenda Item 11**

**21/02424/DISC**

**Land adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury**

#### **Additional representations received**

None received.

#### **Recommendation**

As set out in the published report