



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

5 October 2023

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
18	Pages 2 - 3	Public Speakers
18	Pages 4 - 7	Written Updates

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Aaron Hetherington / Matt Swinford, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

Planning Committee 5 October 2023 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Ward Member	Speaker – Objector	Speaker – Support
8	22/00747/OUT	Land At Bicester Road, Kidlington			Keith Fenwick, Pegasus (Agent)
9	22/01611/OUT	Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL			Huw Mellor, Carter Jones (Agent)
10	22/01756/F	Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL			Huw Mellor, Carter Jones (Agent)
11	22/01757/LB	Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL			Huw Mellor, Carter Jones (Agent)

12	23/01424/F	1 George Street, Bicester, OX26 2EB			Williams Johnson-Mota (Applicant)
13	23/01927/F	43A George Street, Bicester, OX26 2ED			Jenny Surtees (Applicant)
14	22/03877/F	Hatch End Old Poultry Farm, Steeple Aston Road, Middle Aston, OX25 5QL	Councillor Eddie Reeves		Patrick Bradshaw, (Applicant)
15	23/01164/F	OS Parcel 0927 East Of And Adjoining Chacombe Road, Wardington	APPLICATION WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT		
16	23/01952/F	1 Elizabeth Rise, Banbury, OX16 9LZ	Councillor Kieron Mallon	Ian Lyne, Local resident	

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

5 October 2023

WRITTEN UPDATES

**Agenda Item 8
22/00747/OUT – Land at Bicester Road, Kidlington**

No Update

**Agenda Item 9
22/01611/OUT – Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL**

Additional representation received:

OUA (the applicant for PR8 under reference 23/02098/OUT) has written in support of the planning application and remarks that with regard to the canal bridge a proportionate contribution from PR7b would be appropriate. Negotiations have been commenced in this regard recognising that delivering the bridge requires access to multiple third-party land ownerships.

OUA comments on its preference for a public transport connection that would link Oxford Parkway to the planned Oxford Airport Park and Ride via Begbroke Science Park and through the PR7b site. It says the route would provide a direct link between the existing and planned travel hubs and also to the planned expansion of the Science Park, which it says would help ease congestion and provide a high quality alternative to private vehicle use in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. The anticipated relocation of Oxford United FC to the 'triangle' site just west of Oxford Parkway only lends further weight to the potential benefits such a connection could deliver.

OUA does not expect Manor Oak Homes ("MOH", the PR7b applicant) to commit to any contributions above that which is expected for the 'baseline' policy option. Nor would this require any changes to MOH's outline application. OUA advises that it has sought to work with MOH to secure a further feasibility study in the section 106 agreement that allows this potential to be explored further, noting that a Section 106 Obligation of the type suggested would not place any additional financial burden on MOH, or delay the delivery of their project.

Officer comment:

A copy of the full letter can be found on the Council's website.

No change to the Recommendation is required.

Government guidance states that planning obligations may only be included in a Section 106 agreements if they meet these three tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Such a feasibility study would not meet these tests and would not be appropriate to require in Section 106 agreement for the PR7b development. Further, it would conflict with Policy PR7b,

which requires “a new public bridleway/green link suitable for all-weather cycling”, would likely have an adverse impact on biodiversity and wildlife habitats, and would cause harm to the significance of the Grade II listed Stratfield Farmhouse through change to its setting. Notably, the Development Brief for the PR7b site requires sensitive treatment of the road to the south of the farmhouse that provides access to the western half of the PR7b development, including bespoke surfacing (resin bound gravel or similar) and no footpaths adjacent to the carriageway.

Agenda Item 10

22/01756/F – Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL

No Update

Agenda Item 11

22/01757/LB – Stratfield Farm, 374 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 1DL

No Update

Agenda Item 12

23/01424/F – 1 George Street, Bicester, OX26 2EB

Additional consultation response received:

CDC Housing Officer: The proposed plans look broadly satisfactory in terms of the Cherwell District Council HMO Standards 2018. Bedroom 4 should have an openable window or alternate means to adequately ventilate the room. External doors by themselves are not suitable means for ventilation because they can create a security risk if left unattended. Inadequate ventilation may lead to problems with condensation dampness and mould growth.

Officer Comment: The applicant has confirmed that the small windows shown immediately above the external doors (on the elevation drawings) are openable to provide the required ventilation.

Agenda Item 13

22/01927/F – 43A George Street, Bicester, OX26 2ED

No Update

Agenda Item 14

22/03877/F – Hatch End Poultry Farm, Steeple Aston Road, Middle Aston OX25 5QL

Officer Comment: It has come to officers’ attention that development has commenced on site without the benefit of planning permission. This development relates to building 4 and the scout hut only, and not the three additional units as proposed under this application. The application includes the replacement of the scout hut and therefore this part is retrospective. The Council’s Enforcement team is currently investigating. The work carried out does not affect the application before members.

Agenda Item 15**23/01164/F – OS Parcel 0927 East of and adjoining Chacombe Road, Wardington**

Application Withdrawn by the applicant.

Agenda Item 16**1 Elizabeth Rise, Banbury, OX16 9LZ**

Additional representation from Cllr Mallon:

The site has a long planning history. As local member I objected to and made submissions to the council concerning the previous two applications. The wholesale removal of existing trees and shrubs rang alarm bells. Many would still deem the proposals excessive. I was surprised that the council granted permission but it did, I hoped this would be the end of the story. But no.

A second application was submitted 23/01059/F in May 2023. This application had front, side and rear extensions and a proposal to remove the chimney. I again objected. This was refused on the grounds of its adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and on the amenities of the neighbouring residents. I and residents thought that the original application, passed eight months earlier would now be built. But it seemed not!

A third application is now before you. 23/01952/F which seems to me to still merit refusal on similar grounds to the former (2nd) application. It is still out of character, has large first floor extensions, large French windows and balcony which overlooks adjacent properties. The scale of the proposed accommodation seems not in keeping with a regular family home (10 double bed spaces) and one has to wonder what the intended use of the property will be in the future? The amount of car parking spaces is again excessive for a family home and is more akin to an HMO (House of multiple occupation). The covered parking would also lead to excess water not being able to drain away and could cause localized problems in the future.

The third application is so similar to the refused second submission that I am surprised it has been put forward for approval.

The proposal (a) is overdevelopment of the property, (b) would adversely impact the amenity of No. 3 Elizabeth Rise and adjoining properties, (c.) exceeds the parking capacity of the property, (d) would cause water problems and localized flooding due to water run off from the aforementioned excessive hard surface parking.

The ongoing additions and excessive over development would severely affect the local landscape, amenity, street scene and set dangerous precedent in my opinion and I ask you to refuse it for the reasons I have outlined (a-d) and any other reason you as trained planning elected members know of.

Officer Comment:

Removal of trees and shrubs – given the site's location outside of a Conservation Area this work did not require planning permission.

Why the first application was granted – the proposals were very similar to developments previously granted permission at Nos 3, 5 and 6 Elizabeth Rise; they were in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and would not have adversely affected the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Whether the current proposals are out of character – as seen from public vantage points the current proposals would be no materially different from the approved proposals, save for the omission of a rooflight to the single storey front element; the additional first floor rear element cannot be reasonably said to adversely affect the character of the area.

Whether the current proposals would overlook adjacent properties – the additional first floor rear element contains no side-facing windows; its rear-facing windows would be c.45 metres from neighbours to the south-east, approximately twice the 22 metres expected in the Council's guidance.

Future proposals / alternative uses – these are not material considerations in the assessment of the current planning application, which has been submitted as a householder application, with the amount of accommodation proposed being similar to that approved at Nos. 3, 5 and 6 Elizabeth Rise.

Similarity of current proposals to the refused submission – the current proposals address the reasons why the second application was refused, namely (1) the central gable projection to the front elevation (visual impact) and (2) the outer two gable projections to the rear elevation (residential amenity impact) have been omitted from the current proposals.

The current proposals are similar to what has been approved at Nos. 3, 5 and 6, would not result in overdevelopment, nor would the differences between the approved scheme and the current proposal have any material impact on the street scene or the local landscape.

Agenda Item 17

Appeals Progress Report

Clarifications:

Paragraph 3.9 and 3.25 (Finmere) – the one day hearing takes place Tuesday 17th October

The appeals at Shearwater Drive (3.12), North Newington (3.15), Byron Way (3.16), The Hale (3.17) and Epwell (paragraph 3.22) have all been dismissed; decision summaries to follow in future Planning Committee agendas

There is a typographical error at para 3.19 (duplicated at 3.24) – the appeal relates to a site in Great Bourton rather than Yarnton or Kidlington.
