



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

16 July 2020

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
3	(Pages 1 - 2)	Public Speakers
7 - 18	(Pages 3 – 8)	Written Updates

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

Planning Committee 16 July 2020 – Public Speakers

Agenda Item	Application Number	Application Address	Speaker	Reason	
7	20/00293/OUT	Bicester Gateway Business Park, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton			
			Emma Lancaster – Albion Land/Paul Troop – Bicester Bike User Group	Objection	5 mins shared
			Philip Clarke – Chesterton Parish Council/ Richard Cutler – Bloombridge Development	Support	5 mins shared
8 Page 1	19/02708/OUT	Bicester Heritage, Buckingham Road, Bicester			
			Pamela Roberts - CPRE	Objection	5 mins
			Dan Geoghegan - Bicester Motion Planning Consultants	Support	5 mins
9	20/00247/F	Land South East of Town and Country Scaffolding Ltd, Tramway Road, Banbury			
			Mark Schmull – Arrow Planning Ltd – Agent	Support	5 mins
10	20/01195/F	Land to rear of 1 and 2 Langford Park Cottages, London Road, Bicester	Cllr Dan Sames – Ward Member		
			Stuart Kirkwood – SK Architects Agent	Support	5 mins

Planning Committee 16 July 2020 – Public Speakers

11	20/01427/F	112 Mold Crescent, Banbury, OX16 0EU			
			None		
12	20/01444/F	Jamar, 5 Hightown Leyes, Banbury OX16 9NP			
			None		
13 Page 2	20/01204/DISC	Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road Banbury			
			None		
14	20/01203/DISC	Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road Banbury			
			None		
15	20/01104/DISC	General Foods Sports and Social Club, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury, OX16 2PA			
			None		
16	20/01105/DISC	Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury			
			None		

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 July 2020

WRITTEN UPDATES

Site visits

None are proposed

Agenda Item 7

**20/00293/OUT
Chesterton**

Bicester Gateway Business Park, Wendlebury Road,

At paragraphs 9.50 and 9.53 of the Committee report, reference was made to two outstanding matters relating to connectivity that were still being considered. Since the publication of the report, the Highway Authority informally advised that whilst the proposed amended crossing at the Western end of Charles Shouler Way was considered to be a betterment and would make crossing safer for pedestrians and cyclists (due to the provision of a central refuge, a reduced crossing distance and additional visibility), its proximity to the Vendee Drive roundabout could be intimidating for some users, which could then be unsafe for some users. In response to these concerns, the applicant's Transport Consultant has submitted two further amended plans relating to proposals for connectivity at Charles Shouler Way as well as a Technical Note relating to capacity of the road, late on Tuesday 14/07/2020. In brief, the plans show:

- A revised design for a crossing at the Western end of Charles Shouler Way set slightly further away from the roundabout than was previously proposed with associated updates to the design.
- A proposal for Wendlebury Road in the event of Phase 1b being delivered in advance of Phase 2, involving a pedestrian connection, provision for an uncontrolled crossing to the existing facility running north on the western side Wendlebury Road, then, provision for an uncontrolled crossing to the eastern side of Wendlebury Road with a 2m wide footway running north to join the existing infrastructure north of Wendlebury Road.
- The Technical Note concludes that the proposed crossing at the western end of Charles Shouler Way would have only a marginal effect on the operation of the Charles Shouler Way approach to the Vendee Drive roundabout. It also concludes that the reduction in three lanes to two lanes would not materially affect the operation of the arm of the roundabout due to the current lanes being narrow and with most of the approach being single carriageway. The proposal results in a betterment in terms of the ease of cycle and pedestrian crossing.

Due to the timing of receipt of these plans and the Technical note, Officers are unable to report whether the above schemes are satisfactory to OCC as the Highway Authority as was hoped (as set out at paragraph 9.61 of the Committee report). If a response is received prior to the Planning Committee meeting, then a verbal update will be provided.

A further letter has been received by Quod on behalf of Albion Land (which it is understood may have been circulated directly to Members) raising the following points:

- Albion Land continues to have strong objections to the proposals for the reasons previously given. The proposals will undermine the delivery of the Development Plan allocation and therefore the strategic approach to employment delivery and sustainable growth in Bicester.
- The access proposals continue to be unsafe and will undermine the operation of all phases of development at Bicester Gateway.
- The amended proposal narrows the westbound Charles Shouler Way further resulting in a two lane entry rather than three. The acceptability of this from a highway safety and operational perspective is not supported by robust evidence and this will reduce traffic capacity such that it is unclear whether sufficient capacity will remain for the existing, committed and proposed development at Bicester Gateway. No assessment is made of the access arrangements in conjunction with the Phase 2 accesses or the phasing implications.
- It is considered that the proposals will not make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of new strategic highway infrastructure which are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and reasonable in all other aspects. The contribution requested is based on a flawed calculation. The Applicant should be required to make a contribution which has been calculated on the same basis as Phase 2, Bicester Office Park and Wretchwick Green which is the only possible equitable approach. The way the calculation has been undertaken would not satisfy the NPPF tests.
- The proposals continue to fail to provide sufficient on site parking provision.
- The proposals are residential led and are therefore wholly incompatible with the delivery or operation of a strategic employment area, which is precisely what is intended to be created at Bicester Gateway.
- The proposals have the potential to have a significant cumulative noise impact on surrounding existing sensitive receptors which must be assessed in detail prior to the determination of the application.
- The objective of meeting housing needs must be considered in the context of all other Development Plan objectives, including meeting strategic employment needs. Residential development in this location would not comprise sustainable development and would increase reliance on the private car.
- It seems unlikely that all outstanding objections will be resolved by the time the application is brought to Planning Committee for consideration.
- CDC should satisfy itself that its conclusion with regard to the EIA Screening Opinion is robust. The Officer report does not properly consider this issue.

Officer response:

The Officer report has considered the principle of the proposed development in the context of the Development Plan Policies and Objectives. Officers have concluded that the proposal would represent sustainable development and that the planning balance lies in favour of approving the application subject to a S106 agreement and conditions, which would be brought back to Members for further consideration.

With regard to noise, the Environmental Protection Officer has not raised an objection and has recommended planning conditions, one of which relates to requiring noise mitigation, which will be recommended. The proposed residential and employment uses (as well as the employment uses on adjoining sites) sits within an area that will include a variety of uses including a health and rackets club to the north (with outdoor sports facilities) and a hotel. It is therefore considered that sufficient mitigation can be secured through conditions.

The EIA Screening Opinion is available on the file and as referred to within the report is considered to have reached the correct conclusion and been properly reasoned.

The concerns regarding Transport matters are noted. As set out above, additional information has been received and the comments of the Highway Authority are awaited as to whether the Transport objection has been removed.

Bicester Bike Users Group have contacted the Case Officer for clarification regarding routes available for cyclists between the A41 and Wendlebury Road. Officers intend to make plans available to demonstrate the links to be provided through and around the site to maximise connectivity.

Agenda Item 8

19/02708/OUT

Bicester Heritage Buckingham Road Bicester

Additional representations received

One letter of objection received raising the following issues:

- It should remain a grass airfield with building only in the original area.
- Impact on traffic and Skimmingdish Lane.
- Hotel is not needed.
- Impact on gliding activities.

One letter of support received raising the following issues:

- Well thought out plan.
- Creation of jobs and revenue.
- It can be noisy occasionally with race engines revving, the open days and track experiences, but not to excess.

Change to recommendation

No change

Agenda Item 9

20/00247/F

Land South East Of Town And Country Scaffolding Ltd, Tramway Road, Banbury

Additional representations received

CDC ECOLOGIST: No objection. Further to the receipt and review of the additional surveys and Reptile Mitigation Strategy as outlined in the report the Councils Ecologist raises no objection to the application subject to the recommendations in the reports being followed and the submission of a biodiversity enhancement plan which can be conditioned.

Officer comment

In light of the above the proposed development is considered to be acceptable from an ecological perspective subject to conditions.

Change to recommendation

The recommendation to approve is no longer subject to the receipt of comments from the Councils Ecologist as these have now been received.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the legal agreement and conditions set out in the Committee report and the following additional conditions:

1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with:
 - Reptile Mitigation Strategy RT-MME-150960 Rev A May 2020 (which includes monitoring and protection during construction)
 - Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4 of Bat Surveys RT-MME-152681-01 July 2020
 - Recommendations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5 of Otter and Water Vole Survey RT-MME-152681-02 (interim) July 2020
 - Recommendations R1, R6, R10, R11 of updated Preliminary Ecological Assessment RT-MME-151182 Rev B May 2020

Reason - To ensure that the development does not cause harm to any protected species or their habitats in accordance with Policy ESD10 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. A method statement for enhancing biodiversity on site, to include features integrated into the fabric of the buildings, planting and bird and bat boxes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development reaching slab level. Thereafter, the biodiversity enhancement measures approved shall be carried out prior to occupation and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect habitats of importance to biodiversity conservation from any loss or damage in accordance with Policy ESD10 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Agenda Item 10

20/01195/F Land To Rear of 1 and 2 Langford Park Cottages, London Road, Bicester

Additional representations

A third-party has provided representation neither objecting nor supporting the application. The third party suggests several points that should be addressed for the scheme to be viable.

Additional information received from applicants

1. Supplementary details provided regarding the energy performance of the proposed dwellings. This has been made available on public access.
2. Correspondence from the owner of the unadopted highway, stating that it can be tarmacked.
3. Correspondence from the letting agent of 2 and 3 Langford Park Cottages, requesting that these occupiers park on their driveway rather than the unadopted highway.
4. That applicant is happy for landscaping details to be conditioned to deal with noise impact from A41.

Officer comment

1. Whilst an energy performance above the Building Regulation standards is a benefit, this is considered to be relatively minor and would not outweigh the harm identified in refusal reasons 1 or 2.
2. The tarmacking of the drive would not overcome refusal reasons 1 or 2.
3. It was not apparent from the officer site visits that occupiers of 2 and 3 Langford Park Cottages already park on this unadopted highway.
4. A landscaping condition would not overcome refusal reasons 1 or 2.

Change to the officer recommendation.

No change

Agenda Item 11

20/01427/F 112 Mold Crescent, Banbury, OX16 0EU

Additional representations/Information received

Consultation response received from Banbury Town Council raising no objections.

Officer Comment

No further comment.

Change to recommendation

None

Agenda Item 12

20/01444/F Jamar, 5 Hightown Leyes, Banbury, OX16 9NP

Additional representations/Information received

Consultation response received from Banbury Town Council raising no objections.

Officer Comment

No further comment.

Change to recommendation

None

Agenda Item 13

**20/01204/DISC Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal Spiceball Park Road Banbury
(1204)**

No update

Agenda Item 14

**20/01203/DISC Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury
(1203)**

No update

Agenda Item 15

**20/01104/DISC General Foods Sports and Social Club, Spiceball Park Road,
Banbury, OX16 2PA**

No update

Agenda Item 16

**20/01105/DISC Land Adjacent to the Oxford Canal, Spiceball Park Road, Banbury
(1105)**

No update

--