

URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

27 January 2011

Page	Title
(Pages 1 - 4)	Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Legal and Democratic Services natasha.clark@cherwell-dc.gov.uk (01295) 221589

This page is intentionally left blank

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

27 January 2011

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 6 09/01592OUT Land S Talisman Rd. Bicester

- Confirmation has been received that the Environment Agency are satisfied that the SUDS arrangements will be satisfactory
- It is recommended that Condition 21 be amended to refer to Code for Sustainable Homes code level 5 rather than level 4

Agenda Item 8 10/01684/OUT Land N of Milton Rd. Adderbury

Application WITHDRAWN

**Agenda Item 9 10/01841/CM Land E Oxford Spires Bus. Park
Langford Lane, Kidlington**

Copy of **Kidlington Parish Council's** (KPC) comments raising objection to the scheme has been received. The following points are made:

- They are anxious that Members are made aware of the misgivings that exist within Kidlington, in regard to this particular site being used for the centre.
- They support the principle of a waste recycling centre in Kidlington for the use of the local community and is aware that the purpose of the proposal was to serve Kidlington and North Oxford, however there are now proposals to reduce the number of sites within the County – with the public promotion of the Kidlington site as a flagship site, and this is not considered to be suitable for use by an extended catchment area.
- Traffic modelling is based on a local only site and also is based on past data and furthermore, does not use any forecast of the traffic implications of the proposed railway station.
- This particular site was not included in the options for possible waste facilities for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework in March 2007 contrary to what the Site Search document suggests. Parish have carefully considered the supporting evidence and additional information outlining a proposal to close Ardley, Dean, Alkerton, Stanford and part close Redbridge. The status of the proposed site at Langford Lane would be to replace the functions of these existing sites as the Council's flagship site and it is their view that that automatically rules out the idea that 'very special circumstances' exist, which overrule Green Belt objections for the development of what is a new site serving a far wider catchment area than has been suggested in the supporting evidence.
- No proposal was brought forward during the life of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and it is understood that the development of the site was one of last resort. Sites that were included do not cover the site area (Site 181- now referred to as the Langford Lane/ East of Spires Business

Park is not the same as the proposal site, this was previously south of Langford Lane) and to blur the distinctions between these sites, as Mouchel appear to be doing is disingenuous. – Only the Gosford Grain Silo was deemed appropriate for more detailed assessment. Various planning applications exist on the boundaries of the site, including phase 3 of the Business Park.

- Applicant's purpose for the site is unclear. Because it is understood that some other sites will be closed to household waste recycling, this undermines the assertion that this will just be a local facility handling 9,000 tonnes of waste per annum. The fact the site is not intended in reality to serve just a local population within an 8km radius invalidates the site selection process.
- Site selection criteria excludes any consideration of the non Green Belt land that is destined to become part of the Northern Gateway proposals for North Oxford and also excludes consideration of sites that might serve North Oxford well, but which are within 5 miles of Redbridge. If purpose of the site is to provide more than just a local centre, then the restrictive search criteria is invalid as residents from Oxford are being invited to travel further to the centre than had the site selection had a wider catchment area. This is not sustainable, nor does it support the proximity principle identified in policy W3 nor justify the very special circumstances required to overcome the Green Belt policy objections.
- PPS10 states that the impact on neighbouring land uses should be considered. This site on the north of Langford Lane is adjacent to the high tech employment zone and is an inappropriate development on this side of Langford Lane and is likely to impact on the future development of Phase 3 of Spires Business Park. Any extension into the Green Belt as a locally approved exception should be considered only for a use that is compatible with the neighbouring uses, including the Business Park and the Langford Meadows Local Wildlife Site.
- Policy W6 of the MWLP allows for a Waste Reception Centre at Langford Lane subject to other conditions. Permission also exists for a recycling centre within Station Fields and as these are both major traffic generators the presence of two facilities within 400m is incompatible with the protection of local amenity value and on the residences within the adjacent canalside conservation area.
- The initial option assessment did not use Green Belt as a criterion. In excluding this criterion at the early stage, the subsequent reliance on other criteria have been given undue weight in justifying the conclusion that very special circumstances exist to outweigh Green Belt considerations.
- Assessment of the three shortlisted sites is out of date (i.e. not forming part of the MWDF consultation and using Pear Tree as an arbitrary cut off point). Whilst '*developing [the grain silo site] would also directly undermine the setting of Oxford*' that was not an obstacle in approving a huge MRF on that site by the applicant. The argument that the access is substandard and would be costly to improve is incorrect.
- If choice were to be made between renegotiating part of the grain silos site linked to the rail station and parking, and jeopardising planned and possible future high tech employment generation at Spires Business Park, the Grain Silo site is not such a bad option especially as a planning permission exists for a waste related facility on the site and it would mean traffic from Oxford would not need to travel through Kidlington.
- Traffic modelling considered to be invalid. Some of the base data dates back to 2003 and predates the opening of the park and ride. Even though the development itself is not considered to be a major traffic generator, the

existing problems would be exacerbated and by adding 76 movements at peak hour is a significant increase. These figures are considered to be a serious underestimate of what would actually be generated. The report does not set out how the applicant intends to mitigate these traffic impacts or contribute towards future mitigation schemes.

- The advantage of having a local recycling centre does not outweigh the presence of a noisy potential polluter that could impact on the hydrology of the adjacent site and disturb the wildlife.
- They recognise the need for a waste recycling centre in order locally to deal with the waste it generates. Cherwell as a whole already recycles at a higher rate than neighbouring authorities but it is the case that there is currently no local facility north of Oxford.

Your officers have tried to establish the status of the future strategy for the provision of such facilities referred to above by Kidlington PC. It would appear that this is not yet an approved strategy but is a clear statement of intent by the County Council.

It is known that this application was submitted before the strategy announcement and that OCC planners have sought further submissions in respect of the other options, traffic implications and Green Belt issues in the light of the potential pattern of availability.

It is therefore **Recommended** that further consideration of this item be **DEFERRED** to await the submission of the above information , and to allow this Council to be re-consulted upon it.

Agenda Item 10 **10/01852/CM** **Land at Worton Farm, Yarnton**

A letter sent to Oxfordshire County Council signed by 5 residents of Cassington Rd, has been copied sent to Cherwell District Council. The following points are made:

- Understand that the proposal has already started
- Was planning permission sought and obtained before the commencement of the work (particularly taking into account the environmental concerns which may arise)?
- Believe the construction of this pond was not part of the original plans when they were seeking approval for the food digester installation. Must have known at the time a pond would have been required but this was not made clear. Attitude by company is wrong, counterproductive and not a good omen about their future relationship with the Yarnton community. Hope the Parish Council will do its utmost to monitor and control any expansion plans in the future.
- Odours caused in the past by the Worton Farm composting operations appear to have declined, however the potential for similar odours could arise from the open pond contents of the flood digestion plant. Assured by Agrivert that the odours will be minimal, however request that a condition is applied to any planning permission that should any odours degrade the amenity of living in Yarnton, Agrivert's operations are stopped until the situation is rectified.

Second letter (signed by 3 of the above residents) also received:

- Residents representatives are in agreement that their preferred option would be for Agrivert to store the slurry/ digestate offsite, as per their original planning permission and believe the current application should be refused.

This has come about after considering the environmental factors such as odour, flooding and impact on local amenity. Also contrary to Green Belt policy.

- Residents understand that OCC are a client of Agrivert and request this conflict of interest is managed and recognised when the planning request is considered. Current application is the result of poor planning as it originally expected to be able to store all the digestate on its site or other locations as presented in the original application.
- If OCC grant permission it should include conditions to ensure the slurry lagoon is constructed as in-vessel in the same manner as Agriverts current Food Waste Receiving Building facilities at Worton Farm. Should incorporate a similar design whereby the pressure is reduced by a vacuum pump and the air discharging from the pump is filtered to meet fresh air standards.
- Where both the above issues are rejected, suggestion is OCC grant temporary permission to install the slurry lagoon, for a one year period by which time a full evaluation of the lagoon process would be tested and evaluated under all seasonal weather conditions. Should no adverse objections be received during this period, then OCC grant permanent planning permission.
- Evaluation process would need to include a measurement of odour and the environmental impact of spreading the digestate on the fields north of Yarnton Road.
- Evaluation process needs to include Council authorities, residents of Yarnton and Cassington participating in the testing and evaluation procedures. Findings submitted on a monthly basis.
- Residents supported the initial planning request for the in vessel facility as they recognise the utility of recycling waste to produce electricity with benefits to Society and the Environment. The presence of an open slurry lagoon and the risk that is created to the environment significantly offsets these benefits.