

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

16 April 2015

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
14.	(Pages 1 - 4)	Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221589

Agenda Item 14

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 April 2015

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 8 14/01901/F 55-57 Park Road, Banbury

- An e-mail has been received from Cllr Surinder Dhesi in which she states:

I would like to object to the proposed application on the grounds that this a very busy road and at the present moment there are parking problems with vehicles parked all over the pavements and road. As a District Councillor I have had many residents complain about the parking problems already and this proposal will increase more traffic making it worse.

- Letter of objection received from Councillor Steve Kilsby of Banbury Town Council, who states:

I represent the views of local residents, who have expressed concern to me about the problems that acceptance of this application will cause them; increased levels of traffic flow; additional cars parked on the verges around and general pressure on car parking. I would add that this development appears to be over development to me, intruding, as it does, into areas otherwise reserved for residential gardens It would also appear to be an attempt to incrementally produce a main centre for a sector of the Muslim community. A significant section of this same community living in the local streets do not belong to this sector, and will not be using the facility. I therefore object strongly to this application, and will attend the Committee meeting where it is discussed.

Agenda Items 9 14/01911/F Easington Sports Club, Addison Rd. Banbury

- Letter received on behalf of the Addison Road and Grange Road Residents Committee who state:

I am writing on behalf of the Addison Road and Grange Road committee regarding the above planning application.

We have taken a vote of no confidence in the external planning consultant PHILIP SMITH DIRECTOR AITCHENSON RAFFETY THE GRANARY, SPRING HILL OFFICE PARK, HARBOROUGH ROAD NORTHAMPTON NN6 9AA employed to carryout the assessment on the

above application.

We believe due care and attention was not taken in assessing the proposal there was a failure to produce a full comprehensive report, a suitable lighting professional was not employed or consulted.

No site notes were taken or photographs, repeat requests for any communications or evidence of work carried out was not forthcoming. The only hard copy's of any research into the application we can find are two emails between Mr Smith and Mr Lowther the ASBM. Where it is clearly evident that Mr Smith disregarded the opinion of the ASBM that the residents would be unhappy with the erection of the lighting and the increased traffic. He concentrated solely on the fact the lighting meet with industry standards.

These increased number of lights will have a real impact on the people living in this community and as such there needs to be serious attention given to there installation.

- 300 people who's properties back onto the football field will be directly effected by the lighting due to there height and light pollution .

- By reducing the lights by little over a meter they will still be significantly higher than the surrounding properties and the fallout will effect houses on the north side of Addison Road, Springfield Avenue, Grange Road and Timms Estate thereby effect many more hundreds of people.

- Adding to the number of lights in our opinion further compound the problem when there off and when they are on.

- The area is on the edge of Banbury with low levels of light pollution meaning these light will have a greater impact.

- Almost half of the properties have children of school age and under who go to bed before 9pm and most if not all have bedrooms facing the Football field.

- For almost half the football season especially in wet winters the football field suffers with water logging and the pitch is unplayable surely this is a higher priority

- We don't understand why temporary lighting can't be tried first, that's in the interest of all parties.

- Who is going to police there use?

In the first instance we want the application delayed so a proper review can be carried out of the application and a thorough report written using a lighting expert.

We ask that you give our community some respect and use a local Planning officer from Cherwell to carry out the review and assessment.

- Your officers have sent the following reply in response:

I am sorry that you are dissatisfied with the consideration of this application by Aitchison Raffety on behalf of the Council. However, I can confirm that the application has been carefully considered by both Aitchison Raffety and the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Manager. The details of the flood lights have been amended to those proposed under application reference no. 13/00036/F. That application was withdrawn prior to the decision notice being issued by the Council. The proposed floodlight columns will be reduced in height to 15.24 metres and as such will ensure that the flood lighting will be concentrated on the playing surface to reduce the extent of light spillage. A plan has been submitted in support of the planning application detailing the lux levels associated with the proposed floodlighting. Furthermore, the applicants have indicated that the floodlights will only be used on 12 occasions per year.

The consultation response from the Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Manager concluded that if the Council were minded to support this application, a condition should be attached to the planning permission to limit the usage of the floodlights in accordance with the above.

Agenda Item 10 14/02157/F Muddle Barn Farm, Sibford Gower

- **APPLICATION WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

Agenda Item 11 15/00082/F Tesco, Pingle Drive, Bicester

- Two further letters have been received from applicants agent
 1. Letter responding to comments from consultees making the following points
 - **Footpath** diversion works will take place before the footpath is extinguished
 - The statutory footpath will be realigned to skirt the western edge of the site and link with the crossing points of Pingle Drive and the A41 providing effective north/south **pedestrian links**

- The **highway works** will be delivered as previously required for 12/01209/F prior to the first opening for trading of any of the new floorspace (HDM note : see recommendation)
 - Progress being made towards the park and ride car park; the applicant has paid the required contribution – works commencing after Easter and scheduled for completion November 2015
 - Further **active frontage** cannot be provided on northern elevation as it would conflict with the servicing arrangements
 - Proposed **landscaping scheme** has not significantly altered from that previously approved
 - Declining to install a **changing places toilet facility** through lack of space, concern about management requirements and suggesting that there is no need for this facility in their experience
 - Further information given to Environment Agency about **surface water run-off rates**
 - Applicant content with condition re **Employment and Skills Plan**
 - Applicant content with condition re **requirement for ecological survey**
2. Further to the publication of the committee report wish to raise a few queries.

Firstly, draft condition 21 requires that '*no development shall take place until the scheme for the provision and management of an eight metre wide buffer zone alongside Pingle Brook is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority*'. We are aware that this condition was on the previous planning consent, however as Pingle Brook runs north to south, along the side of the Bloor South car / coach park, we query its relevance to the planning application as it is outside the red line of the application. We would therefore request that this condition is removed.

Your officers agree that this has been proposed in error and therefore it is **recommended that condition 21 is omitted**