

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

17 March 2016

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
21.	(Pages 1 - 13)	Written Update

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections aaron.hetherington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 227956

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 March 2016

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 5 Minutes

Minute 169: Twenty Ha of Land Proposal of New Highway Aligned with Howes Lane, Bicester

The minutes currently list conditions 1 – 6 under (d). The following conditions 7 – 33 should also be included in the Minutes.

Subject to the addition of conditions 7 – 33 to Minute 169, Members are asked to agree the minutes of the meeting of 18 February 2016 as a correct record:

7. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the final surface treatment of road, cycleway and footway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.
8. Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, revised positions for the bus stops, which shall be Real Time Information enabled, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bus stop positions shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the development.
9. Prior to the first use of the road infrastructure hereby approved, full details of the bus stop infrastructure and street furniture to be provided at the bus stops as well as details of the future maintenance arrangements for these features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bus stop infrastructure and street furniture shall be provided prior to the first use of the road infrastructure and shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.
10. Notwithstanding the submitted details and prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, revised details of the junction ellipses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The junction ellipses shall be provided in accordance with the approved details.
11. No development shall commence on the road infrastructure hereby approved until such time that a scheme for the closure of the existing parts of Howes Lane and Bucknell Road that are proposed to be closed through a formal Traffic Regulation Order, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the first use of the road, the scheme shall be constructed and implemented in accordance with the approved details.
12. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of the interface between the road infrastructure and the areas of land at the existing Howes Lane and Bucknell Road that are to be closed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so approved.
13. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of the design of the traffic signalised junctions and signalised crossings, including the method by which the signals shall operate in combination as a network, shall be submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to first public use of the road infrastructure, the traffic signals shall be installed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details.

14. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a detailed scheme design including calculations for surface water drainage of the development including details of all SUDs infrastructure and maintenance of the features shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter and prior to the commencement of any development on the site the approved surface water drainage scheme shall be implemented and thereafter maintained.
15. Prior to the commencement of the development, full details of the design of the ponds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design of the ponds shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
16. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan is to include details of wheel washing facilities, any restrictions upon development traffic and routing of construction traffic to the site. The approved plan shall be implemented in full during the entire construction phase.
17. Prior to the commencement of the development, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)/ Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which shall include details of the measures to be taken to ensure construction works do not adversely affect residential properties on, adjacent to or surrounding the site and details of the measures to be taken to ensure that construction works do not adversely affect biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with approved CEMP.
18. Within 4 months from the first use of the road infrastructure hereby approved, a post construction noise survey shall be carried out to assess whether there are any adverse effects from the road once in operation on any existing residential dwelling that would exceed the levels set out in BS8233:2014, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should any adverse effects be identified, a scheme for the remediation of any such impacts shall be identified within the report and shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The identified remediation shall be carried out within 3 months from the written approval of the remediation scheme.
19. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy has been submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval. The remediation strategy shall include details how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall thereafter be implemented as approved.
20. No development shall commence until a Soil Resources Plan that details the soils present, proposed storage locations, handling methods and locations for reuse, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.
21. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of existing and proposed levels for the road infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
22. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, and notwithstanding the submitted details, full details, locations, specifications and construction methods for all purpose built tree pits and associated above ground features, to include specifications

for the installation of below ground, load-bearing 'cell structured' root trenches, root barriers, irrigation systems and a stated volume of a suitable growing medium to facilitate and promote the healthy development of the proposed trees, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and specifications.

23. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for landscaping the site shall include:-
 - (a) details of the proposed tree and shrub planting including their species, number, sizes and positions, together with grass seeded/turfed areas
24. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with BS 4428:1989 Code of Practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces), or the most up to date and current British Standard, in the first planting and seeding seasons following the final surface course of the road/footways being completed. Any trees, herbaceous planting and shrubs which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the current/next planting season with others of similar size and species.
25. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of a scheme for the protection of all retained trees and hedgerows, in accordance with the recommendations contained within the tree survey report submitted with the application (Report number 5003-UA005241-UE21R-01-Arb-App-3 dated 3rd December 2014) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All approved tree protection measures shall be installed prior to the commencement of the development and shall be retained for the duration of the construction phase.
26. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of all service trenches, pipe runs or drains and any other excavation, earth movement or mounding required in connection with the development, including the identification and location of all existing and proposed trees, shrubs and hedgerows within influencing distance of such services, including details of any required engineering solution methods for development within the Root Protection Area of any tree/ hedgerow shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
27. Prior to any demolition on the site, the commencement of the development and any archaeological investigation, a professional archaeological organisation acceptable to the Local Planning Authority shall prepare a first stage archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, relating to the application area, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
28. Prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development hereby approved, and following the approval of the first stage Written Scheme of Investigation referred to in condition 25, a programme of archaeological evaluation, investigation and recording of the application area shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved first stage Written Scheme of Investigation.
29. Prior to the commencement of the development, the site shall be thoroughly checked by a suitably qualified ecologist to ensure that no protected species, which could be harmed by the development, have moved on to the site since the previous surveys were carried out. Should any protected species be found during this check, full details of mitigation measures to prevent their harm shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved mitigation scheme.

30. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs, shall take place between the 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that such works can proceed, based on the submission of a recent survey (no older than one month) that has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site, together with details of measures to protect the nesting bird interest on the site.
31. Prior to the first use of the road infrastructure hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) covering areas to be offered for adoption until such time that the land is adopted and land outside of the adoptable area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the LEMP shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
32. Prior to the commencement of the development a Site Waste Management Plan, targeting zero waste to landfill, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Site Waste Management Plan shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
33. The development shall be constructed to meet a minimum of CEEQUAL Standard 'Very Good'.

Agenda Item 8 15/02359/OUT Land S of Milton Road, Adderbury

- Further 72 letters of objection bringing the total to 220
- Amended plans received 9 March showing the required visibility splays and footpath link along Milton Road. In terms of the visibility splay shown, this is now acceptable to the highway authority and removes their objection in this respect. The extent of the footpath shown however is not acceptable as it must extend to the David Wilson Homes access road to link in with their footpath back into the village. The objection from OCC in this respect therefore still stands. It is suggested however that this could be dealt with by agreement should planning permission be granted.
- Additional information and revised technical note was received 16th March 2016 regarding trip generation from the proposed development and the results of the traffic survey that had been undertaken. This has been assessed by the highway authority who confirm that their objection in this respect has now been removed.
- **CDC Business Support Unit**
It is estimated that this development has the potential to attract New Homes Bonus of approximately £375,000 over 6 years under current arrangements for the Council, with an additional sum paid per affordable home.

Agenda Item 9 15/01012/OUT Land NE Skimmingdish Lane, Launton

- The agent for the applicant comments:
 - The report does not recognise the proactive approach adopted by the applicant in pre-application and post submission: negotiations that

resulted in the scheme being amended. In particular to the site boundary to reflect designation in the CLP of Policy Bicester 11; removal of buildings from the flood plain; and in its relationship to the heritage assets following negotiations with the Conservation Officer.

- Comments of consultee responses are not fully covered:
 - Conservation/Historic England (HE)/Technical Considerations: After agreeing to a reduced height of 16m and following clarification being sought from HE on their views, it was accepted the developer had an operating need that governed design and no concern was raised on height.
 - The applicant has responded positively to the concerns of the Conservation Officer and reduced the height of the building to make it acceptable in heritage terms.
 - There is a complaint that the officer's report, in places, use subjective language e.g. in para. 7.21 to express surprise that HE did not comment in detail. The applicant may not be aware of the close working relationship between officers of CDC and HE at the former military airfields and, taking such criteria as proximity to the scheduled ancient monuments and height of building (as originally proposed), HE's limited comments was a surprise.
 - The Officer's report should but does not conclude that the scheme is acceptable in terms of accessibility, landscape, visual impact, flood risk, ecology and amenity, or adversely effect the function of the gliding operation at RAF Bicester.

A number of comments are made in relation to the conditions. The most significant is that in condition 1 "access" should be omitted as it is a matter of detail for which approval is sought now. The other changes are relatively minor and can be resolved if Officer's are given delegated powers to do so if Committee are minded to grant planning permission.

- **CDC Business Support Unit**

It is estimated that this development has the potential to secure Business Rates of approximately £1,185,568 per annum under current arrangements for the Council.

Agenda Items 10 and 11 15/02052/F and 2053/LB Bean Acre Cottage, Rope Way, Hook Norton

- Hook Norton Parish Council have confirmed that they have no objections following the submission of revised plans
- Two further letters/emails of objection have been received from the owner of the adjacent property (The House on the Green) Mr R Helyer. The objection correspondence received from Mr Helyer raised no new material planning considerations other than those previously identified and relate to the impact on the area of Common Land and that the existing outbuildings are within the registered area. A letter from OCC and OS map extract detailing the extents of the area of registered Common Land were included within the correspondence. The impact on the Registered Common Land has been assessed within the officer report and the contents of the latest correspondence are not considered to alter officer's opinions on this issue.

Agenda Item 12 15/02060/F Land at Brookhill Way, Banbury

• **Comments of applicants agent**

We have reviewed the latest consultation response from Lisa Michelson at Oxfordshire County Council, dated 18 February 2016. I am happy to say that we have been able to respond to all of the points she has raised and we have amended the attached site plan to accommodate some of the changes that have been requested.

To simplify matters the following table lists the OCC comments and our response.

	Item raised by OCC	OCC requirement	Our response	Additional information
1	Bus infrastructure	£4,000 contribution	No	See item 1 below
2	Hennef Way /A422 roundabout mitigation cost	£76,632 contribution	No	See item 2 below
3	Drainage and FRA	Details required	Yes	Full details and revised FRA submitted 01-03-16
4	Parking and manoeuvring areas	Details required	Yes	Full details submitted 01-03-16
5	Details of turning for service vehicles	Details required	Yes	See attached HGV vehicle tracking on the revised site plan 15008-11-C
6	Travel Plan Statement	TP required prior to occupation	Yes	Pre-occupation condition
7	Pedestrian access (1)	Demarcation for a pedestrian walkway across the car park from the DP parking spaces	Yes	Demarcation walkway illustrated on revised site plan 15008-11-C
8	Pedestrian access (2)	Demarcation for a pedestrian walkway along the western side of the building to the rear car park area	Yes	Demarcation walkway illustrated on revised site plan
9	Car parking	Bay 2 and parking space layout query	Yes	Parking arrangement revised. Refer to revised site plan
10	Disabled parking	Query of surfacing level adjacent to the DP parking space	No	The footpath is level and is now noted as such on the revised site plan
11	Cycle parking	Canopy to cycle stands	No	The cycle stands are located beneath the main building canopy

Item 1. (£4,000 contribution to bus infrastructure)

The self-storage unit will only employ 3-4 persons (as specified on the application forms). It is stretching things somewhat to suggest that up to

four employees will generate a need for a proposed new bus stop. Furthermore, the first journey on the shuttle to the retail park leaves Banbury town centre at 9:00am and is therefore not suitable for commuting, and there are existing bus stops in Hennef Way serving other local bus services.

Consequently, this requested financial contribution fails all three of the tests in the NPPF - i.e. *'Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following 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.'*

Item 2 (£76,632 contribution to Hennef Way /A422 roundabout improvement costs).

Please refer to the email sent previously by the project planning consultant Ian Sowerby of Bell Cornwell LLP, dated 23rd February 2016. The summary points being made in the email are that;

- a. Financial contributions have already been paid for via the original consent (98/00160/OUT) for comprehensive employment development in this area.
- b. No contribution was sought for the Karcher development (12/01748) because of point (a) above (refer to clause 5.15 of the Planning Officer's report).

Notwithstanding the conclusive argument, that the contributions sought are not justified, our client is prepared to make a financial contribution, if you are satisfied that the NPPF tests are met. In that case, the contribution should be based upon the 4 (rounded up) new jobs to be created as stated within the planning application, rather than OCC's theoretical calculation of 93 jobs = 4 x £824 per job = **£3,296.00**.

- The following amended plan should now be listed in **Condition 2**

Architectural site and building plans, sections and elevations.

Forum Architecture Limited

15008-01-A Ordnance Survey Site Plan
15008-06-A Topographic Site Plan
15008-11-C Proposed Site Plan
15008-20-C Proposed Ground Floor Plan
15008-21-A Proposed First Floor Plan
15008-22-A Proposed Second /Third Floor Plan
15008-23-A Proposed Fourth Floor Plan
15008-24-A Proposed Roof Plan
15008-31-A Proposed Elevations
15008-40-C Proposed Sections and Long Views

Drainage and external works details.

Calcinotto Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers

3160-001-T1 Existing Drainage Plan
3160-003-T3 Proposed Drainage Plan
3160-010-T3 Proposed levels Plan

3160-050-T2	Drainage Details 1 of 4
3160-051-T2	Drainage Details 2 of 4
3160-052-T2	Drainage Details 3 of 4
3160-053-T2	Drainage Details 4 of 4
3160-055-T2	External Work Details 1 of 2
3160-056-T2	External Work Details 2 of 2

- As a consequence of these comments **Condition 11 can be deleted** and an **additional condition** re travel plans should be added
- **Banbury Town Council** comment on the revised scheme as follows
Object: This site is part of the existing strategic employment sites contained within the local plan. BTC has always had concerns/objections over sites that have been used for B8 use as the ratio of the size of the area used and the number of employees is extremely low (Proposed number of FTE employees = 3.5 on this application)
- **Further representations** on behalf of adjoining business

As you are aware, Lloyds are the current occupier of 1 Brookhill Way, Banbury, OX16 3ED occupying the site immediately adjacent to the application site. Lloyds welcome the revised plans which have been submitted by the applicant in relation to the scale and location of the building, in response to the initial concerns raised in their letter submitted on 21 December 2015. However, they still have a number of concerns and comments which they wish to make in relation to the proposals and wish to be considered prior to the determination of the application at Planning Committee on 17 March 2016.

In summary these relate to:

- 1. Proximity and scale of the built form;*
- 2. Adverse impact on amenity and boundary treatment; and,*
- 3. Future development phase.*

1 – PROXIMITY AND SCALE OF THE BUILT FORM

Lloyds welcomes the revisions which have been made to the scheme by the applicant in terms of reducing the height of the building and moving it away from the boundary with the Lloyds building. Given the floorspace per floor remains the same at 1,395sqm (although the total gross floorspace has reduced from 6,975sqm to 5,580sqm) it has resulted in elongating the built form so it now covers over half of the Lloyds building. This potentially could have greater detrimental impact on the working environment of employees of the Lloyds building given that more of their windows will be affected with reduced daylight into the building.

Whilst the applicant has reduced the height of the building, it is still slightly higher than the highest ridge point of the Lloyds building roof. It is considered that being in line with the eaves of the Lloyds building would be more suitable. Lloyds' concerns still remain regarding the building being overly dominating, especially when considering the blank facades of the storage unit and therefore the impact on the occupiers of the Lloyds building, in terms of the levels of natural daylight into the building.

2 – ADVERSE IMPACT ON AMENITY AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT

Given the reconfiguration of the unit, car parking spaces are now proposed in the space between the storage unit and the Lloyds building. Should

planning permission be granted, Lloyds would wish to see a planning condition placed on the permission which requires the applicant to provide the details of the boundary treatment between the two sites. This will allow the visual, acoustic and any privacy aspects to be considered to ensure the impact on the occupiers of their building is minimised.

3 – FUTURE DEVELOPMENT PHASE

As detailed in their previous representations, Lloyds have concerns regarding the green space to the front of the development site which has been earmarked for a future phase of the development. As mentioned previously, should this site come forward for development of a building of a similar scale to that currently proposed, it would result in the overdevelopment of the site and a significant loss of landscaping compared to the setting of similar developments on neighbouring sites. This would be more of a concern now that the proposed building has been elongated. On this basis, should planning permission be granted for this current development, Lloyds wish to be informed of all future development proposals in relation to this parcel of land so they can ensure there are no additional adverse impacts on the working environment of employees.

- **CDC Business Support Unit**

It is estimated that this development has the potential to secure Business Rates of approximately £104,252 per annum under current arrangements for the Council

Agenda Item 13 15/02068/OUT Land N of The Green, Milcombe

- Milcombe PC have sent the following note to all Committee members

We are aware that the decision with respect to the above application will be made at the Planning Committee Meeting on Thursday 17 March and that a site visit will be undertaken on the morning of that date. This is a very important matter for the village and whilst it is recognised that the adopted Local Plan policies on Villages and the attendant categorisation (Cat A) does support development in Milcombe, we believe there are a number of significant weaknesses with this specific application that we would wish to identify to Members for their consideration in advance of their site visit as follows:

1. The site is entirely back land and has no frontage whatsoever to any existing highway. It is clearly quite out of character with the existing settlement pattern and does not feel like a natural extension to that pattern.
2. The development of this site runs counter to the established historical settlement pattern and risks being as much an anomaly as the large housing development to the south of the main road (New Road, Portland Rd and Newcombe Close etc)
3. The proposed site is entirely green field – there are surely other sites within Milcombe and elsewhere that should be considered first out of preference itself even if those sites are not available or being offered for development

today.

4. The applicants only forwarded to the Council an addendum to their landscape assessment just two days prior to the last planning committee meeting that assesses the view from the east. It is questionable if the Council, through no fault of their own, would have had a chance to have full regard to this in advance of that meeting had the decision not been deferred subject to an agreed site visit. The end graphic in that addendum is importantly of the status quo and the already significant visual impact of the existing development is very clear which members will have full regard to during their site visit. The additional proposed landscape screening by the applicants would clearly not mitigate against even the impact of Oak Farm itself, let alone the far greater impact of the proposed new development that will be very significantly closer.
5. Furthermore, the Heritage Assessment submitted by the applicants again had no regard to the view from the East stating that “The visual impact on designated heritage assets is considered to be none” – clearly incorrect with Farnell Fields (Grade II Listed) having a direct line of sight across the development site and has already been visually impacted by the existing Oak Farm development.
6. It is questionable if the width of Oak Farm Drive is really good enough now, let alone for 40 more houses (an increase of ~ 140% using the same access road). The parking also appears substandard to the existing Oak Farm development with evidence that cars are regularly parked on Wiggington Heath Road itself as well as across pavements in the estate. It is also debatable if the access road and pavement (width) actually meets ‘Manual for Streets’ standards resulting in potential highway safety issues?
7. Whether urban myth or otherwise (No.3 certainly did have significant damp problems) the Phase I site had drainage / damp issues and villagers appear to think that phase II could well be worse. Furthermore the proposed surface water effluent into an existing issues has been rejected by the landowners.
8. The Local Plan states that housing will be delivered ‘at villages where local shops, services and job opportunities are available’ - the only facilities within the village are the Horse and Groom public house and a single shop on Main Road. Furthermore, with the lack of a hard footpath to Bloxham (or any other local villages), residents would be forced to use their cars which is environmentally damaging, or to risk cycling on the A361 – a road highlighted in September last year as one of the top ten most persistently dangerous rural A-roads in the country.

Milcombe is a small rural village (only two Category A villages are smaller) and this proposed development site is an extremely valuable and historic ‘space’ affording views out to the countryside landscape and helps to impart a very important spacious rural atmosphere to the village – in a loose knit village such as ours, it is as extremely important to protect and enhance these open spaces as it is the buildings themselves.

Whilst the above points are a small subset of all matters relevant to this application we believe they are particularly pertinent for members to be aware

of during their site visit on Thursday, and kindly request that they are given due consideration.

Agenda Item 14 15/02119/F Swacliffe Park School, Swacliffe

- The total number of lights proposed in the scheme is 73, an additional 3 have been shown on the amended drawing to show three existing lights on the building and 3 lights were missed in the number specified in the report. The lights are proposed as follows:
49 wall mounted lights (Including 3 additional lights shown within the covered canopy) 24 pole mounted lights
- **Amended plan submitted** - Amended plan 15-246-01 Rev E has been submitted and has addressed the comments made by the conservation officer and the case officer and includes the following:
 - Three wall mounted lights shown within the covered canopy to the rear of the main building, which replace existing lighting in this location;
 - One Talos 31W wall mounted light re-sited to the rear of the main listed building to avoid being positioned close to an important window of the listed building;
 - Confirmation that all pole mounted lights are to be 3 metres in height;
 - Light to north of muster points has been moved 2 metres back away from the roadway;
 - The exact location of the lights on the listed building are to be agreed through the further submission of location details sought via condition number 3.
- **Additional comments from Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue**
 - The school will have an obligation to provide emergency lighting under health and safety laws, as well as article 14.2.h of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.
 - I am unable to make a determination of suitability of an emergency lighting provision based upon a plan. As we are not lighting contractors, the FRS can only state that for a scheme to be suitable it must be installed and commissioned in accordance with British Standard BS5266, having been designed in accordance with the guidance within that suite of documents.
 - There is no specific requirement for a muster point. The advice I would offer is that it should be far enough away from the building to prevent persons standing at such from being endangered by an incident in the building e.g. collapse. It is also advisable that it is in a location where the numbers of people present can be safely accommodated where they will not be at risk from the roadways into the site so they cannot come into contact with fire appliances or other emergency vehicles that arrive, nor get in the way of emergency operations.
- **Additional supporting statement from the agent:**

An additional statement has responded to a number of the Case Officer's suggestions as follows:

- Mount the lighting close to the northern boundary on the boundary wall instead of poles – the agent has looked into the possibility of mounting the lights on the boundary wall. However, if the lights were mounted on the wall they would be 2-4 metres away from the roadway and mounted at 2 metres above the ground and therefore the lights would need to have a strong forward throw of light and more lights would need to be used. The use of columns lower than the boundary wall and facing away from the neighbour was considered most appropriate to reduce light spillage towards the neighbour.
- Use of bollard lighting – bollard lighting is at a much lower level and therefore many more lights would be needed across the site to achieve a good level of lighting without shadows.
- **Additional comments from the Principal of Swalcliffe School:**
 - The proposal is essential to ensure safety and welfare of the young people in the schools care;
 - The proposed lighting will be a significant improvement on the existing site lighting;
 - Safeguarding vulnerable young people is taken extremely seriously. The proposed scheme provides lighting across the site which allows the residents in the care of the school to reduce levels of anxiety during the hours of darkness.
 - The proposed lighting will allow staff to move safely across the site to carry out their care duties. The lighting will allow staff to see areas of the site beyond where is triggered by the sensors.
- **Additional third party comments:**

Two further letters of objection have been received raising the following comments:

 - Comments from neighbour who lives on Park Lane to the west of the site. Concerns raised regarding the number of lights being proposed and at the height of some of them. At 2 to 4 metres, I imagine that there will be considerable light pollution. I am unsure as to how bright these lights will be, having not seen any of the demonstrations, but would like the houses in Park Lane to be considered when you are making the final decision. I am not in favour of night lights. We have a dark sky policy in the village and have decided not to install street lighting. One of the advantages for the boys at the school must surely be the country/ village environment, which in my opinion would be detrimentally affected by excessive lighting. I cannot imagine that bright lights on all night will be in the interests of the boys at the school or residents nearby. I would be in favour of installing the minimum number of lights necessary for safety. Presumably the boys will not be running about the grounds late at night or have the need to play outdoor sports during the night. Therefore a small number of down lights focussed on the access to the car park and emergency lights should suffice.
 - Further comments from residents of the Swallows to the north of

the site. Concerns regarding the number of lights proposed as being excessive and would affect the dark environment of Swalcliffe. Concerned about the control of the low level of lighting to ensure they are not on a full output all the time.

- **Recommend amended/additional Conditions:**

- Amend condition 2 to reference amended plan 15-246-01 Rev E
- Additional condition - Prior to the fitting or erection of any of the lights hereby approved, a schedule of the existing lights within the site and existing lights attached to any building within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All existing lights identified on the schedule shall be removed from the site prior to any new light being brought into use.

Reason – To ensure that unauthorised development is removed from the site to protect the visual amenities of the area and the special appearance and setting of the listed building.

Agenda Item 19 16/00246/F Woodgreen Leisure Centre, Banbury

- Banbury Town Council raise no objections