

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

14 December 2017

Page	Title
Pages 1 – 4	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

14 December 2017

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 9 16/02190/F Oxford Airport, Kidlington

- Further information provided by applicants agents to OCC on 13.12.17 with regards to car park layout, access layout amendments, drainage strategy and layout arrangements, and additional comments as an addendum to the transport assessment.
- Comments from the Business Director of the Airport giving background to aircraft movements and the business of the airport etc.

Pilot training activity at Oxford has seen a massive decline since pre 9/11 days and before that, the late 1990s where it was at it's peak (158,000 movements a year versus our 44,000 movements a year today). Economic, political and global market changes have contributed to the decline, but also changes in training practices whereby greater use is made today of both flight simulators and fair weather bases overseas in better climates for year round productivity. In order to try and stop the decline, we have explored many avenues, but have found few solutions to revive anywhere near the flying activity levels we once saw from which we derive income in terms of fuel sales and landing fees. However, a new opportunity has arisen to host a new training academy which aspires to be one of the finest on a global basis in terms of the teaching standards, use of technology and the standard of the amenities, capitalising on the 'Oxford' brand which is synonymous with the finest training in the world. For the first time in a decade, we have this opportunity to host a world-leading, new school, run by well-respected and globally-recognised professionals with a multi-million pound investment being made into the new campus. This in turn will maintain Oxford Airport's position in providing the world's best commercial pilot training. However, the maximum 120 students a year that might eventually be trained in this new campus will collectively only add some 3,000 extra aircraft movements a year at most, with students only doing 20 hours flying training at Oxford and the rest overseas (or in simulators).

The airport as a whole is the only commercially capable airport between Heathrow and Birmingham (an 'IFR' airport) which supports some twenty five businesses that collectively employ over 1,000 staff in highly skilled and knowledge-based professions. Those businesses collectively generate several hundred million in sales. The airport is the primary aviation hub between London and Birmingham. It provides a port to many local businesses, in particular the multi-billion pound motorsports sector and the rest of the motor-manufacturing industry including the likes of BMW Mini. Essential services such as air ambulance and organ transplant flights are hosted daily. Historically the airport has been Europe's foremost provider of professional pilot training services. World-leading companies such as Airbus Helicopter UK, CAE and Gama Aviation have headquarters or key UK operations at Oxford Airport employing hundreds of people and using a multitude of local services and

suppliers. The airport itself and tenanted companies generate well over a million pounds in business rates revenues for the local authority.

- No formal comments in reply yet received from OCC, but indication that the information is still deficient
- In the light of the lack of formal comments from OCC and issues concerning the submitted plans it is **RECOMMENDED that the application be DEFERRED**

Agenda Item 10 17/02192/F 5 The Colony, Sibford Gower

- Additional comments from Parish Council
Further to Paragraph 6.2 of the Committee Report, comments have since been received from Sibford Gower Parish Council in support of the application. The Parish Council considers that the proposal would be of a sympathetic design and would not be at odds with the existing development along the Colony. Full comments are available to view on the public access site.
- Additional comments from the Applicant's Agent
Members are advised that, following the publication of the Agenda, the Applicant's Agent has provided comments in respect on the Committee Report. The full version of these comments is available to view on the public access website (along with the attachments submitted alongside this document).

Re Paragraph 8.10 of the Committee report, the Agent suggests that national planning policy does not confine the re-use of rural buildings to '*traditional farm buildings*' and therefore, Policy H19 is '*out of date*'.

Officer comment: However, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) was adopted after the NPPF was released and therefore would have been reviewed in light of the NPPF. The Inspector, in considering the Local Plan, chose to retain Policy H19 and it therefore forms part of the adopted development plan. Additionally, Policy H19 does encourage the re-use of agricultural buildings (in accordance with the NPPF), but provides some additional guidance on the type of buildings considered appropriate for 'conversion'.

Re Paragraph 8.11 of the Committee report the Agent has provided photographs of the building '*which shows no sign of structural distress or serious dilapidation*'. The Agent contends that it would be '*reasonable to conclude that the building is structurally sound to allow for conversion*'.

Officer comment: No evidence has been submitted in the application to support this assertion. Given that the asbestos sheet roof would be replaced with a slate roof, it has yet to be demonstrated that the building is capable of supporting this additional weight. Therefore the opinion of the Agent should not be afforded any weight in this respect.

Re Paragraphs 8.25 and 8.26 of the Committee report the Agent considers that Members are "*entitled to conclude that 'other material considerations', namely enhancements to the Conservation Area – pursuant to the statutory duty (Section 72(1)) – outweigh this limited degree of tension with development plan policy*". The Agent further advises that the current power supply to Long Acre runs directly overhead of the piggery and requires the substation and powerlines

to be relocated as part of the development proposal and power supply agreement. As such the Agent suggests that three conditions be imposed on any planning permission.

Officer comment: The plan submitted to support this shows the location of the existing and proposed cabling – which does not go over the existing piggery. A condition in this respect could only be considered appropriate if it is deemed to make the proposal acceptable. The repositioning of the cabling is not considered to make the proposal acceptable and sits independently from it. Furthermore, the proposed plan shows a very limited section of the cabling being subverted underground, which would have a very limited visual benefit (given that it is predominantly to the rear of the properties).

In addition to the above, one of the Agent's suggested conditions relates to Western Power Distribution taking third party costs in respect of the cabling. Members are advised that this would not be reasonable and requiring a third party to take on costs would be wholly unjustifiable.

Re Paragraph 8.27 of the Committee Report, the agent advises that the hedge has been sited to the rear of the highway boundary, revealing adequate visibility in either direction to serve a single dwelling, and thus suggests that no hedgerow removal is required.

Officer comment: We disagree with this suggestion and remain of the view that hedgerow would be required to be removed to allow for adequate visibility.

Re Paragraph 8.28, the Agent considers that backland development relates to one dwelling to the rear of another, which is served by the same access (which is not the case for the application site). The Agent refers to an application at the neighbouring property which received planning permission for extensions to the existing property under application reference 00/01135/F.

Officer comment: That proposal was for an *extension* to an existing property and not a *new* detached dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that this would have little relevance to the current proposal.

Re Paragraph 8.15 of the Committee report the Agents that the proposal would not set a precedent and would not alter the planning context in which any other application for the re-use of an existing building might be sought.

Officer comment: There are a number of outbuildings and small agricultural buildings to the rear of these properties and should Members accept the conversion of this building (irrespective of Policy H19), then further conversions in this area would be difficult to resist.

- **Amended recommendation**

Officers maintain the position as outlined in the report. However, in light of the Agent's comments, it is recommended that the reason for refusal is amended as follows:

- 1) The proposal would amount to an inappropriate form of development by resulting in the consolidation of the existing isolated and sporadic development in the open countryside beyond the built up limits of the village of Sibford Gower. This would set an undesirable precedent for

similar proposals to the rear of 'The Colony' which would be equally vulnerable to this form of development and would be increasingly more difficult to resist. The proposal would also result in development which is at odds with the prevailing pattern of development, which is harmful to the open and rural nature of the site and its surroundings and fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal would also result in development in a location where future occupiers would not have a realistic choice of means of travel and who would be entirely dependent on the private car. This would result in an environmentally unsustainable form of development. The proposal would be thus contrary to Saved Policies C8, C28, H18 and H19 of the CLP 1996; Policies ESD1, ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.