

Application 11/01081/F	No:	Ward: Bloxham and Bodicote	Date Valid: 11 July 2011
Applicant:	Countryside Crenns Ltd		
Site Address:	21 and 22 Portland Road, Milcombe, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 4RL		

Proposal: Demolition of 2 No. dwellings and erection of 5 No. new dwellings, associated access drive and parking

1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 21 and 22 Portland Road form the southern two properties of a terrace of four dwellings (numbers 19-22). The properties are in private ownership and are constructed from concrete with a tile roof and they are currently empty and in a poor state of repair due to vandalism. The site is within a residential area of the village, outside a conservation area and there are no listed buildings within proximity. The site has a large garden area to the south of number 22. The site may have some ecological potential and is on land where there is the possibility for naturally occurring arsenic, chromium and nickel.
- 1.2 This application seeks planning permission to demolish numbers 21 and 22 and to then erect five new dwellings on the site, along with an associated access drive and parking areas. The dwellings would be arranged with a pair of semi detached properties directly to the south of number 20, in a similar position to the existing two properties but set slightly further back into the site and on a staggered relationship. The other three dwellings would form a terrace and would be situated to the south of the new pair of semi detached properties on an east to west orientation. These properties are also arranged in a staggered relationship. The proposed properties would be constructed from brick, with a tile roof and UPVC windows and doors. The dwellings proposed comprise 2 no. two bedroom units and 3 no. three bedroom units.
- 1.3 Planning history
B.156/55 (Permitted) Erection of 26 dwelling houses
- 07/00603/OUT (Refused and dismissed at appeal) Outline application for demolition of existing dwellings. Erection of pair of semi detached dwellings and a terrace of 3 No. Dwellings. New vehicular and pedestrian access with associated car parking facilities
- 1.4 Whilst considering the application, the Case Officer has requested amendments to the scheme to show the ten parking spaces required and to show the footpath linking from the street to the new site access road. Furthermore, the red line is considered to be incorrect at the time of writing the report as it does not include a small area of land between the proposed dwelling and number 20 Portland Road, which is necessary to ensure that the Council can request details of how the end wall of number 20 will be made good. An update will be given at committee in relation to these matters.

- 1.5 The application is being presented to committee for determination at the request of a Local Ward Member.

2. Application Publicity

- 2.1 The application has been advertised by way of two site notices (one posted on a lamp post to the rear of the site on Newcombe Close and one posted on a telegraph pole at the front of the site on Portland Road). The final date for comment was 18 August 2011.
- 2.2 Two comments have been received raising the following points:
- Feel that the proposal would be good for the area and are in favour. Agree that five would be too many, but support the application
 - Whilst existing properties are a danger and eyesore, five houses is too many to build and 3-4 houses would be a more acceptable proposal.
 - Five houses would increase the traffic level of a quiet street and concern raised over safety of children
 - Consideration of local wildlife as the site backs onto a field and wildlife has been seen in the local area
- 2.3 The Case Officer has also spoken to a resident of one of the properties in the terrace, who raised some concern about the stability of the existing properties if numbers 21 and 22 are to be removed. Another neighbour to the south of the site has questioned what will happen to the trees to the rear of the site and questioning whether the developer could carry out some work for them.

3. Consultations

- 3.1 Milcombe Parish Council objects to the proposal.
- They comment that they desperately wish to see this untidy site cleared, however they have reservations about the application as submitted.
 - Milcombe has a proven need for low cost/ affordable housing and is concerned at the loss of two social homes (21 and 22 Portland Road). Portland Road represents the major proportion of the villages lower cost housing stock and this should be preserved
 - Considers five to be too cramped on this site and feels that four would be more acceptable on this very rural site and could be better spaced from numbers 20 and 23.
 - Concern over additional traffic into Portland Road/ traffic calming would need to be instigated. Concern about safety of the access as a number of children live nearby
 - On site parking is inadequate considering most households have more than one vehicle
 - Is the car parking area large enough for large vehicles to turn safely? Reversing out could be hazardous
 - Not all properties have a rear access
 - House number 2 has much less garden area, no parking and fronts the access. It is considered this is too close to the access road
 - Difficult to ascertain how neighbours would be affected. Close to numbers 20 and 23. Site is too overgrown to be able to inspect properly.

- Previous site layout was considered in better taste than the current application
 - Uncertain of the current planning policy for backfill. Milcombe is a category 2 village.
 - Parish Council would welcome some new build on this derelict site, preferably affordable with safe access but is unhappy with the application as submitted
- 3.2 Oxfordshire County Council (Highways) – No objection subject to conditions
- 3.3 Cherwell District Council (Ecology) – Some potential for wildlife due to the proximity of the site to the open countryside and due to the condition of the properties. Requested a protected species scoping survey.
- 3.4 Thames Water – With regard to sewerage and water infrastructure no objections are raised. Comments in relation to Surface Water Drainage have been compiled into a planning note and Thames Water have also recommended a further planning note, which has been included.
- 3.5 Oxfordshire County Council (Drainage Team) – Roof water run off from the proposed dwellings will need to go to a soakaway within the site boundary and not into the highway drainage system. New hard standings should be SUDs compliant as surface water within the site should be dealt with within the site boundary and not enter onto the highway and into the highway drainage system.
- 3.6 Cherwell District Council (Building Control) – No adverse comments to make regarding the Building Regulations

4. Relevant Planning Policies

- 4.1 PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
 PPS3: Housing
 PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
 PPG13: Transport
- Draft National Planning Policy Framework – July 2011
- 4.2 The South East Plan: Policy BE1, H4, H5, H6, BE1, BE5, CC6, T4, NRM5
- 4.3 Adopted Cherwell Local Plan: Policies H14, C2, C4, C28, C30

5. Appraisal

- 5.1 The key issues for consideration are:
- History of the site
 - Principle of the development
 - Visual amenity
 - Neighbour amenity
 - Highway safety
 - Ecology
- 5.2 History of the site
 Firstly, it is important to set out the planning history of the site, due to a scheme for

the same amount of houses having been refused and dismissed at appeal in 2007. The previous scheme involved numbers 21 and 22 being demolished and replaced by a pair of semi detached properties to the south of number 20 but set further into the site than the current properties. To the south of these but much deeper into the site, a terrace of three properties were proposed. The access road extended into the site alongside the boundary with the bungalow at 23 Portland Road. This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its scale, the size of the site and its backland location, would be contrary to Policy G1 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, Policy H14 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Policy H16 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011, which restrict residential development in Milcombe, to conversions, infilling and other small-scale development that would secure significant environmental improvement within the settlement. None of these requirements are satisfied by the proposal, which would adversely affect the spacious character of this part of the settlement, which adjoins open countryside. Furthermore, the development if approved would create an undesirable precedent for further similar development in the locality which would be contrary to the Development Plan and would further erode the character of the locality.
2. The proposal, by virtue of its layout and backland location, without an adequate road frontage, would be out of character with the existing pattern of development in this part of Milcombe, producing a discordant and cramped development, which would have an adverse impact on the amenities of this part of the village, bordering open countryside, contrary to Policy G2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, Policies C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Policies D1, D3 and D6 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.
3. The proposal, by virtue of its layout, access, parking and manoeuvring arrangements, would produce unsatisfactory relationships with existing adjoining dwellings, resulting in overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and general disturbance from vehicular activity close to neighbouring properties and their gardens, which would be contrary to Policy G2 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan, Policy C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Policy D6 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.

5.3 That decision was appealed. An Inspector dismissed the appeal, a copy of the appeal decision notice is provided at appendix A. As can be seen, the Inspector had concerns over the impact the development would have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the impact that the driveway and the associated vehicular activity would have on the amenities of 23 Portland Road.

5.4 Principle of the development

Milcombe is categorised within the adopted Cherwell Local Plan as a category 2 settlement under policy H14 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. This policy restricts new residential development to conversions which accord with policy H21, infilling and other small scale development that can be shown to secure significant environmental improvement within the settlement. This scheme does not relate to a conversion and it is not strictly infill development, but the proposal is small scale development and so it must be demonstrated the proposal can secure significant

environmental improvement.

- 5.5 From a policy perspective PPS1, Delivering Sustainable Development states that “Planning Authorities should plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes. Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people.” (paragraph 34).
- 5.6 PPS3, Housing states that good design is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing, which contributes to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.
- 5.7 Policy BE1 of the South East Plan 2009 sets out the Plan’s approach to promoting and supporting imaginative and efficient design solutions in new development, and aims to increase public acceptance of new housing by making sure that it is of a high quality design that respects local context and confers a sense of place. The policy echoes the guidance of PPS1 and PPS3 in promoting good design.
- 5.8 Policy CC6 of the South East Plan addresses sustainable communities and character of the environment and seeks to ensure that development respects and where appropriate enhances the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes throughout the region. Development should also use innovative design processes to create a high quality built environment which promotes a sense of place. This will include consideration of accessibility, social inclusion, the need for environmentally sensitive development and crime reduction.
- 5.9 This site is currently unused, with the buildings themselves having not been lived in for the last 5 years due to extensive vandalism, they are covered in graffiti and they need to be secured with metal panels over their openings to stop them being entered. The garden is very overgrown and has evidence of debris. There have been a number of police reports related to activities that have occurred and the site is a clear anti-social behaviour problem within this area.
- 5.10 Policy H16 of the non statutory Cherwell Local Plan reflects policy H14 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan but does not specify the consideration of development that secures environmental improvement. The supporting information however states that *there may be occasions where the environment of the village might be significantly improved by small scale residential redevelopment... In considering such schemes, the Council will have regard to Policies EN4 and EN46.* Policy EN4 states that:

Within settlements, small scale re-development of sites whose existing use causes serious detriment to local amenities will be permitted providing the proposal would result in significant environmental benefit.

EN46 is not relevant in this case.

- 5.11 It is noted that under the previous application in 2007 the case officer did not consider that the development would secure significant environmental improvement especially considering the proposal involved the demolition of two houses and the construction of five on a largely undeveloped site, however the condition of the site overall appears to have worsened since 2007 and it is now considered that the re-

development of the site would secure environmental improvement and improve the overall amenities within this area, as such, the proposal would comply with policy H14 in principle.

- 5.12 Members may be aware that guidance in PPS3: Housing encourages making efficient and effective use of land and this is considered to be the case in this application. It must also be noted however that garden land has recently been removed from the definition of previously developed land, which is where development should usually be directed to. It is considered that this change to PPS3 does not necessarily mean that all development on garden land is unacceptable, but that which is inappropriate and which causes harm to the character and form of the existing area, can be more readily resisted.
- 5.13 The comments made by local residents and the Parish Council in respect to five dwellings being proposed are noted and that they consider three or four would be preferred. However, the SDPHE considers that as it has been demonstrated that five units can be accommodated on the site without compromising the form and character and amenity of the locality and amenity of neighbours, this makes more efficient use of land and one more dwelling causes no more significant harm. Furthermore, by replacing the terrace of 3 with a pair of semis this would increase their value contrary to their statement about preserving lower cost housing stock in this part of the village.
- 5.14 The layout of the site has been redesigned to take into account the opinions expressed by the Inspector. The dwellings are now proposed to be arranged closer together, rather than building upon the entire land and placing the housing to the far side of the site and thus respects the existing layout of development much more closely. The terrace of three dwellings is now positioned closer to the other properties and although they are set further back into the site than the bungalows to the west, they are not considered to constitute backland development, from the streetscene perspective; they read as a continuation of this established building line. The re-positioning of the properties also means that the access road no longer extends the length of the garden which was found to cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties by the introduction of vehicular activity in this otherwise quiet garden area and results in a more contained parking and turning area to the front of the site. The proposed arrangement of the dwellings ensures that the rear section of the site remains as spacious garden land and is similar to other patterns of development elsewhere in the district. The proposed development is respectful of the established, spacious character of the housing estate and therefore helps to overcome the concerns the Inspector held in terms of the character and form of this area.
- 5.15 Given this assessment, the proposed development for five houses is considered to make efficient and effective use of the land and due to the positioning of the houses is considered to sit comfortably on the site, providing acceptable standards of amenity for neighbours and future occupiers and will not cause an unacceptable impact on the character and form of the existing residential area. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with PPS3 and is considered to be acceptable in principle.

5.16 Visual amenity

As has been set out above, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character and form of this area in terms of its layout. The dwellings are designed to be similar to each other but would appear different to the existing dwellings, being constructed from brick rather than the concrete as others are. This area is not sensitive to change and as such, this change in the design of the dwellings is considered acceptable and will be sympathetic particularly as they will be similar to the scale and character of the existing development in this area. Conditions have been recommended to ensure that the materials to be used are appropriate and so this should ensure that the proposal sits comfortably in the street scene and causes limited harm. There is a fair amount of hard standing to the front of the site, which is unfortunate however this provides the parking areas and given the overall improvement to this area that will occur, it is considered that the proposal causes limited harm to visual amenity. As such, the proposal complies with policy C28 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

5.17 Neighbour amenity

In terms of the impact of the development upon the residential amenity of nearby neighbouring properties, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The positioning of the dwellings and the positioning of the fenestration on each dwelling (which is contained to the front and rear elevations only), means that any impact by loss of light, loss of privacy or over dominance will be limited both to the existing properties nearby and to each of the new properties and this is considered to be acceptable.

5.18 As can be seen from the appeal decision at appendix A, the Inspector was concerned about the impact to residential amenity by the long driveway alongside the boundary with number 23 Portland Road. The current arrangement means that the driveway would curve around, but would not extend any further south than the rear of number 23 (except for the parking for the dwelling on plot 3), which would not have the same impact as the previously proposed driveway. As such, it is the view of the SDPHE that the impact upon the amenity of number 23 by noise and disturbance has now been improved significantly and is now considered to be acceptable.

Given the above assessment, it is considered that the proposal offers good standards of amenity and is acceptable and complies with policy C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

5.19 Highway safety

The Local Highway Authority raises no objections to the scheme subject to the inclusion of conditions. One of which is to secure 10 parking spaces on the site and another is to extend the footpath from the road into the site. These amendments have been requested but have not been received at the time of writing the report. As such, the suggested conditions have been imposed. The concerns of the Parish Council in terms of highway safety are noted and appreciated, however, given the comments of the Highway Authority, which would secure enough parking on the site for the development itself and the fact that the site is at the end of the road, which is where slower speeds would be used, the highway safety implications which may arise are not considered to be so significant that the proposal is unacceptable on these grounds.

5.20 Ecology

PPS9 places a duty upon Local Planning Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey be undertaken prior to determination of a planning application. The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal. PPS9 states that “It is essential that the presence or otherwise of a protected species, and the extent to that they may be affected by the proposed development is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.”

5.21 Local Planning Authorities must also have regards to the requirements of the EC Habitats Directive when determining a planning application, as prescribed by Regulation 3(4) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 (as amended). Under art.12(1) of the EC Habitats Directive, Member States requires that a system of strict protection of animal species be established to prohibit the deterioration or destruction of their breeding sites or resting places. The result is that there is in practice two linked systems of regulation. First under reg. 39(1)(d) it is a criminal offence to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place but under reg.44 this does not apply if a licence has been granted for such operations and Natural England being that licensing authority. Secondly where planning permission is required reg.3(4) provides that local planning authorities must have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions and also the derogation requirements might be met.

5.22 The Council's Ecologist was consulted on the application and commented that there is potential for bats to be using these properties which are to be demolished as they face onto open countryside and are in poor repair and have been empty for a number of years. As such, she has requested a scoping survey to determine whether any bats are present. She considers that the proposed replacement hedge and tree planting would be beneficial particularly along the Eastern boundary if native species are used. Trees and shrubs should not be removed during the bird breeding season to ensure nesting birds are not disturbed. She has also identified that there is some potential for the garden area to harbour other protected wildlife such as badgers or reptiles, which should be addressed within any ecological report and a method statement to avoid harm to reptiles in particular and other wildlife during any clearance work including removal of any debris or rubble on site should be prepared and in place before any works commence on site.

5.23 As such, in accordance with PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, an ecological survey has been requested, which has now been received and the Council's Ecologist consulted. The bat survey has found that the buildings and nearby trees have a negligible potential to be a bat roost and no further surveys are recommended. Enhancement measures are recommended. The badger and reptile survey found no badger evidence, however found that the land is suitable for reptile use. Although it recommends no further survey work, a reptile mitigation method statement is required and this has been submitted. The comments from the Ecologist are awaited and any mitigation measures necessary will be conditioned accordingly.

5.24 Consequently it is considered that art.12(1) of the EC Habitats Directive has been duly considered in that the welfare of any protected species found to be present at

the site and surrounding land will continue and be safeguarded notwithstanding the proposed development. The proposal therefore accords with PPS9 and Policy C2 and C4 where relevant of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

5.25 Trees

The site is very overgrown and so some trees and vegetation will need to be removed. None of the existing trees that will have to be removed are particularly worthy of retention and the trees to the rear of the site, which have some greater value are not to be affected by the development and which are important in helping to screen and soften the development.

5.26 Other matters

No comments have been received from the Environmental Protection Officer, however given that the land may have some contamination issues due to it being on naturally occurring arsenic, chromium and nickel, a planning note has been recommended to ensure the applicant is aware of what to do should any contamination arise. The comments of the third parties are noted and have been addressed within the appraisal. The concern over the stability of the other houses in the terrace is noted; however it has not been considered necessary to request further details in relation to this as it is not a planning matter but would be controlled under the building regulations. A condition has been imposed to ensure that details of the making good of the wall of number 20 Portland Road are submitted to ensure that this wall will be made good to an acceptable standard. The other request in terms of the developer carrying out work for a nearby neighbour is not something that the Council can insist on.

5.27 The comments of Milcombe Parish Council are noted and have mainly been addressed within the report. It is noted that some of the houses in Portland Road are Charter Housing or housing association properties, however nos 21 and 22 are owned by the applicant and are not social houses and the proposed housing would also be market housing. The threshold for providing affordable housing on this site would be six properties and as such there is no requirement that any affordable housing be provided on this site (note that the application was received before the Council introduced using the new Planning Obligations SPD on the 15 August 2011). The concerns in terms of the level of parking provided have been addressed by the imposition of a condition to ensure that ten parking spaces are provided on site. Furthermore, the Local Highway Authority has assessed the proposal and has raised no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of conditions and it is considered therefore that the highway safety implications are acceptable.

5.28 Conclusion

Clearly the site is in serious need of tidying up to prevent anti-social behaviour from continuing. Since the previous application, the site has deteriorated and the applicant has not known exactly what to do with it and through further negotiation with the Council, the proposed scheme has been formulated. Therefore it is considered that taking into account the appearance of the site and the activities that have occurred there (the current site causes a serious detriment to local amenities both visually and to the character and general amenities of this area of the village) the proposal would secure significant environmental improvement and would be an acceptable form of development in the village. The design, appearance and layout of the development would be respectful of its context without compromising residential amenities of neighbouring properties and highway safety and parking

provision is considered to be acceptable. Furthermore the proposal would result in the provision of an additional 3 no. small scale quality market houses and provision of 2 no. replacement dwellings in a village where relatively low cost market housing to rent or buy is scarce. As such, the proposal is considered to cause limited harm and will comply with the above mentioned policies.

6. Recommendation

Approval; subject to:

- The comments of the Council's Ecologist,
- The following conditions:

1. 1.4A (RC2) [Full permission: Duration limit (3 years)]
2. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents: application forms, design and access statement, information received with agent's email of the 17 August 2011 and drawing numbers 1167CCCD100, 1167CCCD102, 1167CCCD103, 1167CCCD201, 1167CCCD211 rev B, 167CCCD212 rev A, **1167CCAB113 rev A, 1167CCCD113 rev A1167CCCD112 rev A**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and to comply with PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

3. 2.0A (RC4A) [Details of materials and external finishes] insert 'dwellings' after 'finishes' insert 'including samples' at end add 'The development shall be carried out in accordance with the schedule and samples so approved.'
4. 4.0AB (RC13BB) [Access, specification, proposed (as plan)] insert 'construction' 'dwellings'
5. 4.12AA (RC14AA) [...Surface, laid out etc] insert 'access road'
6. 4.14AB (RC15AA) [Plan of car parking provision (specified number of spaces)] insert 'ten' after 'the site' insert 'including specification details'
7. That a plan demonstrating the shared pedestrian access to be extended to join to the access road to the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (RC13BB)
8. 2.10A (RC7A) [Floor levels] insert 'dwellings'
9. 2.13AA (RC8A) [Demolition of buildings – before commencement of the development]
10. 3.7AA (RC12AA) [Submit boundary enclosure details (more than one dwelling)]
11. 3.0A (RC10A) [Submit landscaping scheme]
12. 3.1A (RC10A) [Carry out landscaping scheme and replacements]
13. 3.3AA (RC72A) [Scheme to be submitted to protect retained trees]
14. That the full details of the treatment of the gable of the retained dwelling at 20 Portland Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (RC4A)
15. **Ecology condition as required by the Council's Ecologist**
16. 6.2AA (RC32A) [Residential – No extensions]
17. 6.3A (RC33) [Residential – No new windows]

Planning notes

1. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
2. The applicant is advised that in respect of Surface Water, Thames Water have recommended that it should be ensured that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. Where it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.
3. The County Council's Drainage Team have advised that any roof water run-off from the proposed dwellings will need to go to soakaway within the site boundary and not into the highway drainage system. Furthermore, new hardstandings should be Suds compliant, ie Permeable or positively drain into a soak-away within the site boundary. Surface water from the site should be dealt with within the site boundary and not enter onto the highway and into the highway drainage system.
4. ZZ – Unsuspected contamination
5. X1 – Biodiversity/ Protected species
6. S1 – Post permission changes
7. T1 –Third party interests
8. U1 – Construction sites

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION AND RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

The Council, as local planning authority, has determined this application in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The development is considered to be acceptable on its planning merits as the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle and pays proper regard to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal also has no undue adverse impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring properties or highway safety. Furthermore, the proposal will cause no harm to protected species. As such the proposal is in accordance with PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development, PPS3: Housing, PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, PPG13: Transport, Policies BE1 H4, H5, H6, BE1, BE5, CC6, T4, NRM5 of The South East Plan and Policies H14, C2, C4 C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. For the reasons given above and having proper regard to all other matters raised the Council considered that the application should be approved and planning permission granted.

CONTACT OFFICER: Caroline Ford**TELEPHONE NO: 01295 221823**