

Ambrosden Court, Merton Road, Ambrosden, Nr Bicester

13/00621/OUT

Ward: Ambrosden & Chesterton

District Councillor: Cllr A Fulljames

Case Officer: Rebecca Horley

Recommendation: Refusal

Applicant: The Trustees of Norman Collisson Foundation c/o Agent

Application Description: Demolition of Ambrosden Court and erection of 45 No. residential units with access off Merton Road

Committee Referral: Major

1. Site Description, Background and Proposed Development

- 1.1 This is an outline application for the demolition of Ambrosden Court and erection of 45 residential units together with the construction of new vehicular access off Merton Road and estate roads and the formation of an open space/amenity area on land adjoining and to the rear of Ambrosden Court, Merton Road, Ambrosden. Only the principle of developing the site for up to 45 units and the means of access/amenity area, parking and open space are to be determined as part of the application with all other matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for subsequent determination.
- 1.2 The site comprises a large property known as Ambrosden Court and its associated gardens on the south western edge of the village of Ambrosden. The site is on the south side of Merton Road which forms its north western boundary except for a single detached dwelling (Roman Way) which sits in the middle. The land beyond to the south is open countryside mainly used as grazing/pasture. To the north east of the site are detached dwellings accessed off Merton Road and to north west (opposite the site on the other side of Merton Road) are detached properties fronting Merton Road, one of which is a listed building (Holly Tree Cottage) and a small housing scheme (Home Farm Close) comprising terraced properties.
- 1.3 .Although the application is in outline an indicative site plan has been submitted along with a Planning Statement, a Design and Access Statement, Landscape Strategy, Statement of Community Involvement, Layout Plans & Detailed Elevations, Flood Risk Assessment, Arboricultural Report, Transport Statement, Ecological site audit and a Contamination Report.
- 1.4 It can be noted that as well as the site's proximity to a grade II listed building, it is constrained by being of archaeological interest and potentially contaminated. The site is also in flood zones 2 and 3 (at most risk).

2. Application Publicity

2.1 The application has been advertised by way of neighbour letter, site notice and press notice. The final date for comment was 20th June 2013. At the time of writing 38 letters/emails have been received raising objections on the following grounds:

- Demolition of Ambrosden Court will remove a part of Ambrosden's heritage
- Loss of important wall
- Ambrosden Court should be converted to flats
- Insufficient facilities and resources in Ambrosden to cater for additional residents
- Merton Road is used as a rat run and people regularly break the speed limit
- Gas, water, drainage and electricity services are already overstretched.
- Views will be adversely affected
- Harm to rural character
- Loss of agricultural land
- Sewage and road surface drainage are inadequate in this area and blockages occur particularly in times of heavy rain leading to smells
- Merton Road is not wide enough
- The public footpath is less than 1m in width which is already dangerous and there's no footpath at all on the south side of the road
- Parked cars make driving on Merton Road hazardous
- Effect on Yew Tree Cottage – a listed building
- Loss of important trees
- The tree report is out of date
- Loss of wildlife
- Loss of European Protected Species – Great crested newts
- The site is part of the Otmoor Flood Plain associated with the Nature Reserve
- The Springfield Farm site is more appropriate
- A modern housing estate in this location would look odd in the historic context of the rest of Ambrosden
- The site floods
- Ambrosden has had enough development
- Insufficient school places and being so far from the school people would not be able to walk and would have to drive which is not sustainable
- A modern pedestrian crossing would look odd close to a listed building
- There are no play areas on the drawings or other community facilities
- This is the wrong place for a housing development
- The development of this site is contrary to policy as its outside the village envelope and not infill
- There is no longer a need for more housing in Cherwell District Council
- The access vision splays are inadequate
- There's been a history of refusals at this site
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of sunlight and daylight
- Increased noise pollution
- Increased level of light pollution
- Loss of attractive agricultural landscape which is part of the Ray Valley

- If approved the transition from countryside to urban landscape will be sudden and brutal

3. Consultations

3.1 Consultation responses are summarised below. The full versions can be found on the Council's website.

3.2 **Ambrosden Parish Council:** Object.

- The site represents over development and plots 37-45 are at the most risk from flooding when all the developments discharge surface water into the River Ray
- The attenuation pond seems to be in a ridiculous position in the middle of the development and it would be dangerous to children as there appears to be no green space or play area
- There's no information about foul drainage
- Concern about the site entrance being re-aligned to a spot where the road narrows considerably. Vision splays are poor
- The pavements on both sides of the road are too narrow for a pushchair and when children walk to school there is conflict with traffic
- There are no safe places to cross and a pedestrian crossing would be difficult to site
- Development of this site would spoil the look of the village when approaching from Merton
- There are great crested newts present
- The road is not wide enough for even 2 hgvs to pass outside East Cottage
- We don't need anymore community/sports facilities
- Sewerage issues and problems
- The proposed houses look too urban – Ambrosden is a village
- This represents backland development
- There's no visitor parking

Cherwell District Council Consultees

3.3 **Planning Policy Officer:** Comments awaited but in the meantime the following update has been provided: The assumptions are available from the 2012 AMR, the May 2013 update and the details for the new sites outlined by the case officers at the June 2013 committee. With regard to the latter, the new supply within the 5 year period 2013-18 comprises the 350 at North of Hanwell Fields, the 90 homes West of Southam Road, 355 of the 510 for East of Southam Road and the 44 for Banbury School. A total of 839 for 2013-18.

The shortfall with a 5% additional requirement was 438 (2013-18) and with 20%, was 1001. The additional supply from the June Committee approvals produces figures of 401 in surplus for five years plus 5% and 162 in deficit for five years plus 20%.

3.4 **Urban Design Officer:** The urban design review has been based on the information set out in the Design and Access Statement and associated plans. This statement should set out the framework for how the uses described above will be organised across the scheme. The Design and Access Statement is a

very short statement of intent. For a scheme of this scale and nature it would be expected that the Design and Access statement uses plans, sections and three dimensional materials to set out the site constraints, design principles and proposals.

Site Setting

The development site is located to the southwest of Ambrosden, separated from the main village by the railway line. Development along Merton Road largely forms a ribbon development, with development fronting onto the street. Development in this area forms a mix of cottages, 19th century development and 20th century infill development. The area is currently in domestic use, including a 19th century residence, with tennis courts, a swimming pool, outbuildings and a paddock. No information has been provided that set within the design and Access Statement that sets out the nature and form of the site, which would normally considered a key part of the design process.

- There is no explanation of the landscape value of the site and the lie of the land.
- There is no information set out on the location of mature trees across the site.
- The existing character of the village and adjacent development is not discussed, not is the character of Merton Road.
- Views from the site and into the site are not considered.

Heritage Setting

Ambrosden has a long history. The village and Church date back to the Norman period and the place name is thought to be of Roman origin. There are a number of heritage assets on or adjacent to the site which should have be considered in the development of the proposals.

- Much of the site boundary is defined by a stone boundary wall which is approximately two meters in height.
- Holly Tree Cottage, a Grade 2 listed building is located to the north of the development area.
- Much of the site is identified as an Archaeological Constraints Area, and therefore requires appropriate consideration.

Masterplan Layout

It would normally be expected that a project of this scale would be supported by a series of diagrams and supporting text which explain how different design principles are being applied to the site. These have not been provided, which combined with the lack of understanding of the site and its setting has led to a weak proposal which will not deliver a high quality of development.

- Density will be an average of 28 uha and the units appear to be very evenly distributed across the site.
- A single access point provides access to the site from Merton Road. This breaks a large hole in the existing boundary wall. There are no other points of vehicular connection, resulting in a cu-de-sac development.
- The proposed relationship with Merton Road is poor. While the Design and Access Statement sets out in its list of key features 'the creation of active frontage onto Merton Road' at the top of the list, this is not translated in plan form. To the northeast of the development site, dwellings are fronted onto the new cul-de-sac, with gable ends onto Merton Road.
- To the northwest of the site gardens back onto Merton Road. The new western face of the village is also defined by back gardens and screen planting.

As this is the new gateway onto Ambrosden, this response is not appropriate – it is a critical corner which requires careful consideration.

- Internally, the site layout is over complicated, with the main route dividing into a number of short cul-de-sacs. There are a number of difficult relationships between buildings which could be improved through rationalisation of the layout.
- Buildings appear to be pepper potted loosely around the roads, with little thought for the quality of townscape that this will create. While an elevation has been provided for each house type, there are no elevations of key facades, indicating how this development will read across the length of a street.
- The road structure is based around straight linear routes and they have no variation in width along their length nor are they punctuated by public places

House Types

The proposed house types are limited in scale, materials and detail and likely to produce a monotonous development character.

- Four housing typologies are proposed, a four bedroom, three bedroom and two two bedroom. These are either arranged as detached, semi detached or terraces. Joined dwellings are always of the same type.
- While very limited detail has been provided, it appears that all but the bungalow have internal garage or drive through area for parking. This will have a negative impact on the elevations, undermining the development quality.
- There is very little variation in the proposed architectural details or materials, promoting a monotonous environment that does not replicate the richness of the existing settlement.

Landscape and Public Realm

The Design and Access Statement sets out 'incorporation of both open spaces and public open space throughout the site' as a key feature. On review of the plans there are no public open spaces or play areas indicated.

- The development to the southwest of the site appears to be structured around an attenuation lagoon. It is not clear whether this will be a highly engineered structure or an element which can form part of the open space structure. The design of this feature will be important if it is to be a positive part of the public space structure.
- No play areas are indicated within the site layout.
- The design of the streets provides the opportunity to create a strong public realm. The proposals as shown present an engineered approach.
- It is not clear how the retention of existing trees have been considered into the scheme.
- While some planting has been proposed, this does not appear to have been fully considered, with a variety of types and sizes distributed along the (verges?) of the streets.
- The removal of a substantial part of the existing boundary wall will have a negative impact on the character of the street.

Conclusions

- The proposals form a substantial backland development on the periphery of the village. Development will extend the settlement to the west and close the views over open countryside that would greet you as you enter the village.

- The layout is poorly considered and will not support a high quality development proposal.
- There is little variation in the house types and details, with four typologies that are repetitively repeated across the site.
- The development does not reinforce the traditional settlement patterns in the village. This is of particular issue against Merton Road where development would normally front outwards onto this route.

3.5 **Housing Officer:** This outline application for 45 units has a requirement to provide 35% affordable housing provision, which equates to 16 units. The affordable housing should be provided on a 70/30 tenure basis, 70% for rent and 30% shared ownership or some other form of low cost home ownership to be agreed with this officer. The units should be dispersed into 2 clusters enabling integration and tenure blindness within the scheme. The affordable units should meet HCA Design and Quality Standards and relevant HQL's. The rented should also meet Lifetime Homes Standards. Below is a proposed mix for the affordable housing:

<u>Rent</u>	<u>Shared Ownership</u>
6x2b4p Houses	4x2b4p Houses
3x3b5p Houses	1x3b5p Houses
1x4b6p Houses	
1x2b3p Bungalow	

The affordable units should be transferred to one of CDC's preferred development RP partners.

3.6 **Landscape Officer:** The site is on the SW periphery of Ambrosden. It is partially within the existing built form having housing facing it up to Roman Way. However, the other half of the development is surrounded on 3 sides by open countryside.

There are no public footpaths in the immediate vicinity. The immediate surrounding land is flat with small undulations. However the site will be very visible from Merton Road as you travel towards Ambrosden. There is no screening vegetation on the site boundary and an inadequate amount proposed. The built form proposed does not form a coherent edge.

The site will be visible from Graven Hill but since there isn't public access here this isn't significant. It will also be visible from Arcott Hill but again there is no public access.

I am uncertain if the hedge on the southern boundary is to be retained as it is not shown at a realistic width if it is. The proposed garages to plots 34-37 are too close to the hedge particularly as it has some willow in it.

D & A statement

There does not appear to be any site analysis which will inform the constraints and opportunities of the site. The character of the surrounding village and landscape is not explored

There is no explanation of how the layout was arrived at and how it is justified in view of the analysis.

There is no visual indication of the character of the existing village and how this will inform the proposal

There is nothing on the landscape character and quality of the scheme.

The SW boundary is a mixture of back gardens and gable ends. This is not attractive. Even with adequate screen planting it will form an untidy edge with garden paraphernalia being visible on the approach from Merton

The proposal has none of the proposed dwellings fronting onto Merton Road when the majority of existing dwellings do. This is not providing an active frontage to Merton Road and not in character with the area

There is no LAP provided on site. This should be provided in a central position with easy access for all residents. There also needs to be general recreation space of 2.3ha/ 1000 residents.

The attenuation lagoon is unlikely to be able to provide recreation space as it will periodically fill with water and locating it in the centre of the development may not be the best solution as they can look rather bare of vegetation. I suggest that this is located on the periphery of the development or fully incorporated into the open space as useful green space but not useable space.

Account has not been taken of existing trees. Too many category A and B trees are to be removed under this proposal destroying the character of the walled garden. The existing wall along Merton road will have to be removed to allow a site access altering the character of the road.

There is no landscaping strategy. The trees shown dotted everywhere are largely not feasible. Trees grow tall and wide and need correspondingly large spaces to grow in. There has been no attempt to create places with the built form and landscape forming those spaces. The trees are shown as too small, too close to dwellings, planted too close to edgings.

Section 106 contributions

Required for informal open space, water course maintenance for the attenuation of the lagoon, onsite LAP and hedge maintenance with screen planting on the south west boundary.

- 3.7 **Arboriculturalist:** Object and recommend refusal due to the proposed unnecessary removal of trees worthy of retention and capable of providing a level of amenity value for at least 10 – 20 years.

An arboricultural report undertaken in July 2009 accompanies the application and covers the trees within the boundary of Ambrosden Court only. Although the Design & Access statement states that it has taken account of the existing trees to assist in generating “...a *gentle aesthetic setting within an attractive landscaped setting*”, the proposed development seeks to remove a significant percentage of these trees in order to facilitate the proposals. A number of these trees highlighted for removal are designated within the arboricultural report as category ‘B’ and along with a significant number of arguably useful category ‘C’ trees. Particular concern is given towards the proposed removal of:

T4 – weeping ash (cat ‘C’)

T9 – lime (cat ‘A’)

T10 – birch (cat 'B')
T23 – cedar (cat 'c')
T24 – dawn redwood
Un-surveyed close clipped yew hedge

An appraisal of the overall housing density proposed for the site would seem to indicate that by amending the site layout and the access road (too close to T23 & T24) or the individual aspects of various dwellings it may be possible to achieve the retention of these trees plus the few trees already identified for retention.

The proposed landscaping scheme for the current proposal appears to provide a good level of tree coverage particularly on the south-west portion of the site.

3.8 Ecology Officer: No objections subject to conditions.

The update is a little better as it includes a daytime assessment for bats on the buildings (I am still disappointed by the lack of methodology given throughout) however importantly it recommends additional bat surveys. There is no potential mitigation suggested for bats and therefore as we do not have the full information or any proposals of working methods or mitigation to deal with the various scenarios that could arise from the additional surveys required it is hard to assess if there are actually any issues to address or not with regard to bats. Given the evidence shown to date it is likely that bat roosts present can be accommodated elsewhere on site with careful mitigation and phased working methodology however and therefore this could be dealt with by condition although I'd rather have the information up front.

An entomological survey is also recommended and this is an involved piece of work and there is nothing on how the applicant will cater to the results of this survey. Should an important assemblage of invertebrates be found this may be difficult to accommodate within their plans as we are unaware of which features may need to be retained or replaced. Again I think it would be easier information had been obtained before submission.

There is still no indication of whether they have assessed the land particularly the field with rough grassland for its suitability as Great Crested Newt habitat. Even if the pond on site is totally unsuitable the land is surrounded by other small ponds and this should be taken into account. There is little information on how they have concluded that reptiles are only present at an individual level only either.

Whilst there are no badgers setts found on site it appears that badgers forage within the paddock area therefore they should be taken into account within any designs for fencing and corridors of vegetation should be maintained for them along boundaries.

Whilst I do not think it is likely that there are insurmountable ecological issues on site I do not feel the site has been properly assessed as yet.

3.9 Recycling and Waste Manager: The developer needs to take into account the Waste and Recycling guidance where it is indicated that Section 106 contribution of £67.50 per property will be required.

3.10 **Safer Communities Urban & Rural (Community Development) and Recreation & Health Improvement:** No contributions sought for community development on schemes under 50 units

3.11 **Recreation & Health Improvement Manager (Public Art):** Comments awaited

3.12 **Environmental Protection Officer (Contaminated Land):** Comments awaited

Oxfordshire County Council Consultees

3.13 Oxfordshire County Council has provided a comprehensive response relating to all aspects under their jurisdiction. It has been generally noted that there is some confusion regarding the status of the outline application and matters for consideration at this stage. The application form includes layout as a matter for determination but the submitted planning statement suggests layout is to be a reserved matter. Also it would appear that the application is seeking approval of the proposed estate roads and parking but the submitted details are very limited and greater detail will be required to provide any worthwhile appraisal of a planning application. Overall, there appears to be a lack of information to enable the County Council to assess the impact of the application as well as some inconsistencies between the developer's data and the records of the County Council.

The main conclusion is that the County Council has '*significant concerns about the proposed access to the site and that this would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users*'. Summarised comments in relation to each County matter are provided below.

3.14 **Transport Planner:**

Holding objection pending the receipt of further information from the applicant

Key issues

- The development could further exacerbate peak period rat-run traffic on the less suitable rural road towards Oxford, i.e. Middleton Road and Middle Street. This can be deduced by the findings of the traffic distribution under section 4.4 of the transport statement, where the westbound and eastbound traffic movements are heavily tidal according to the morning and late afternoon peak periods.
- I question the relatively low number of additional two-way vehicular trips that the development is expected to generate in the morning and evening peak periods, especially given its location in a rural settlement. I do, however, concur with the conclusion that the traffic generation and impacts on the development on the local highway network are not severe. Nevertheless, the development is likely to add to the existing rat-run issue on the wider road network.

Informatives

- The proposed development is within a fair distance (700m) of the centre of Ambrosden and the local amenities. It is therefore reasonably accessible by foot and bike to its nearest local centre and amenities. Bicester town centre, however, is less accessible; situated 3 miles or over 4km away.
- The council welcomes the proposals to create a formal crossing across Merton Road to facilitate safe pedestrian access to the northern footway from

the development site, as set out in the Transport Statement. This would not only improve access to the village centre and to the more frequent Bicester and Oxford bus service.

Bus service provision

- The proposed development is a fair distance (700-800 metres) from bus stops for the main bus route in Ambrosden, the S5 which currently operates every hour during weekday daytimes from Arncott to Bicester and Oxford. This distance would not be a barrier to using public transport, provided that the bus is of sufficiently high quality, which the S5 generally is S5 following the January 2011 upgrade of the service;
- There are plans to develop the bus route between Arncott and Bicester to operate twice per hour (plus improved evening and Sunday service), to facilitate population growth along this route, not only in Ambrosden but also at Graven Hill and the 'East Bicester' development site;
- The Council very recently requested £1,000 per dwelling towards the improvement of the S5 service from a proposed residential development site to the east of Ploughley Road, and the same request would apply to this development. Please see the Legal Agreement section. The total estimated cost of this enhanced s5 bus service is £400,000, to procure an additional bus on a pump-priming basis, with declining financial support until it becomes commercially viable after four years. The enhanced service will give much better connectivity to employment and other facilities in Bicester for the new residents, as well as providing meaningful connections into the new rail passenger services in Bicester;
- Route 94 to Oxford through the Otmoor area operates much less frequently and the service is part-financially supported.

Legal Agreement required to secure the following

- The developer would be expected to provide a pair of new bus stops adjacent to the site on Merton Road, so the less-mobile residents of this development can access this bus service with the minimum walking distance. The applicant should provide the necessary hard-standing areas, and provide £2,000 (index linked, June 2013) for the installation of two poles and flags. The applicant is required to provide a plan showing the location of these new bus stops.
- The developer is expected to make contributions towards S5 bus services in line with the Ploughley Road agreement discussed above. It would be equitable for this development to contribute £45,000 (index linked, June 2013).

3.15 Senior Engineer and Transport Planner:

Object for the reasons given below:

The key issues are access and layout

Status

There is some confusion regarding the status of the outline application and matters for consideration at this stage. The application form includes layout as a matter for determination but the submitted planning statement at paragraph 1.2 suggests layout is to be a reserved matter. Also paragraphs 1.2 and 1.10 appear to be seeking approval of the proposed estate roads and parking but the submitted details are very limited and greater detail will be required to provide any worthwhile appraisal of a planning application.

Access

Vehicular access is proposed via a priority junction to Merton Road. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 33m and 51m are shown and justified by a speed survey. However, I am unable to concur with the findings of the survey as the County Council's own surveys show much higher speeds and, therefore, a requirement for greater visibility splays. I consider the proposal fails to provide appropriate visibility at the access to Merton Road to the detriment of the safety and convenience of highway users.

The proposed priority junction is in close proximity to the junction of Home Farm Close and Merton Road and therefore would create potential for conflict between highway users as a result of turning, passing and queuing vehicles. Therefore, I consider the proposed location of the access would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users.

The proposed priority junction has not been tracked to demonstrate manoeuvring a refuse or other large vehicle to/from the site. Given the width of Merton Road, there is potential that such vehicles would be required to use the opposing side of the carriageway or overrunning the footway to perform turning manoeuvres. Such manoeuvres would create potential for conflict between highway users to the detriment of the highway safety and convenience.

Pedestrian provision at the access to Merton Road is poor. I do not consider the footways are continuous as they are too narrow to be practical. A reference is made to the provision of a pedestrian crossing but no details or plans have been provided and an appropriate location has not been identified. I consider the proposal fails to provide appropriate pedestrian access to the detriment of highway safety and convenience.

Layout

Within the site and away from the access there is not any separate provision for pedestrians. Whilst such an approach may be acceptable, appropriate urban design features would be required, none of which have been included within the proposal.

Turning heads are shown at various locations throughout the site but the practicality of these turning heads has not been demonstrated ie, tracked.

The submitted plan lacks detail although it appears appropriate levels of off-street parking could be provided. No visitor parking is shown.

3.16 Archaeology:

No objection subject to conditions and legal agreement

The building concerned lies within an area of some archaeological interest located 180m to the west of the site of a medieval Manor House (PRN 5657). A substantial building returned 13 hearths in 1665, during the ownership of Francis Mildmay, and was still extant when a new house was built to the north in 1673. The exact location of the manor house is unknown and it is therefore possible that aspects of this Manor and could be disturbed by this development. The site is also located 260m south of a series of undated features that were recorded, along with Neolithic and Bronze Age flint, during a pipeline excavation (PRN 16825). Recent archaeological work 600m to the north-west

of the site has recorded a series of Iron Age roundhouses and Roman and Saxon ditches (PRN 27985).

We would, therefore, recommend that, should planning permission be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of an archaeological monitoring and recording action to be maintained during the period of construction. This can be ensured through the attachment of a suitable negative condition.

3.17 **Drainage Officer:**

Holding objection pending the receipt of further information from the applicant

Key issues

- Foul drainage in the village is at capacity. There have been surcharging foul sewer manholes in the past which in turn get into the highway drainage and some of the properties on Merton Road.
- Capacity for the Foul sewer needs to be investigated or a holding tank allowed for with an agreed discharge into the main foul system.

3.18 **Education:**

No objection subject to conditions, legal agreement and informatives

Key issues

- The application is in outline. In the absence of a housing mix, our assessment of the impacts of the proposal and our required contributions are based on the housing mix we are using for work on the Cherwell Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We will reassess our infrastructure requirements when detailed information becomes available.
- The proposed development is projected to generate a demand for 16 primary school places (age 4-10), 9 secondary school places (age 11-15) and 1 sixth form places (age 16-19).
- This development lies within the school planning area of Bicester and within the current designated areas of Five Acres Primary School and Bicester Community College (secondary).
- Expansion of primary school capacity in the area would be necessary as a direct result of this housing development. This would be achieved through the permanent expansion of Five Acres Primary School.
- Expansion of secondary school capacity in the area would be necessary as a direct result of this housing development. This would be achieved through a new secondary school facility at SW Bicester.
- The development would also be expected to result in an increased demand upon special educational needs (SEN) schools, and expansion of provision would be necessary as a direct result of this housing development.

Legal Agreement required to secure:

- Developer contributions towards the permanent expansion of Five Acres Primary School by a total of 16 pupil places. Contributions are sought based on Department for Education (DfE) advice for primary school extensions weighted for Oxfordshire and including an allowance for ICT and sprinklers - £11,582 per pupil place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. We therefore require a contribution of £185,312 (index linked to from 1st Quarter 2012 using PUBSEC Tender Price Index) to primary school infrastructure for these homes.

- Developer contributions towards the new secondary school buildings on SW Bicester in line with the existing S106 agreement at SW Bicester, at a proportionate rate in line with the projected 10 secondary places including one sixth form pupil place.
- Developer contributions towards the expansion of one or more SEN schools by a total of 0.3 pupil places. We are advised to allow £30,656 per pupil place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base to expand capacity in special educational needs schools. We therefore require a contribution of £9,197 (index linked to from 1st Quarter 2012 using PUBSEC Tender Price Index) to special educational school infrastructure for these homes.

Detailed Comments

Five Acres Primary School's admission number has increased to 60 for Sept 2012 and final approval to make this permanent was agreed March 2013. This is partly due to existing pressure on places and partly ahead of planned housing. Additional accommodation is to be provided. Developer contributions will be sought towards the capital costs of expansion.

Bicester secondary schools currently have spare capacity, but this will be filled as the higher numbers now in primary school feed through. The large scale housing development planned for the town will require new secondary school establishment(s), the nature of which will be determined following local consultation. All housing developments in the area would be expected to contribute towards the cost of the new establishment(s).

1.02% of children across Oxfordshire are educated in SEN schools. On this basis, it is projected that the development will generate an additional 0.3 pupils requiring SEN provision, and expansion of SEN capacity would be needed as a direct result of the increased school-age population.

3.19 **Property:**

No objection subject to the following conditions, legal agreement and informatives

Key issues

- The County Council considers that the effect of the application forming this development will place additional strain on its existing community infrastructure.
- The calculations are based on the following development mix:
 - 14 No. x Two Bed Dwellings
 - 22 No. x Three Bed Dwellings
 - 9 No. x Four Bed Dwellings

It is calculated that this development would generate a net increase of:

- **125 additional residents including:**
- 9 resident/s aged 65+
- 85 resident/s aged 20+
- 12 residents 13-19

Legal Agreement required to secure:

- | | |
|--------------------|----------|
| ▪ Waste Management | £ 8,000 |
| ▪ Libraries | £ 10,625 |

▪ Museum Resource Centre	£ 625
▪ Social & Health Care	£ 9,900
Total	£ 29,150
Plus administration & monitoring	£ 3,750

The County Councils legal fees in drawing up and/or completing a legal agreement will also need to be secured.

- The County Council as Fire Authority has a duty to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available for fire-fighting purposes. There will probably be a requirement to affix fire hydrants within the development site. Exact numbers and locations cannot be given until detailed consultation plans are provided showing highway, water main layout and size. We would therefore ask you to add the requirement for provision of hydrants in accordance with the requirements of the Fire & Rescue Service as a condition to the grant of any planning permission

Informatives

Fire & Rescue Service recommends that new dwellings should be constructed with sprinkler systems

Detailed Comments

With regard to Strategic Waste Management, under Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, County Councils, as waste disposal authorities, have a duty to arrange for places to be provided at which persons resident in its area may deposit their household waste and for the disposal of that waste. To meet the additional pressures on the various Household Waste and Recycling Centre provision in Oxfordshire enhancements to these centres are either already taking place or are planned, and, to this end, contributions are now required from developers towards their redesign and redevelopment.

A new site serving 20,000 households costs in the region of £3,000,000; this equates to £64 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base
 $£64 \times 125$ (the forecast number of new residents) = £8,000

With regard to library contributions, Oxfordshire County Council has an adopted standard for publicly available library floor space of 23 m² per 1,000 head of population, and a further 19.5% space is required for support areas (staff workroom, etc), totalling 27.5 m². Botley library is significantly under-size in relation to its catchment population and this development will therefore place additional pressures on the library. The current cost of extending a library is £2,370 per m² at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. The proposal would also generate the need to increase the core book stock held by the local library by 2 volumes per additional resident. The price per volume is £10.00. This equates to £85 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. The full requirement for the provision of library infrastructure and supplementary core book stock in respect of this application would therefore be based on the following formula:

$£85 \times 125$ (the forecast number of new residents) = £10,625

With regard to the County Museum Resource Centre, Oxfordshire County Council's museum service provides a central Museum Resource Centre (MRC). The MRC is the principal store for the Oxfordshire Museum, Cogges Manor Farm Museum, Abingdon Museum, Banbury Museum, the Museum of Oxford and the Vale and Downland Museum. It provides support to these museums

and schools throughout the county for educational, research and leisure activities.

The MRC is operating at capacity and needs an extension to meet the demands arising from further development throughout the county. An extended facility will provide additional storage space and allow for increased public access to the facility.

An extension to the MRC to mitigate the impact of new development up to 2026 has been costed at £460,000; this equates to £5 per person at 1st Quarter 2012 price base.

$£5 \times 125$ (the forecast number of new residents) = £625

With regard to Social & Health Care – Day Care Facilities, to meet the additional pressures on day care provision the County Council is looking to expand and/or improve day care facilities - Bicester Day Centre, Launton Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6DJ serves the area related to this planning application.

A new Day Care centre offering 40 places per day (optimum) and open 5 days per week costs £11,000 per place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base. Based on current and predicted usage figures we estimate that 10% of the over 65 population use day care facilities. Therefore the cost per person aged 65 years or older is £1,100.

$£1,100 \times 9$ (the forecast number of new residents aged 65+) = £9,900

Oxfordshire County Council require an administrative payment of £3,750 for the purposes of administration and monitoring of the proposed S106 agreement.

Financial contributions have to be indexed-linked to maintain the real values of the contributions (so that they can in future years deliver the same level of infrastructure provision currently envisaged). The price bases of the various contributions are covered in the relevant sections above.

General Comments

The contributions requested have been calculated where possible using details of the development mix from the application submitted or if no details are available then the County Council has used the best information available. Should the application be amended or the development mixed changed at a later date, the Council reserves the right to seek a higher contribution according to the nature of the amendment.

The contributions which are being sought are necessary to protect the existing levels of infrastructure for local residents. They are relevant to planning the incorporation of this major development within the local community, if it is implemented. They are directly related to this proposed development and to the scale and kind of the proposal.

Other Consultees

3.20 Environment Agency: No objection.

Part of this site is within our Flood Zone (FZ) 2 and 3 map extents. However, we note that the applicant has carried out Hydraulic Modelling of the River Ray and the nearby unnamed watercourse.

The EA have not carried out a detailed review of the flood modelling. However,

based on the results of the modelling within the Flood Risk Assessment submitted, we can see that the site is predominantly in FZ1 and that the built development on the site is within FZ1.

3.21 **Thames Water:**

Waste Comments

Following initial investigation, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application, Thames Water would like a 'Grampian Style' condition imposed to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.

Water Comments

The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. Thames Water therefore recommend a condition be imposed to ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the/this additional demand.

4. Relevant National and Local Policy and Guidance

4.1 Development Plan Policy

Adopted Cherwell Local Plan (Saved Policies) (ACLPL)

H13: The Category 1 Settlements

H18: New dwellings in the countryside

C2: Development affecting protected species

C4 Creation of new habitats

C7: Landscape conservation

C8: Sporadic development in the open countryside

C13: Areas of High Landscape Value

C28: Layout, design and external appearance of new development

C30: Design of new residential development

C31: Compatibility of proposals in residential areas

C32: Provision of facilities for disabled people

R12: Provision of public open space in association with new residential development

TR1: Transportation funding

ENV1: Pollution Control

4.2 Other Material Considerations - Policy and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Cherwell Local Plan - Proposed Submission (August 2012) and Focussed Consultation (March 2013) (PSLP)

The Local Plan (March 2013) is out for a second round of public consultation. Although this plan does not have Development Plan status, it can be considered as a material planning consideration. The plan sets out the

Council's strategy for the District to 2031. The policies listed below are considered to be material to this case and are not replicated by saved Development Plan policy:

- BSC1: District Wide Housing Distribution
- BSC2: The Effective & Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land & Housing Density
- BSC3: Affordable Housing
- BSC4: Housing Mix
- ESD3: Sustainable Construction
- ESD6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management
- ESD7: Sustainable Drainage Systems
- ESD10: Protection & Enhancement of Biodiversity & the Natural Environment
- ESD13: Local Landscape Protection & Enhancement
- ESD16 The Character of the Built & Historic Environment
- Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation – Cat A Ambrosden
- Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas – Group 1 Ambrosden
- Proposals Map Allocation – Conservation Target Area

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – Draft Final Report – March 2013

Appendix D - Sites outside Settlements with Future Potential

The report concludes that the site is considered to be suitable in principle if the Council require sites located outside the built up area of Ambrosden. The site is available and potentially suitable if any proposed scheme can address the identified constraints, such as landscape and flood issues. It is recommended that the Council considered the site further.

Ambrosden Housing Needs Survey Report – March 2013

There was an identified need for 24 affordable homes.

Non-Stat Cherwell Local Plan 2011

- OA1 – General Policy
- TR4 – Mitigation Measures
- R8 – Playing Fields
- R10A – Built Sport and Recreational Facilities

5. Appraisal

5.1 The key issues for consideration in this application are:

- Planning History
- Policy principle
- Housing need
- Visual amenity/landscape impact
- Layout and design
- Flooding & Drainage
- Highway Safety
- Heritage Assets
- Ecology

Planning History

- 5.2 09/01346/OUT – Application refused for 9 No. dwellings on a red line site which was largely made up of the land within the gardens of the Ambrosden Court and a small parcel of land between Roman Way and Ambrosden Court. The application was refused on grounds of being outside the built up limits of the village, poor layout which is out of character with the area, flood risk and failure to secure affordable housing provision.
- 5.3 10/01219/OUT – Planning permission granted for 5 No. dwellings on a reduced red line area which did not include the land to the far south east beyond the tennis court/s. It did not include the demolition of Ambrosden Court.

The Policy Principles

- 5.4 The site is beyond the built up limits of the category 1 village of Ambrosden and it is not an allocated site with the adopted Cherwell Local Plan (ACLP). The proposed housing scheme, therefore, has to be assessed against Policy H18 of ACLP. This limits residential development to agricultural workers dwellings and affordable housing. Quite clearly the development fails to comply with this policy. This position is consistent with the case history.
- 5.5 Policy Villages 1 categorises Ambrosden as a Category A village which remains similar to the adopted policy position in Policy H13. Due to their population size, range of services, accessibility, employment opportunities etc, these villages are considered to be the most sustainable. Categorising villages ensures the most sustainable distribution of growth across the rural areas and is an approach taken from the previous adopted Local Plan and featured in the Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan.
- 5.6 Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (PSLP) (amended in March 2013) places Ambrosden in a group of 5 other villages. Having now taken into account completions and permissions, the stated combined limit of new homes to be built in these settlements during the period 2012-2031 for sites that comprises ten or more dwellings is yet to be formally reported and it is hoped that this information will be available at this Committee. Not all the villages will necessarily accommodate a site and the precise number of homes to be allocated to an individual village will be set out in the Local Neighbourhoods Development Plan Document in the light of evidence such as the SHLAA.
- 5.7 The SHLAA identifies 2 sites “outside settlements with future potential” in Ambrosden, one of which is this site and whilst it is clear that the site ‘contravenes existing policy’ the SHLAA concludes that “The site is considered to be suitable in principle if the Council require sites located outside the built up area of Ambrosden. The site is available and potentially suitable if any proposed scheme can address the identified constraints such as landscape and flood issues. It is recommended that the Council consider the site further.” This application represents an opportunity to do just that.

- 5.8 Notwithstanding these policies and supporting evidence more weight has to be attributed to the NPPF given the current status of the development plan and a deficit in the five year land supply (if the 20% buffer is considered to be appropriate/necessary) if it can be demonstrated that the ACLP is at odds with the goals of the NPPF. The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and states that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless *“any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in [the] Framework taken as a whole”* (para. 14).

Housing Need

- 5.9 With particular regard to the issue of housing need within the NPPF, it is noted that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) are required to boost significantly the supply of housing by meeting assessed needs and identifying key sites critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period (para' 47).
- 5.10 LPAs are expected to *“identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land”* (para' 47).
- 5.11 Footnote 11 to paragraph 47 states, *“To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans”*.
- 5.12 Para' 49 states, *“Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.”*
- 5.13 Whilst time has not allowed a formal response from the Policy team to this application, the assumptions are available from the 2012 AMR and the June 2013 update and reference is made to the comments in paragraph 3.3 of this report concluding that the new supply produces figures of 401 in surplus with 5% and 162 in deficit with 20%.
- 5.14 It would seem that there is no longer the acute shortage of housing land requiring further consideration to be given to otherwise unacceptable 'non-policy compliant' sites located outside the settlement boundary. That said, as the identified district wide need issue is marginal, and if the site were to be otherwise acceptable i.e. no harm would be caused to the other identified interests outlined in para 5.1, then this issue ought to be considered as part of

the planning balance. However, it should also be noted, that the Committee recently authorised the granting of planning permission at Springfield Farm in Ambrosden for 65 units, 32 of which are affordable, so in theory the local housing land supply has also been met.

Visual Amenity/Landscape Impact

- 5.15 Landscape impact is one of the issues considered crucial to whether or not the development of this site would be appropriate. This has been highlighted by the SHLAA. It is, therefore, difficult to agree with the applicant's decision to submit this outline application reserving the matter of landscaping for later determination. The site lies beyond the built-up limits of the village in an area of open countryside and is unallocated. The surroundings are not of any special historic or townscape sensitivity and this is not an Area of High Landscape Value. Nevertheless, policies C7 and C8 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan seek to protect the landscape, preventing sporadic development that would cause harm to the topography and character. The NPPF also advises that the open countryside should be protected for its own sake.
- 5.16 Without the benefit of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which would assess the physical make up of the site and the condition of the landscape itself and the way in which the site is experienced, it is difficult to justify how a site that is mostly surrounded on 3 sides by open countryside would avoid harming the landscape. There is no site analysis which would ordinarily inform the constraints and opportunities of the site so a character assessment of the surrounding village and landscape is not explored. There is nothing in the submission relating to the landscape character and quality of the scheme. Given that landscape impact issues are considered crucial to this case, Council officers have undertaken their own assessment of the likely impact a housing development would have in this location in order to draw a conclusion on the matter.
- 5.17 The landscape officer has noted the characteristics of the area as being flat with small undulations and despite its lack of public footpath availability in the vicinity and general lack of views from surrounding high points, the site is very visible when viewed from the southwest on entering the village along Merton Road. There is no screening vegetation on the site boundary and there is an inadequate amount proposed with the built form having no coherent edge. It is also not clear if the hedge on the southern boundary is to be retained as it is not shown at a realistic width. The important south west boundary is shown to be an unattractive mixture of back gardens and gable ends. Even with adequate screen planting it will form an untidy edge with garden paraphernalia being visible on the approach from Merton.
- 5.18 The proposal does not take sufficient account of existing trees. Too many category A and B trees are to be removed under this proposal destroying the character of the walled garden. The loss of trees has met with an objection from the Council's arboriculturalist though it is noted that an alternative solution could be found at the reserve matters stage to avoid the unnecessary loss of these highest grade trees. However, what is not reserved for later determination is the access point through the existing wall along Merton road which will have to be removed to allow a site access altering the character of the road which forms part of this rural setting. With no landscaping strategy, the trees are

shown dotted everywhere are largely not feasible. Trees grow tall and wide and need correspondingly large spaces to grow in. There has been no attempt to create places with the built form and landscape forming those spaces. The trees are shown as too small, too close to dwellings and planted too close to edgings.

- 5.19 It is considered that, as a matter of principle, the development of this site for a housing scheme would have a harmful impact on the open countryside even at this outline stage. This view is consistent with a previous case for a much smaller scheme which was refused on grounds of landscape impact.

Layout, scale and design

- 5.20 Policies C28 and C30 seek to control all new development to ensure layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the area and that they should be compatible with the appearance, character, layout, scale and density of existing dwellings in the vicinity with acceptable standards of amenity and privacy. Again, this outline application seeks to reserve these matters for later determination so the comments made here relate to their indicative submission and there are certain matters of principle that can be concluded.
- 5.21 Firstly the urban street scene of this southwest part of Ambrosden is characterised principally by the ribbon development fronting onto Merton Road. Development in this area forms a mix of cottages, 19th century development and 20th century infill development. The proposed single access point (not a reserved matter) provides access to the site from Merton Road. This breaks a large hole in the existing boundary wall. There are no other points of vehicular connection, resulting in a cul-de-sac development. This is totally uncharacteristic of the locality and cannot be compared to the very intimate small scale scheme on Home Farm Close which was, in any event, built on previously developed land.
- 5.22 It is considered that the proposed relationship with Merton Road is poor. While the submitted Design and Access Statement sets out in its list of key features 'the creation of active frontage onto Merton Road' at the top of the list, this is not translated in plan form. To the northeast of the development site, dwellings are fronted onto the new cul-de-sac, with gable ends onto Merton Road. More detailed criticisms are noted in the comments submitted by the Council's Urban Designer some of which could be addressed at detailed stage but the fundamental approach to the layout with a fixed access point, the way the scheme wraps around Roman Way and the backland cul-de-sac design principle is considered a fundamental flaw. The harmful impact of this is further exacerbated by the removal of a substantial part of the existing boundary wall will have a negative impact on the character of the street.
- 5.23 Overall, the proposals form a substantial backland development on the periphery of the village. Development will extend the settlement to the west and close the views over open countryside that greets you as you enter the village. The development does not reinforce the traditional settlement patterns in the village. This is of particular issue against Merton Road where development would normally front outwards onto this route.

Flooding & Drainage

- 5.24 Part of this site is noted as being within flood zones 2 and 3 but the Environment Agency (EA) has considered the submission and note the contents of the applicant's Hydraulic Modelling of the River Ray and the nearby unnamed watercourse. Whilst the EA has not carried out a detailed review of the flood modelling, based on the results of the modelling within the Flood Risk Assessment submitted, the conclusion is reached that the site is predominantly in flood zone 1 and that the built development on the site is within that low risk area. On this basis there is no objection to the application on flood risk, though the caveats from the EA would appear to indicate that the site is restricted and may lead to problems with, for example, loss of certain important trees as the flexibility may not be there to revise the layout.
- 5.25 The drainage implications of the development at this site have been considered by the County Council and it is noted that they have a holding objection pending the receipt of further information from the applicant, which has not been provided at this outline stage. Various problems have been identified including that foul drainage in the village is at capacity. There has been an issue of surcharging foul sewer manholes in the past which in turn gets into the highway drainage and some of the properties on Merton Road. Capacity for the foul sewer needs to be investigated or a holding tank allowed for with an agreed discharge into the main foul system. As it would appear that a solution can be reached, an objection on these grounds would be difficult to sustain.

Highway Safety

- 5.26 The vehicular access point as shown on the submission is not a reserved matter and it is proposed to be via a priority junction to Merton Road. The County Council has identified a number of problems with this scheme which are considered to be justification to refuse the application on grounds of being detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users. These include:
- that visibility splays are shown and justified by a speed survey but the findings do not match those of the survey undertaken by the County Council's which show much higher speeds and, therefore, a requirement for greater visibility splays.
 - the proposed priority junction is in close proximity to the junction of Home Farm Close and Merton Road and therefore would create potential for conflict between highway users as a result of turning, passing and queuing vehicles.
 - the proposed priority junction has not been tracked to demonstrate manoeuvring a refuse or other large vehicle to/from the site. Given the width of Merton Road, there is potential that such vehicles would be required to use the opposing side of the carriageway or overrunning the footway to perform turning manoeuvres. Such manoeuvres would create potential for conflict between highway users; and
 - pedestrian provision at the access to Merton Road is poor and the footways are too narrow to be practical. A reference is made to the provision of a pedestrian crossing but no details or plans have been provided and an appropriate location has not been identified.

Heritage Assets

- 5.27 The site is close to the grade II listed property known as Holly Tree Cottage and there is some historic context here but these are not considered to be a particular constraint to the development. Holly Tree Cottage is already compromised somewhat by the proximity of other more modern development which is closer than this site and it is not considered that the development would harm the situation further. There may be other solutions that could be promoted at a detailed stage which would respect the setting of this listed building should this be necessary.

Ecology

- 5.28 Ecology concerns have been raised by objectors and a report has been submitted which has been considered by the Council's ecologist who finds that whilst more detail is required there should not be any insurmountable problems. A refusal on these grounds would not be likely to be sustainable.

Other Matters

- 5.29 This type of application would require contributions to be made in the form of a section 106 agreement. This has not been completed and to date there has been no progress.

Engagement

- 5.30 With regard to the duty set out in paragraphs 186 and 187 of the Framework, no problems or issues have arisen regarding the submission during the application. It is considered that the duty to be positive and proactive has been discharged through the efficient and timely determination of the application.

Conclusion

- 5.31 Development of this site would be contrary to the adopted Local Plan. Based on the assessment above, the housing need is considered to be an insufficiently mitigating factor and there is no affordable housing requirement in Ambrosden. Even if there remains a housing need, the site is considered to be unacceptable in principle for development for housing as it would have a harmful impact on the open countryside and would be uncharacteristic in the street scene. Further, the access arrangement would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users. This application is therefore recommended for refusal on the reasons outlined below.

6. Recommendation

Refusal, on the following grounds:

1. The proposal represents development beyond the built up limits of Ambrosden where there is no proven need for agriculture or other existing

undertaking and the application has not been made on the basis that it is a rural exceptions site. As the proposal cannot be justified on the basis of an identified need it represents sporadic development in the countryside which fails to maintain its rural character and appearance and which fails to conserve and enhance the environment. The application is, therefore, contrary to Policies H6, H12, H13, H18 and C8 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, Policy for Village 2 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan Incorporating Changes March 2013 and Government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The layout of the site and number of units proposed together with the access arrangement onto the public highway fails to respect the established settlement pattern resulting in an incongruous, prominent, urbanising and discordant built form in a backland position to the serious detriment of the established character and layout of the village and detracting from its rural setting and open countryside adversely affecting the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies C7, C27, C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed access is inadequate in terms of its visibility and proximity to another junction. Together with the narrowness of Merton Road and provision for pedestrians the proposed development would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users, contrary to Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. In the absence of a satisfactory planning obligation, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the infrastructure directly required to service or serve the proposed development will be provided. This would be contrary to the Policy R12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, Policies OA1, TR4, R8 and R10A of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011, Policy INF 1 of the Proposed Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission Draft March 2013 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

STATEMENT OF ENGAGEMENT

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No 2) Order 2012 and paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), this decision has been taken by the Council having worked with the applicant/agent in a positive and proactive way as set out in the application report.