

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION****Planning Committee****8 September 2022**

| Agenda Item Number | Page | Title |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 12 | (Pages 2) | Speakers list |
| 12 | (Page 3 -8) | Written Updates |

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Lesley Farrell / Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk, 01295 221534

Planning Committee 8 September 2022 – Public Speakers

| Agenda Item | Application Number | Application Address | Ward Member | Speaker – Objector | Speaker – Support |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 8 | Development Brief for Local Plan Partial Review site PR6a | Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford | Cllr Ian Middleton | None | Carolyn Puddicombe – Agent |
| 9 | Development Brief for Local Plan Partial Review site PR6b | Land West of Oxford Road, North Oxford | Cllr Ian Middleton | None | None |
| 10 | 22/00489/F | Os Parcel 9078 and 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane and North of Rattlecombe Road, Stocking Lane, Shenington | WITHDRAWN | | |

**CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

8 September 2022

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 8

Development Brief for Local Plan Partial Review site PR6a – Land East of Oxford Road, North Oxford

Additional representations received

Savills have commented on certain matters which they wish to bring to Members' attention:

1 – Primary school location – they reiterate that the central location is preferred, that the school in this location would not impact on archaeological assets and that Linda Griffiths as DM case officer 'appears agreeable' to the level of impact on the buffer. Savills suggests that the central location enables all of the school requirements to be met, would have no impact on the Green Belt and would allow for future expansion. Savills therefore requests the Development Brief is amended to show the central location for the school. Savills disagrees with officers' comments in your report which state that the central location does not work.

2 – Christ Church Logo – Savills notes officers' comments in your report but states that, whilst it has inputted to the document on behalf of Christ Church, Savills has not written it and disagrees with elements of the document. It repeats its request for the Christ Church logo to be removed from the document. Savills requests that the second paragraph in the Executive Summary and in the Introduction section are amended to say that, "This Development Brief has been jointly prepared by Cherwell District Council, Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council with input from landowners and key stakeholders."

3 – Savills advises that the land to the south of the site within Oxford City has now been granted planning permission (21/01449/FUL) and that the reference at paragraph 3.2.5 should be updated accordingly.

Savills has sent a second representation, which we quote in full as follows:

1. Change to the Development Brief:

We would request that the Development Brief acknowledges the significant amount of work that has been on going for the past 18 months in line with the PPA document that was entered in to with the Council, the County and Oxford City Council. This is because various elements of the design have moved on from the position set out in the Development Brief and these positive elements should not be constrained by the time it has taken to produce and consult on the Brief.

We would ask that the following is added to the second paragraph in the Executive Summary:

"..However, it should be noted that the landowner has been engaged in proactive and positive pre-application discussions with the Council and other stakeholders as the Brief has been prepared. There may therefore be elements of the Brief that differ from this emerging design and technical work. Any deviations can be addressed during the

determination of any planning application, especially where such changes result in a superior design or approach to that set out in the Brief.”

A similar paragraph should be added at the end of section “1.2.2 – Status” in the Brief. If this is accepted then Christ Church is agreeable to the “jointly prepared” wording and the use of its logo.

2. Change to the Committee Report.

The Committee Report refers in several places to the location of the primary school. In particular it states in relation to a possible central location for the school that it would encroach on the Green Belt and that would harm archaeological remains. This is not correct.

Christ Church has carried out detailed technical and design work on the school in the central location having ruled out 5 other options. The latest position is that the school can be made to work in the central location and the County officer and CDC planning officer are in general agreement that such a location can be made to work. This work also demonstrates that a school can be expanded in the future if required.

The amended Green Belt boundary runs along the eastern edge of the green buffer. The location of the school in the central location will have no impact on Green Belt and maintains a landscaped buffer of circa 46m to the edge of the site.

Furthermore, a buffer around the archaeological remains on the site has been agreed with the County Archaeologist, the location of the school and associated roads etc is located outside of this buffer and therefore there is no impact on archaeological remains.

Therefore please can you amend the following paragraphs in the Committee Report:

3.34 - ... “A central location would be preferable from an urban design perspective and would have no impact of Green Belt or archaeology. Work is ongoing with the County Council and District Council to refine how and whether a school in the central location can work. The northern location has its own constraints that will need to be addressed in any planning application.”

3.37, 8th bullet – replace second sentence with .. “Work is ongoing with the County Council and District Council to refine how and whether a school in the central location can work and ensuring it would have no impact on archaeological remains. The northern location has its own constraints that will need to be addressed in any planning application”. ...delete last sentence of this bullet.

3.37, 9th bullet – delete 3rd sentence and replace with - ...“Work is ongoing with the County Council and District Council to refine how and whether a school in the central location can work and ensuring it would have no impact on archaeological remains. The northern location has its own constraints that will need to be addressed in any planning application. A location for the school adjacent to the local centre is possible in either the northern or central location.” Delete remaining paragraph.

3.42, 2nd bullet – replace the third sentence with.. “Work is ongoing with the County Council and District Council to refine how and whether a school in the central location can work and ensuring it would have no impact on archaeological remains. The northern location has its own constraints that will need to be addressed in any planning application”.. delete “..The central location has no ability to expand in the future.”

Oxfordshire County Council makes comments in response to the published agenda:

OCC says that it asked for some updates to the development briefs to refer to relevant County Council documents. Such amendments have not been recommended in the officer report, the main reason being consistency with other development briefs. OCC considers the most up to date position should be recorded given the passage of time between briefs. OCC cites the example of its recently adopted Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, and its street design guide adopted in 2021. However, OCC acknowledges that such mentions are not critical and that OCC will input into the planning process and respond on planning applications having regard to all relevant publications.

With regard to PR6a, OCC makes comments on three specific matters:

1 – Primary school location – it notes that the developer is promoting a central location, that OCC has therefore had limited discussion with the developer on the northern location and that at the moment OCC is not able to say which of the two options is better overall. OCC considers that this will need to be assessed through the planning process, and the Development Brief should be flexible as to the location of the primary school. OCC is content that the Development Brief allows for other options than the northern location – e.g. it includes asterisks in the drawings that the ‘school site location is subject to further detailed assessment’.

2 – Pipal Cottage – OCC notes that amendments are recommended in your report in response to the developer’s comments that Pipal Cottage will be excluded from their proposals. OCC notes that its exclusion will have implications for the location of new cycle paths and is not sure that this has been taken into account, but is content that the cycle paths will be considered through the planning process.

3 – Egress left-out onto the Park & Ride road – OCC notes the developer does not feature this vehicular connection in its public consultation materials and ‘understands that it may not be needed’. OCC says that it is content for such an egress to be included in the Development Brief, it will further consider whether it is needed through the planning process, and notes that the development brief allows for that, e.g. asterisks are included in the drawings that access points are ‘subject to highway testing’.

Officer comments

Savills – your officers note that Savills prefers the central location, indeed it has proposed the central location for the primary school since design inception. OCC’s advice to CDC is that the central location would not allow for future expansion and that it has not yet been shown to meet all of OCC’s requirements.

At page 18, as part of paragraph 3.34, officers state in the first bullet point that, “a central location for these uses is not achievable without harming the archaeological remains or encroaching into the Green Belt”. At page 21, as part of paragraph 3.37, officers state in the first full bullet point that the school cannot be accommodated in the central location “without conflicting Green Belt policy or harming archaeology and so it needs to be located elsewhere”. This is slightly different to the analysis on the same subject presented elsewhere in your report. The current discussions taking place with the landowner suggest that the central location could be accommodated without intruding on the buffer zone around the archaeological interests and without conflicting with Green Belt policy. From those discussions it appears likely the central location would result in some narrowing of the green buffer adjacent to the central site for the school but this would not necessarily impact on the Green Belt if the narrowing of the green buffer was acceptable. The central location would also require flexibility from OCC in respect of the size and/or shape of the school site, but the

comments from OCC are relevant in this regard, showing that they are actively considering how the school could be flexibly accommodated in this central location.

In relation the last bullet point at page 20 of the agenda, work is ongoing with the County Council and District Council to refine how and whether a school in the central location can work and ensuring it would have no impact on archaeological remains. The reference to the green belt in the third sentence of this bullet point, and in the third bullet point at paragraph 3.42 (page 24), should instead refer to the "green buffer", which is not retained Green Belt land at this point.

In relation to the use of the Christ Church logo, we note that Savills, on behalf of their client, accepts that with the additional wording proposed it would be willing to accept the position. Officers are happy to add in paragraphs to the relevant sections of the Brief to reflect what is sought by Savills on behalf of Christ Church; amendments have been made to the suggested wording in order for reasons of policy and/or clarity.

Section 3.2.5 – officers are grateful for this information and happy to recommend a minor edit to 3.2.5 to make the appropriate change.

In relation to OCC's comments, we would note that the Development Brief is not a planning policy document itself and does not set out new policies. It will be a material consideration in the submission of planning applications for the site(s).

The Oxfordshire Street Design Guide isn't referenced in the Development Briefs for PR7b and PR9, or for PR7a, so the effect of agreeing the change will be that parking has to be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide in the case of the Briefs for PR6a and PR6b but not in the case of PR7b or PR9.

Irrespective of whether it is mentioned in the Development Briefs, the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide is/will be a material consideration in the assessment of proposals at all six of the PR sites.

In addition, and perhaps more importantly, Section 6.4.1 of the Development Brief states:

"The design of streets within the site should follow the guidance set out in the Cherwell Residential Design Guide and the Manual for Streets, in a manner which is appropriate to the character and quality of place which is to be created as described below. A standardised highways-led layout is not acceptable: carriageway space and turning radii are to be limited (in line with adopted guidance)."

Primary school location – there has been limited discussion with the developer on the northern location because the developer has focused entirely on the central location, seeking to make it work. The constraints of the central location – archaeological interests, the green corridor – are not replicated in the northern site. At the present time, CDC officers have insufficient evidence to be comfortable that the central location can work in practice; as such the appropriate response is that the Development Brief shows the northern location but builds in flexibility.

Egress left-out onto the Park & Ride road – OCC had advised officers that this would be needed as part of a compromise position with the developers that allowed them flexibility on the position of the second Oxford Road access and ensured that some drivers wanting to travel in a northward direction from the site didn't have to first drive southward to the nearest roundabout in Oxford before travelling north.

OCC's advice to CDC officers had been that if this access was not included by the developer then both Oxford Road accesses would have to be crossroads with the two accesses with the PR6b site rather than just one as is currently proposed.

It is not clear as to why this would no longer be needed, unless (i) the developers for PR6a and PR6b are willing for both vehicular access to their sites to be cross road junctions, or (ii) OCC is content with the southern crossroad junction being used more frequently by northbound traffic.

Recommendation

Amended to include:

- An additional paragraph early in the Executive Summary of the Development Brief, and at the end of Section 1.2.2 – Status, as follows:
“The landowner has been engaged in proactive and positive pre-application discussions with the Council and other stakeholders as the Brief has been prepared. This work is ongoing. Should final proposals differ from elements of the Development Brief in due course, in response to further technical and design work, some of which is not yet available to the Council, this would be examined through the planning application process in the usual way.”
- The second sentence of Paragraph 3.2.5 to be amended to refer to the Croudace development having been approved.
- The third sentence of Paragraph 6.4.6 to be amended to add the words “applicable at the time.” after “cycle parking standards”

Agenda Item 9

Development Brief for Local Plan Partial Review site PR6b – Land West of Oxford Road, North Oxford

Additional representations received

Bidwells is pleased to note the PR6b Development Brief is being recommended for approval by Planning Committee, but makes further comment on certain matters which it wishes to bring to Members' attention:

Bidwells would like to thank the officers for providing detailed feedback on its comments submitted in response to the Draft Development Brief, but is disappointed that the majority of those comments were not taken on board. Bidwells considered that its suggestions could move the Brief to something that could manage the design process more flexibly. Bidwells invites Members to review its comments in this light, but 'broadly supports the framework as a strategic document, albeit one led by the Council and its advisors'.

Bidwells comments that the development proposals for PR6b are still at an early stage and that it anticipates discrepancies may arise between the Development Brief and those proposals 'as more information becomes available'. Bidwells is grateful that comments within the agenda acknowledge the need for future collaboration and discussions, e.g. in relation to the access strategy.

On this basis, Bidwells states that it is generally content with the strategic direction of the Development Brief and, although some of its initial concerns persist, it is happy to progress its scheme within the strategic goals of the Development Brief and through ongoing collaboration with Cherwell District Council.

Officer comments

We appreciate Bidwells' desire for greater flexibility, but would submit that the Development Brief sets sufficient parameters to enable a successful development to be delivered, whilst allowing flexibility in respect of the details, and that if it was less detailed in the way sought by Bidwells, it would lack teeth and would be less effective.

Should the developer wish to put forward proposals that conflict with the Development Brief the onus will be on the developer to demonstrate why such conflict is acceptable.

Recommendation

No change

Agenda item 10

**Os Parcel 9078 and 9975 Adjoining Stocking Lane and North of Rattlecombe Road
Stocking Lane Shenington - 22/00489/F**

Agenda item withdrawn.