

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### Planning Committee

20 June 2019

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
14.	(Pages 1 - 7)	Written Update

*If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Aaron Hetherington, Democratic and Elections [aaron.hetherington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:aaron.hetherington@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk), 01295 227956*

## CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 June 2019

### WRITTEN UPDATES

#### **Agenda Item 7**

##### **Proposed Pre-Committee Site Vists**

Officers would like to recommend that the Committee agrees to hold pre-committee site visits for the following applications, which are expected to be brought before the Committee for determination at the next meeting:

#### **None proposed**

If the Committee agree any site visits at today's meeting, the site visits will be held on Thursday 18 July 2019

#### **Agenda Item 8**

##### **18/00211/F Railway embankment between Blackthorn and Piddington**

#### **Additional information received**

- Comments have been received from the applicant in respect of conditions 3 – Noise; 11- - Surface Water Drainage and 13 – Hydrological Impact Assessment.

#### **Officer comment**

Any amendments to these conditions need to be discussed and agreed with the relevant experts and therefore delegated authority is sought to continue discussions in respect of these and make any subsequent amendments as required prior to issuing the decision.

#### **Change to recommendation**

None

#### **Agenda Item 9**

##### **18/01852/F Dewey Sports Centre, Bloxham**

- Application withdrawn

## **Agenda Item 10**

### **18/01882/OUT – Drayton Lodge Farmhouse, Warwick Road, Banbury**

#### **Additional information received**

- In terms of delivery, **the applicant's agent** has confirmed that they aim to market the site in September 2019 post receipt of the outline planning permission and completion of the Sec 106 agreement. They then anticipate that discharge of conditions and submission of reserved matters would follow with a realistic target for the commencement of development on site during the latter half of 2021 with a delivery rate of approximately 50 dwellings per annum.
- A biodiversity impact assessment calculation has now been received (19<sup>th</sup> June) but the comments of the ecologist are awaited. It is stated that the submission will result in net biodiversity gain. Delegated authority is therefore sought to agree this submission or to discuss further with the applicant/agent if necessary.
- Further to writing the committee report, a revised Design and Access Statement and parameter plans have now been received. However, your officers remain of the view that the minimum width of buffers and open space to the western and southern boundaries, and the minimum sizes of the proposed village greens and play spaces should be identified at this stage, to ensure an appropriate form of development which delivers the aspirations and vision for the site and having regard to the sensitive nature of this site when viewed from the adjacent public rights of way and Drayton. Following further discussions with the agent, it has been agreed that the parameter plans will be further amended accordingly. This will also be important in ensuring that the site is suitably mitigated in terms of landscape impact. These are awaited.
- The Design and Access Statement is also to be amended further to provide greater clarification in terms of materials, design and streetscape. The revised DAS is awaited accordingly.

#### **Officer comment**

As a consequence of the above, it has not been possible to finalise the detailed conditions.

#### **Change to recommendation**

None but delegation is sought (in conjunction with the Chairman) to continue negotiations with the applicant/agent in respect of the DAS, parameter plans and finalisation of the conditions and Section 106 agreement

## **Agenda**

### **Item 11**

**19/00055/F Meadow Barn, Merton Road,  
Ambrosden OX25 2LZ**

## **Additional Representations received**

### **Statement from applicant's agent**

Firstly, I'd like to thank the Committee members for allowing me to speak in support of this application

- The proposed development is largely unchanged from the approved scheme in terms of size and appearance.....the larger 5 bed house as approved has simply been extended one meter to the South to create adequate floor space to create the new 3 and 4 bed dwelling. It is very much in keeping with the existing courtyard development in terms of massing and general appearance and this was originally driven by comments at the pre-app stage from the conservation officer in producing a long 1 and a half storey courtyard style development.
- Although the site does not require the implementation of CDC Housing Mix Policy BSC4, it is worth noting that this adopted policy does not even mention 5 bedroom homes and looks for a mix of 1,2,3 and 4. The provision of one 3 bed and two 4 bed accords more comfortably within the levels described within BSC4 and is potentially a far better mix than the currently approved scheme of one 5 bed and one 4 bed. It also makes far more efficient use of the site in terms of Housing Density and policy BSC2.
- The site is NOT over developed. The site area is 1322m<sup>2</sup> with only 381m<sup>2</sup> taken up with buildings, the equivalent of 29%
- The proposal under consideration today should be considered with reference to the currently approved scheme in terms of additional burden on traffic and bin collection etc.
- With this in mind, we have read through the objections and would comment as follows:
- This development would require a maximum of two extra bins on any given collection day when considering the requirements of the larger 5 bed house already approved. NOT the 16 bins referred to in the objection statement.
- The bins DO NOT obscure the view to the main road as they are set back on a shingle area to the side of the private drive and DO NOT encroach on the public footpath.
- The drive way does have passing points. This was a requirement of the original approval for the existing courtyard. Site measurements confirm a width dimension of 4.62m.

- Emergency vehicles can and have accessed and manoeuvred within the existing courtyard site. The large area of open courtyard proposed, some 16m x 26m at it's widest, will only facilitate this, the notion that there are tight manoeuvring spaces here is totally incorrect. It should be noted that grocery delivery vehicles enter and manoeuvre within the current courtyard regularly. Building control have also been consulted on the application and have raised no concerns over emergency vehicle access.
- Objection also draws reference to the parking situation within the existing courtyard. This should NOT be a material consideration for the proposed courtyard. The proposed courtyard has a huge amount of parking and manoeuvring space and requires access only over where right of way already exists. There is no possible way that the development would affect parking within the existing courtyard, and it should be noted that each of the existing properties within that development has allocated parking. If that is problematic, then it should be discussed amongst the existing occupants and not passed through as an objection onto this application.
- Some reference has been made to parking not being shown on the proposed plans. We are slightly unclear as to how the three clearly identified garages on the site have been misinterpreted, but they are there!
- The approved scheme allowed for a triple garage to the 5 bed and double to the 4 bed, a total of 10 spaces with parking directly outside each garage space. The proposed scheme allows for 3 x double garages with similar levels of parking in front of each garage space...a total of 12 spaces. This is an increase of only two cars.
- This and the previously approved scheme have been the subject of repeated consultation with Highways, largely due to a principle objector, and this is simply being repeated here. It has to be noted that, despite this, Highways have themselves repeatedly stated that the scheme is acceptable and poses no issues subject to their conditions being met.
- There also seems to have been some slight, and understandable, confusion in terms of the previous applications and pre-app advice given for the site as they have in the past overlapped and been viewed alongside the adjoining site to the rear of Home Farm Close.
- However, the planning for the properties on the adjoining site is completely separate and would be accessed via Home Farm Close NOT the private drive. There will be a maximum of 7 properties on the site under consideration today (not 8 as previously stated) – 4 existing and 3 new.
- Finally, I believe it is really important to note the planning officers recommendation for approval and that he has stated that the impact of the proposed scheme would be NO different to the approved and would not cause harm to it's setting.

Thank you

### **Change to recommendation**

None

## **Agenda Item 12**

### **19/00596/OUT – Land north of Southfield Farm, Weston-on-the Green**

#### **Additional information received**

No additional information has been received.

#### **Additional Representations received**

##### Planning Policy advice

Colleagues in Planning Policy have suggested that, to provide greater clarification on the implications of the Submission Neighbourhood Plan with regard to housing in the neighbourhood plan area, Paragraph 9.9 of the committee report should be amended to read as follows:

*“The Weston on the Green Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted for examination so is only considered to carry limited weight in decision making at the current time. The Social and Economic Baseline Studies which forms part of the evidence base for the neighbourhood plan states that based on information gathered the housing needs for the village were calculated as an objective of 15% growth in new housing for the period 2017 – 2031 which equated to 38 new homes. This housing figure of 38 from the baseline studies is not, however, carried forward in to any draft Neighbourhood Plan policy, although there are a number of other policies relevant to the principle of the development”.*

##### Stagecoach

Stagecoach has removed its objection as the applicant has proposed to provide a fund of £120,000 to provide a public transport link between the village and Oxford Parkway station. It is stated that this fund could sustain 2-3 round trips in each morning and evening peak, Monday-Friday, for up to 5 years. Stagecoach are of the opinion that this service could be sustained in some manner in the longer term and that it would reduce demand for personal care use in the A34 corridor.

##### Applicant

The applicant's agent has included an appeal decision where it is stated that a similar offer was found to meet the tests of paragraph 56 of the NPPF. The agent states that no other scheme can contribute in circumstances where the LPA appears to have placed an embargo on further housing in the village despite the identified need for 38 dwellings in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The agent states that the service would be better than that which previously operated in the village and that it should be given significant weight in the planning balance.

The applicant's agent has submitted a summary of their position. This requests that the application is deferred to allow further discussions regarding the sustainable transport options for the site. The agent states that the Council has not properly addressed the Neighbourhood Plan in the committee report or that the Landscape Officer raises no objection to the scheme. The agent states that the proposals would enhance the vitality of the local community and support

new and existing services. The agent states that the concerns relating to drainage are under discussion and are likely to be addressed by condition as accepted previously.

#### OCC Highways

OCC have responded to the Stagecoach withdrawal of objection reported above.

The local highway authority (LHA) has expressed doubts whether the bus contribution set out above would sustain a service for 5 years, whether the suggested 2-3 trips in peak hours is enough to satisfy users when people have a spread of departure times from work and who would operate the service.

Following additional information being received from the applicant's agent regarding the bus service, the LHA states that the appeal decision referred to was significantly different as an existing bus service already operated through the village and that the service could be enhanced through a Section 106 contribution. There is also a much larger population in the appeal area that could be served by an enhanced bus route. The LHA states that the applicant's estimated cost is inadequate. The applicant states that the operating cost would be £20 per hour, whereas the LHA has stated that the Council quotes £50 per operating hour for bus services required to meet shift-changes at major employment sites and that the Council could not procure any form of public transport service at the estimates given. Furthermore, the LHA states that there is no evidence provided that the proposed service could ever be commercially viable. The Council would not agree to the creation of a new service which faced almost-inevitable withdrawal after a few years. There is a very limited population in Weston on the Green and this small development would not increase the number of potential users significantly. This aspiration is not backed by any form of Business Plan for a viable bus service.

The County Council therefore maintain their objection

#### **Officer comment**

The clarification from the Planning Policy Officer makes the position of the Neighbourhood Plan clearer. The 38 dwellings mentioned in the housing needs survey is not carried forward into any policy and therefore this figure does not carry any weight in decision making.

The proposed financial contribution would improve public transport links to the village, however from the OCC Transport Planner's response it is clear that the proposed contribution would be inadequate to provide a bus link for five years and that there is no evidence that the proposed service could ever be commercially viable. Therefore, only limited weight can be given to the proposed bus service as it would not provide a reliable, long term, viable service that could be relied upon to improve the sustainability of the village.

A deferral of the application is not considered appropriate given the Council's concerns regarding the principle of development on the site. Even if the required sum for a public transport link were provided, the village would remain as one of the least sustainable Category A villages, with a lack of services and

facilities. Given the number of proposed trips, many residents would still rely mainly on private car usage. The applicant's agent suggests that the development would enhance the vitality of the local community and support new and existing services; however, the Inspector in the dismissed appeal stated that there was no substantive evidence to show that these services are struggling and that it seemed that the vitality of the community could be maintained with fewer new houses.

The Landscape Officer did not object to the scheme; however, this was also the case for the application that was dismissed at appeal on the site. The Inspector in the dismissed appeal accepted the finding in the LVIA that the effect on the wider landscape would be limited. The Landscape Officer has commented in this regard and not with regard to how the development would relate to the existing village. However, the Inspector found that the development would be a 'modern estate type development bolted onto the edge of the village', which would not enhance the built environment and would not reinforce local distinctiveness. The Inspector considered that the proposal would be viewed in conjunction with the development to the south as a single development and that this quantum of development would be materially harmful to the local character and identity. Eight fewer dwellings are proposed in this application; however, the harm identified by the Inspector would remain the same.

#### **Change to recommendation**

None