

Caroline Ford

From: Paul Barton <Paul.Barton@cpplc.com>
Sent: 20 December 2021 18:16
To: Caroline Ford
Cc: Phil McHugh; Stuart Ward; David Leadbetter; Coleby, Tim; Hobbs, Jack; Tim Hart
Subject: Himley Village - updated Design Code, Regulating Plan and Illustrative Masterplan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Caroline,

Please find links below to the Design Code and the RM application.

1. The Design Code Link contains: The Design Code (Rev C)
2. The RM Link contains: House type Portfolio (Parts 1 to 4); Location Plan; Planning Layout; Tenure Plan; Materials Distribution; Boundary Treatment; Parking Plan; Surface Materials; Architectural Style Document; Street scenes; and Presentation Layout.

In addition Stuart has made comments on your latest email as promised when we met at your offices during the Autumn.

I note from your mail earlier you don't wish to meet yet. Instead I will call you following tomorrows OCC meeting, now that you have the information to discuss timescales, and any other considerations- especially the need for a design review which will delay the applications for months. Our strong preference is to continue to work with you and other CDC Officers, unless we reach an impasse on any matter- which I would like to try and avoid.

I understand you advise the applications may not need to go to committee. You will know this was your Council's original position, but Andy thought that Design Codes now need to go to members? It should speed the applications up if we can avoid committee.

Let me know if you require any further information.

Paul Barton
Senior Planning Manager

South Midlands Partnerships
3100 Park Square, Birmingham Business Park,
Solihull Parkway, Solihull, B37 7YN

Tel 0121 312 5252 | DDI 0121 312 5309 | 07880 244 022 | countrysideproperties.com



From: Stuart Ward <Stuart.Ward@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Sent: 20 December 2021 17:53
To: Paul Barton <Paul.Barton@cpplc.com>
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Himley Village - updated Design Code, Regulating Plan and Illustrative Masterplan

This message originated from outside Countryside Properties

Hi Paul,

Apologies for any delay, please find below an updated link to the latest revisions of both the Design Code and RM work, as well as a response to CF's comments (highlighted in the email below).

Link to Design Code: <https://we.tl/t-UoElyfR4BT>

Link to RM work: <https://we.tl/t-1VDKjf7hFR>

I hope this helps.

Kindest regards,

Stuart Ward

Director

Pegasus Group

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS | HERITAGE

Sutton Coldfield: Unit 5 | The Priory | London Rd | Sutton Coldfield | B75 5SH

City Centre: Colmore Place | 39 Bennetts Hill | Birmingham | B2 5SN

T 0121 308 9570 | **E** Stuart.Ward@pegasusgroup.co.uk

M 07790 543141 | **DD** 0121 796 5176 | **EXT** 3051

Birmingham | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | Dublin | East Midlands | Edinburgh | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Newcastle
Peterborough | Solent




www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Pegasus Group is the trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd [07277000] registered in England and Wales.

This email and any associated files, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person.

If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately. We have updated our Privacy Statement in line with the GDPR; please click here to view it.



Please consider the environment before printing this email message.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING PEGASUS GROUP & CORONAVIRUS / COVID-19*****



From: Caroline Ford <Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>

Date: Thursday, 18 February 2021 at 15:55

To: Paul Barton <Paul.Barton@cpplc.com>, Stuart Ward <Stuart.Ward@pegasusgroup.co.uk>

Cc: Andy Bateson <Andy.Bateson@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>, David Leadbetter <David.Leadbetter@cpplc.com>,
Tim Hart <Tim.Hart@cpplc.com>, Tommy Buggins <Tommy.Buggins@cpplc.com>, "Coleby, Tim"

<tim.coleby@stantec.com>, Alex Chrusciak <Alex.Chrusciak@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Himley Village - updated Design Code, Regulating Plan and Illustrative Masterplan

This message originated from outside Countryside Properties

Paul, Stuart,

Apologies for the delay in providing these comments to you.

I have now had the opportunity to review the most recent documents sent through (please note I have not re-consulted on these at this stage) and I have the following comments: * **Note. These amendments are to assume that**

achieving a true net zero carbon development have been addressed, independent and without influence to the design. .

- The Vision has not been updated and I would re-iterate my previous comments. You may wish to refer to the NW Bicester SPD which sets out a Vision and Objectives for the NW Bicester site as a whole. Whilst this does not need to be replicated (as it applies anyway), I would expect that the Vision for the site would be based upon this and would define it to this specific site. The current vision is generic and not site specific to this particular development. **Done. Updated to refer specifically to Himley and achieving a true zero carbon development.**
- I am afraid that I still don't see that the requirements for NW Bicester in terms of it being a sustainable true zero carbon development designed to meet the effects of future climate change are still really influencing the consideration of the design for this site. You have a set of design objectives but this does not feature in this list and as a whole, I still consider that the site is not responding to this requirement. As set out in the Local Plan and the SPD the Council's strategy for delivering Bicester's vision is to bring about pioneering eco-development which will establish a new sustainable community, integrated with, and for the benefit of, the whole of Bicester. The NW Bicester development will be part of Bicester but it should also show innovation and ambition to meet these high standards. The Design Code does not embrace this and propose ways in which to enable future designs to provide anything more than a normal urban extension. The NW Bicester SPD should be referred to as well as the CDC Residential Design Guide. **Done. Achieving a true zero carbon development is referenced throughout.**
- At 7.28 on page 84, some mention is made of a strategy for energy and sustainability. Reference is made to 'net zero ready' – you will of course appreciate that this is not Policy compliant and the Policy for true zero carbon development is the requirement for the site. In addition, it refers to ensuring the scheme is resilient to climate change but this should be expanded with details in the Code. For example, orientation (for PV and daylight/ overheating considerations) might well be important but this is not referred to. **Done.**
- The Code still does not provide a contextual analysis to explain how this site has considered its location and how it responds to context, but in an innovative way that also acknowledges the standards/ requirements at NW Bicester. **Done.**
- I referred to the arrangement of buildings and the public realm along the primary street in my previous comments. I still have concerns about this in terms of the character being created and how this sits with lower order streets. I would expect the primary street to be the most formal arrangement of buildings with the formality changing through to the lower order streets. Primary streets often have enclosure created by scale and continuity of built development and your proposal for detached properties along this route is not the right approach in my view. The street will feel informal and not define the public realm as it should for a primary route through a large development. The use of private drives along this route will not be acceptable in design terms. Secondary streets and tertiary streets with mostly terraced and semi detached units will have a more formal character (in terms of built form) than the primary street in my view. **Done and updated to suit.**
- You include Home Zones but how will these function differently to the private drives/ lanes. To me, a Home Zone is a space that would include features such as informal play, seating etc. No guidance is provided as to what could be possible within a Home Zone. Private drives should be limited and they should not be used where connectivity between spaces for pedestrians and cyclists would be helpful. **Done.**
- Various information is included regarding traffic calming and pedestrian and cyclist movement including crossings – I think these should be considered further now to set some broad parameters for where these could be required. Desire lines should be something that could be considered now? OCC have raised similar comments around connectivity. **Done. Pedestrian crossings indicated on Access and Movement parameter plan, page 77 of the Design Code.**
- The parking arrangements on page 24 don't cover parking courts and I think that they should. Whilst I appreciate that they bring their own challenges, I do consider that they can play a role alongside place making considerations (i.e. where you have continuity of built development) as long as they are designed appropriately and are not oversized. My concerns are emphasised in this regard by the layout plans for Phase 1, which show unacceptable arrangements of parking dominating street scenes and creating a poor layout and environment. The Design Code should allow for all types of parking so that future reserved matter applications can be negotiated to suit the different areas of the site. The Code should also consider parking numbers and visitor parking. **Done. Parking indicated on pages 86-87 of the Design Code.**
- I am unable to assess what you have added on cycle parking. **Done. Indicated on page 86 of Design Code.**

- Page 26-27 sets out built environment principles but I would expect to see further points considered and the Code still lacks detail on Urban Design principles (such as blocks, types, density, legibility, gateways, key buildings, vistas, landmarks, groups, frontage, relationship of buildings to one another, building lines, height/ enclosure, roofscape, scale and proportion, fenestration) and the materials choices continue to remain limited given this is a large site. Done. Further principles and materials etc. indicated from page 52 of the Design Code (Character Areas). Block structure added on page 74.
- The information on building heights does not define the parameter plans further. The Regulating plan is very general in this regard also. Done. Plans refined.
- The plan on page 31 is helpful but I think further consideration beyond the main blocks is required for features such as marker and landmark buildings. Done. Marking and landmark buildings indicated on page 73 of Design Code.
- At 4.13 on page 32, 3-4 finishes on a single elevational composition is identified. I am concerned about this reference – I think an example should be shown of what this means but in any event, I would not expect this to be commonly applied. This needs to be explained. I think that guidance for key/ marker buildings should be provided. Done. Guidance on page 72.
- Suggestions are made within 4.13 around colours that could be used within specific character areas but these are not then covered in the tables later for each character area. Done.
- Boundary treatments should refer to prominent side/ rear elevations and the fact that these should not be close boarded timber fencing (preferably following the material of the dwelling). Done. Boundary treatments specified for each of the Character Areas from page 52 of design Code.
- Materials are still limited and no reference is made to stone or timber for example. Done. Materials specified for each of the Character Areas from page 52 of design Code.
- I expressed my concern about the character areas in my last email. No changes have been made and I still consider that the character areas do not create enough variety over such a large site to create proper character. The Character Areas must be reconsidered to define areas of the site and the character that each will have. I am pleased to see the landscape character areas defined so I would suggest that these could assist with creating character areas for the built development. Visualisations in terms of a layout plan to test these should be provided. Done. Character Areas amended (from page 52 of Design Code).
- I will need to seek comments from the Landscape Team on the Landscape Chapters and the soft and hard landscape materials palette. Further detail of design principles may be needed and there should be a tying together of the landscape code elements with the built environment elements (hence my suggestion above regarding character areas). Understood.
- Consistency between the landscape plan and the parameter approved by the outline permission is needed – for example, on the eastern edge adjacent to the Albion Land site, the parameter plan showed woodland along this extent but this is not followed on the Landscape Strategy plan. Done. All plans correspond.
- The visualisation street scenes are concerning in terms of the type of development to be achieved. I am not convinced that development of the nature indicated which forms standard suburban development (particularly for example the public open space frontage, core housing frontages) will be acceptable. You have included influences/ precedent images but no reference is made to where these are – I would expect the context of Bicester to be drawn on and for example the ‘mock Tudor’ style is not a common feature in the town (or I would expect on a pioneering eco town development). Done. Precedents from Bicester included within the Character Areas (from page 52 of Design Code).
- Visualisations provided are not always helpful – for example, the indicative visualisation on page 58 would not be acceptable with the brick banding (for which I am unsure why this is added) and which then does not extend around side elevations and unacceptably large porch features that would not be appropriate. Done. Character Areas amended (from page 52 of Design Code).
- I can see that sections have been added on the non-residential spaces and will await to understand further detail. Please note the allotments are not located in accordance with the parameter plan and one block serving the whole site is not allowing for local provision distributed through the site (please note the accessibility standard in Policy BSC11 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 2011-2031 for allotments) and it is placed in a tucked away location that is not appropriate. Done. Plans updated to correspond.
- I am unclear on the indicative visualisation for the employment site and how this sits with the key principle on page 31 for frontage to Middleton Stoney Road (which is what I would expect). Employment site (Other Uses) updated (see page 64 of Design Code).
- Section 6 on Biodiversity will need input from the Council's Ecologist. Understood.

- The position of play areas do not follow the outline parameter plans and are pushed to the periphery of the site rather than being embedded within the built area. The position shown on the parameter plans must be followed for main areas of play with opportunities included elsewhere for perhaps more informal play opportunities. **Done. Location of play areas updated to correspond.**
- No reference is made to the listed buildings or the character that might be established in this area. **Done. Analysis of surrounding areas on pages 22-35 of Design Code.**
- The Regulating plan should explain the key views and should show key connectivity routes for all modes. **Done. Regulating Plan updated.**
- The Phasing plan should show the phasing of landscaped areas and infrastructure.
- I still consider the Code to be ambiguous and not detailed enough to really guide future reserved matter submissions. **Design Code updated taking into account comments received.**

I would again emphasise that these comments are made at a high level as I am afraid I consider key principles need to be re-considered first before detailed elements are commented upon. I would also say that this advice is provided without the benefit of some consultee comments on some areas and other comments may be made. Please accept that detailed comments in respect of road layouts, house types etc will be made in due course. **Details relating to the road layout addressed.**

In terms of the sports pavilion, the S106 requires that a site be safeguarded for this purpose adjacent to the pitch areas because the size of the site identified for the pitches is what is required (alongside some extra pitch area space adjacent to this site on the adjoining site) to serve the whole site. The safeguarded pavilion position must therefore be re-considered. **Done.**

I have now received comments from various consultees which I attach for your information. The key points can be summarised as follows:

- Comments have been received from the Thames Valley Police Design Advisor which you should consider and where appropriate respond to within the Code. Additional detail as I have suggested may help respond to these comments and advice is also provided on parking courts (which as I advised, I think can have a place in some cases). **Noted.**
- OCC have given Highway guidance on the requirements of the S106 which should be followed and on the layout and design code, on the phasing plan and other general advice. Drainage advice is also provided but this is at a relatively general level as I don't think detailed drainage information has been submitted (your covering letter advised that supporting material would follow separately as you were seeking advice on this). **Noted**
- The Landscape Team have made the following key points (please note this was based upon an earlier version of the Code):
 - The draft landscape strategy plan should include the layout of the proposed pedestrian/ cycleways and the walkable/ bikeable connectivity to school, play areas, open space and community hub. **Done.** Associated route lighting should be identified.
 - There should be play provision for young children (2-6 yrs – a LAP) with equipment specifically designed for them – either individually or combined with a LEAP. **Done.**
 - A buffer should be considered between the employment area and the housing to protect against harmful visual effects. Consideration should be given to overshadowing of the south facing gardens. **Done.**
 - There are some narrow development parcels adjacent to the eastern woodland plantation. These could have very small gardens and with tree growth, this could cause issues around reduction in light levels. Protection of the woodland from future pressure to remove vegetation is required, possibly with a larger development parcel in this area to enable sufficient width to be provided.
- The Housing Team have reviewed the phase one plans and have noted the provision of 142 affordable dwellings. This is not 30% of the phase so it would be helpful to understand why the required 30% is not being provided on the phase. We will also need to understand which units are rented and which are shared ownership so that we can assess both clustering and to ensure the rental units meet the NDSS standards. Details of which units meet the Part M4(2) (2) and Part M3(2) dwellings will also be needed. Further details as to the mix and how this meets the requirements of the S106 will also be needed. As it stands, the

clustering is agreed as is the fact that the affordable dwellings are planned to be indistinguishable from the market housing – this should always remain the case. **Noted / CPPLC to advise.**

- The Environmental Protection Team have also highlighted that noise disturbance between the commercial and residential sections of the site should be designed out. **Done.** It is also highlighted that EV charge points must be allowed for and this could be covered by the Code. We look for every new residential and commercial property to be provided with EV charge points and ducting to meet EV demand. **Done.**

We have mentioned a PPA previously and I have picked this up internally. It would help us to know your current timescale for the submission of applications to be able to provide an indication of what we would be looking for through the PPA or whether we will be negotiating through an extended pre-app process. In light of my comments above I think it will be important to bring in some external Urban Design advice to support the Council in this process and move this forward positively. We would look for the cost of that (as well as potentially ensuring we are resourced internally) to be covered by a PPA and we would be happy to have a conversation around who would be appointed with you. I am aware that your timescales are tight and to positively move this forward and ensure we can resource assisting you with meeting those timescales (within reason), alongside being supported with appropriate advice we do think a PPA will be valuable. If you could let me know your thoughts on timescales as soon as possible, that would be appreciated so that we can move this forward.

I look forward to hearing from you. This advice is of course provided without prejudice.

Kind regards
Caroline

Caroline Ford BA. (Hons) MA MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer – Major Projects Planning Team
Development Management Division
Place and Growth Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Tel: 01295 221823
Email: caroline.ford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
Web: www.cherwell.gov.uk

Find us on Facebook www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil
Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil

My usual working hours are: Monday to Friday, 09:00am to 17:15pm.

Coronavirus (COVID-19): In response to the latest Government guidance and until further notice, the Planning Service has been set up to work remotely, from home. Customers are asked not to come to Bodicote House but instead to phone or email the Planning Service on 01295 227006: planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk. For the latest information about how the Planning Service is impacted by COVID-19, please check the website: www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk.

This e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential and may contain legally privileged information. You should not disclose its contents to any other person. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst the Council has taken every reasonable precaution to minimise the risk of computer software viruses, it cannot accept liability for any damage which you may sustain as a result of such viruses. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening the e-mail(and/or any attachments).

Unless expressly stated otherwise, the contents of this e-mail represent only the views of the sender and does not impose any legal obligation upon the Council or commit the Council to any course of action..

To see the actions we are taking to help reduce the spread of Coronavirus, please [click here](#).



Proud to be awarded HBF 5 star rating for exceptional customer satisfaction

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may contain privileged material intended solely for the recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this email please contact the sender immediately and destroy this email. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and might not represent those of Countryside Properties plc or any of its subsidiaries. Countryside Properties plc and its subsidiaries will not accept any liability in respect of any statements made in this email. Warning: Although Countryside has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email, the company cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

Countryside Properties plc. Registered in England No. 09878920

Registered Office: Countryside House, The Drive, Brentwood, Essex, CM13 3AT. Telephone: 01277 260000