



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Planning Committee

21 May 2020

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
18	(Pages 1 - 7)	Public Speakers and Written Updates

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Lesley Farrell, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221591

Public Speakers 21 May 2020

Agenda item	Application number	Application	Speaker	Reason	Time Allowed
7	20/00377/F	Rope Walk, 106 Church Street, Kidlington, OX5 2BB			
8	20/00285/F	OS Parcel 6086 Adjacent and North West of Railway Line, Ploughley Road, Arncott	Richard Taylor	Objector	5 mins
			James Hartley-Bond- Agent	Support	5 mins
9	19/01740/HYBRID	Land Adj to Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton (1740)	Paul Troop - Bicester Bike Users Group/Richard Cutler	Objectors	5 mins shared
			Mike Pollard - Banbury Ornithological Society/ Emma Lancaster - Agent Simon Parfitt - David Tucker Associates	Support	5 mins shared
10	19/01746/OUT	Land Adj to Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton (1746)	Paul Troop - Bicester Bike Users Group/Richard Cutler	Objectors	5 mins shared
			Emma Lancaster - Agent Simon Parfitt, David Tucker Associates	Support	5 mins
			Cllr Nick Cotter / Cllr Dan Sames	Local Ward Member	
11	20/00530/F	Symmetry Park Phase 2, Morrell Way, Ambrosden			
			Peter Frampton / Mark Wilkes Director of Infrastructure and Sustainability, DPD Group UK Ltd.	Agent	5 mins shared
12	20/00286/F	Land South and Adj to Cascade Road, Hook Norton			
			Charlie Luxton/Cathy Ryan	Support	5 mins shared
13	20/00624/DISC	Land Adj to Bullmarsh Close off Middleton Park, Middleton Stony (0624)			
14	20/00979/DISC	Land Adj to Bullmarsh Close off Middleton Park, Middleton Stony (0624)			

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 May 2020

WRITTEN UPDATES

Agenda Item 7

20/00377/F Rope Walk, 106 Church Street, Kidlington, OX5 2BB

No update

Agenda Item 8

20/00285/F OS Parcel 6086 Adjacent and North West of Railway Line, Ploughley Road,. Arncott

Additional representations/information received

A letter has been received from CPRE objecting to the application. They have commented that:

- They recognise the importance of retaining farmland for food production and nature
- Would prefer that photovoltaic arrays are installed on roofs of large buildings rather than green field sites
- This will adversely affect countryside views and activities of walkers and riders
- It will change to landscape to a more industrial one despite the proposed planting scheme
- Several footpaths and bridleways will be negatively affected
- The project is far to big, too close to the village and the access too close to a listed building
- The land has community value and concerned whether there are plans for the local community to be compensated for amenity loss
- Site is close to River Ray, ancient woodland and several SSSIs. Concerned that the development would cause further fragmentation of these important sites of biodiversity.

The agent has asked that the consultation response from Ambrosden Parish Council is clarified. They have raised concerns about the application rather than an objection. They have raised issues that they would like to see be addressed via mitigation, all of which are either included in the application or would be secured via condition.

Officer comment

All issues raised in the representation from the CPRE have been assessed in the Officer Report. It is considered that no new issues have been raised by the CPRE.

The comments made by Ambrosden Parish Council have been addressed in the Officer Report.

Change to recommendation

No change

Agenda Items 9 and 10

19/01740/HYBRID Land Adj to Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton (1740)

19/01746/OUT Land Adj to Promised Land Farm, Wendlebury Road, Chesterton (1746)

Additional responses to publicity

3no. further responses to the publicity have been received since the Committee reports were published raising concerns/objections to the applications relating to the provision for safe cycle and pedestrian access. These generally support the views and recommendations of Bicester Bike Users Group (BBUG) as set out in the Committee report.

A further representation has been received from Chesterton Parish Council raising the following concerns: the appropriateness of the design of the proposed Wendlebury Road roundabout; lack of widening of Shouler Way/Vendee Drive (link); delivery of jobs not in accordance with policy Bicester 10; design of development; lack of community consultation from Albion Land; industrial park does not fit with the vision for Bicester Gateway.

A further representation has also been received from Bloombridge LLP identifying the following issues: The rationale for a maximum of 35% B1(a) use is flawed and will not deliver the policy vision for Bicester Gateway; highway works and obligations are not sufficient to mitigate the impacts of the development and do not provide a joined up approach with Phase 1; lack of improvements to the Vendee Drive (link); a Development Framework Plan should be provided prior to determination; determination of this application is premature and should it be considered alongside the latest proposals for Phase 1B.

Officer comments

The above issues have in the main part already been raised and addressed in the Committee report(s).

The B1(a) floorspace restriction is imposed to limit the effects of the development on the strategic and local highway network but is not considered to constrain the development of the site for high-tech knowledge economy base as set out in policy Bicester 10. This is justified within the Planning Statement and supported by the Market Report submitted with the application. This sets out the diverse requirements of knowledge based operations, which includes a variety of workspaces such as office, studio and design space, research and product development and testing, manufacturing and small scale storage and distribution. Officers agree that not all high-tech businesses will be office based and a scheme which includes a high concentration of B1(a) uses would not meet the requirements of the policy allocation. Policy Bicester 10 does not impose a mix in terms of the types of B1 uses that should be brought forward on the site, but the preamble to the Policy notes that the site provides a location “for science and research and technology transfer and commercial application”. As such the proposals put forward are considered to be in conformity with the aspirations of CLP 2031 policy Bicester 10 in this regard.

The proposed development must be considered on its own merits and the highway works and obligations requested are what has been considered necessary by the County Council as Local Highways Authority, to mitigate the impact of the development proposed. The traffic impact is limited by the restriction on B1(a) floorspace, which Officers have considered is acceptable in

accordance with policy Bicester 10 as set out above. Whilst it is noted that the potential to widen the Vendee Drive link was safeguarded as part of the Phase 1 development, to ensure that it would not prejudice the development of the second phase of the policy allocation on the Promised Land site, this widening cannot reasonably be required if it has now been shown that it is not necessary to make the currently proposed development acceptable. In relation to works to the A41, which are a requirement linked to the existing Phase 1 consent, these were considered necessary to make that development acceptable at that time and are considered to be committed works. The consent for Phase 1 remains extant and there is a separate planning application currently with the Council proposing a revised scheme for Phase 1B. As there is no suggestion that Phase 1 will not come forward in some form within the plan period, Officers consider it is not necessary or reasonable to also impose this requirement on the Promised Land development.

It has also been suggested that consideration of these applications for Phase 2 of Bicester 10 is premature. Officers do not agree that the consideration of the applications, which were submitted in August last year, is premature. The objections and concerns raised through the consultation on these applications have either been overcome through amendments to the scheme or have been addressed within the reports to Committee. There are no outstanding issues which would warrant delaying the determination of the application at this time. It is noted that a new application for Phase 1 of the Bicester 10 allocation has now been submitted. However consideration of the two schemes together is not necessary or justified by Policy Bicester 10, which does not require a comprehensive approach to development of this allocation. It should be noted that the extant planning permission for Phase 1 was considered and approved on this basis (i.e. in advance of Phase 2 coming forward) and has been partly implemented with the construction of the hotel. To emphasise it is not a requirement of the policy that the allocation come forward as a comprehensive scheme, and it would be unreasonable for the Council to delay determination of the Phase 2 applications for this reason. Officers are satisfied on the basis of their consideration of the separate applications and on the information provided, that the Bicester 10 allocation can be successfully delivered in accordance with the requirements of the policy. Notwithstanding this, the applicant is preparing a Development Framework Plan which will address the relationship between the different phases of the allocation and ensure there is proper consideration of place-making at reserved matters stage. This will be included in the Officer presentation to Committee.

Recommendation and Conditions

Recommendations remain unchanged and there is no update to the draft conditions as set out in the Committee report but it should be noted that Officers have been in discussion with the applicant regarding the phasing of conditions to take account of the proposed phased delivery of the development, in particular the timing of initial infrastructure and site preparation works. Some re-drafting will therefore be required. Officers have sought delegation to add or amend conditions without the need to bring the application(s) back to Committee for further consideration.

Agenda Item 11

20/00530/F Symmetry Park Phase 2, Morrell Way, Ambrosden

ADDITIONAL RESPONSES TO PUBLICITY

The following responses have been received since the Committee report was published:

CPRE have raised objections to the application as follows: the application is premature and not in the current local plan; farmland will be destroyed which contributes to the open character of the area; increase in traffic flow; proximity to local wildlife sites and impact on biodiversity; light and noise pollution; DPD's argument for relocating is not a valid reason to sacrifice the countryside.

The Langford Village Community Association (LVCA) has also raised objections to the application similar to those raised by the CPRE. In addition the LVCA expresses concern about the proposed climate change mitigation; the limited economic benefits in terms of number of jobs; undermining the plan-making process and the availability of other planned B8 sites at Bicester.

Cllr Broad has also raised objections to the application as follows: the development is outside the Bicester 12 allocation and should be brought forward as part of the Local Plan Review; planning approval should not been given on the basis of DPD urgent need to relocate and the Committee should judge the location, type and design of the development in its setting and against local plan policies; the development would result in uncoordinated urban sprawl; the traffic impact of the development has not been adequately considered.

Officer Comment

The above issues have in the main part already been raised and addressed in the Committee report.

The Committee report sets out the commercial pressures and immediate needs of DPD and their justification for identifying the application site as the only currently available option for meeting those needs at Bicester. However, it should also be noted at paragraph 9.19 of the Committee report that Officers consider the site to be a logical extension to the development of Bicester 12 and would be well related to it. In the absence of any other suitable sites in the town, and on the basis that the applicant's exceptional circumstances are accepted, the application site is considered by Officers to be an acceptable departure from the local plan policy in advance of the local plan review.

OCC Highway Objection

The Committee report sets out the objections of OCC in relation to the provision of car parking which is in excess of the County Council's parking standards. The applicant has submitted further information and justification to support the proposed parking levels, this includes clarification that the development would employ up to 264 staff (including 64 office/warehouse staff and 200 drivers). The shift overlap of these staff generates the need for the car parking levels proposed. In order to address the concerns that a high level of car parking provision will encourage car use, the applicant has agreed to contribute towards upgrading the cycle route on the A41 to improve the quality of the route and make cycling more attractive and has committed to additional travel plan measures to include the provision of bicycles to be made available on site for the use of staff to encourage more sustainable travel. On this basis OCC highways have removed their objection to the application subject to conditions and planning obligations. It should also be noted that Paragraph 106 of the NPPF advises against imposing maximum parking standards unless there are clear and compelling reasons to do so.

A revised travel plan condition will include the provision of bicycles for staff use and the requested financial obligations have been uplifted to current base figures as follows:

Contribution	Amount £	Price base	Index	Towards (details)
Strategic Transport Contribution	£91,935	December 2019	Baxter	Strategic Transport Infrastructure improvements outlined under Policy BIC 1 of the Local Transport Plan 4 – South East Perimeter Road, Western Section.
Public transport services	£14,637	December 2019	RPI-x	Enhancements to public transport servicing the site at times suitable for the site’s occupiers.
Travel Plan Monitoring	£2,346	December 2019	RPI-x	To enable the Workplace Travel Plan to be monitored for a period of 5 years following occupation.
Highway works	£148,000	April 2020	Baxter	Improvements to cycle facilities along the A41.

Recommendation and Conditions

As set out above, condition no. 12 (Travel Plan) will be revised as follows:

Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby approved, a Travel Plan, prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport’s Best Practice Guidance Note ‘Using the Planning Process to secure Travel Plans’ and its subsequent amendments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The plan shall incorporate site specific details of the means of sharing and encouraging reduced reliance on the use of private cars related to the development in favour of other modes of transport including the provision by the occupier of 10no. bicycles for use of staff employed on the site, and means of implementation and methods of monitoring. Thereafter the approved Travel Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

A satisfactory Apprenticeship and Training Strategy has also now been submitted to avoid the need for a pre-commencement condition to secure this. A response is still awaited from OCC Archaeology in relation to the submitted Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.

Additional conditions requiring the recommendations contained in the Sustainability Statement to be fully implemented prior to first use/occupation, and also requiring the proposed EV charging points and infrastructure to be provided prior to first use/occupation, are also recommended for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure they are provided on site in a timely manner.

Agenda Item 12

20/00286/F Land South and Adj to Cascade Road, Hook Norton

Additional representations/information received

The applicant has agreed to make the financial contributions requested by OCC Education and OCC Highways.

The applicant has submitted a letter from its drainage engineer to respond to the objection from OCC Drainage.

Officer comment

With regard to the letter from the drainage engineer, officers note no new information is included but that the engineer instead refers back to his letter of 3rd April 2020 (which was published on the Council's website 7th April 2020). Officers have sought further comments from the OCC Drainage engineer and any response received will be reported to Planning Committee by way of verbal update on 21st May 2020.

Change to recommendation

None

Agenda Item 13

20/00624/DISC Land Adj to Bullmarsh Close off Middleton Park, Middleton Stoney (0624)

No update

Agenda Item 14

20/00979/DISC Land Adj to Bullmarsh Close Off Middleton Park, Middleton Stoney (0979)

No update

Agenda Item 15

Appeals Progress Report

No update