1. **APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY**
	1. The site is an area of land within the Jacobs Douwe Egberts factory site. The land is predominantly laid to concrete but also an existing tarmaced car park area and a small area of grassed land. The site is bounded on three sides by existing factory buildings and by the Southam Road to the east. Along the Southam Road boundary there is a chain-link fence with a hedgerow and trees.
	2. There are no notable site constraints relevant to planning and this application.
2. **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**
	1. The application seeks planning permission for a new car park area to serve the adjacent conference centre. The car park area would be surfaced in concrete and drained to a soakaway. The proposals would also see the removal of three existing trees that sit just inside the boundary hedgerow.
3. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**
4. There is no planning history directly relevant to the proposal.
5. **PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS**
6. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal*.*
7. **RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY**
	1. This application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed near the site and by letters sent to all properties immediately adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The final date for comments was 21.08.2017.
	2. No comments have been raised by third parties*.*
8. **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**
	1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council’s website, via the online Planning Register.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

* 1. BANBURY TOWN COUNCIL: No comments received.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES

* 1. HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY: No objections.

NON-STATUTORY CONSULTEES

* 1. ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER: No comments received.
1. **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**
2. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
3. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031.  The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the ‘saved’ policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District’s statutory Development Plan are set out below:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011 - 2031 PART 1 (CLP 2031 Part 1)

* ESD15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

* C28: Layout, design and external appearance of new development
1. Other Material Planning Considerations
* National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
* Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
1. **APPRAISAL**
2. The key issues for consideration in this case are:
* Principle of development
* Visual amenity
* Highway safety

Principle:

1. The site is within the existing wider factory site. The proposals would see a rationalisation and extension of existing parking arrangements and would remain ancillary to the existing use of the site. The principle of development is considered acceptable in general sustainability terms subject to further considerations with regards to visual amenity and highway safety discussed further below.

Visual amenity:

1. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment within the NPPF. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. These aims are also echoed within Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2031, which looks to promote and support development of a high standard, deliver buildings, places and spaces that can adapt to changing social, technological, economic and environmental conditions.
2. Saved Policy C28 of the CLP 1996 states that control will be exercised over all new development to ensure that standards of layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the rural or urban context of that development.
3. The proposals would see a minor extension of the existing area of concrete hardstanding and this would not appear out-of-place. Views of the proposed parking area would largely be restricted to localised views from within the site given the existing boundary screening that is to be retained along the boundary with the Southam Road.
4. The trees proposed to be removed sit inside the existing boundary treatment and are considered of little amenity value and could potentially be removed without requiring any further consent. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement including Tree Protection Plan has been submitted in support of the application and includes appropriate measures to ensure the health and well-being of retained trees at the site.
5. It is considered that the proposals would not significantly detract from the overall visual amenities of the wider site and are acceptable in this regard.

Highway safety:

1. The Highways Authority has assessed the proposals and raise no objections, considering that there would be no significant impacts on highway safety. Officers see no reason to disagree with this opinion. The proposals would not affect access to the site and would provide additional parking. The proposals would not result in any significant impact on the safety and convenience of highway users and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of highways safety.
2. **CONCLUSION**
3. The proposals assessed within this application are considered to be an acceptable form of development which looks to provide additional parking for an existing use on the site. The proposals would appear appropriate within the context, not appearing out-of-place or detrimentally impacting on highway safety. The proposals are considered to be broadly consistent with the provisions and aims of the development plan policies identified above and are therefore recommended for approval as set out below.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **RECOMMENDATION**

That permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.1. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents: Application forms, ‘RammSandersons’ Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan report, dated July 2017, Site Location Plan and drawing numbered C101-2 Rev.K.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.PLANNING NOTES:1. Bats are a highly mobile species which move between a number of roosts throughout the year. Therefore all works must proceed with caution and should any bats be found during the course of works all activity in that area must cease until a bat consultant has been contacted for advice on how to proceed. Under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Habitat and Species Regulations 2010 it is illegal to intentionally or recklessly disturb, harm or kill bats or destroy their resting places.
2. Birds and their nests are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), which makes it an offence to intentionally take, damage or destroy the eggs, young or nest of a bird whilst it is being built or in use. Disturbance to nesting birds can be avoided by carrying out vegetation removal or building work outside the breeding season, which is March to August inclusive.
 |
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