**From:** Judith Ward
**Sent:** 19 November 2018 15:40
**To:** Nathanael Stock
**Subject:** RE: Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Hi Nat

The landscape scheme is acceptable. The lonicera japonica ‘Halliana’ which is a climber will need some wires. I can’t see any supports specified on the drawings.

Kind regards

Judith

**Judith Ward**

**Landscape Planning Officer**

Cherwell District & South Northants Councils

****01295 221711
 01295 221878

mailto:Judith.ward@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk

<www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk>

<www.southnorthants.gov.uk>

[www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil)

[www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil

Follow us on Twitter : @SNorthantsC

**From:** Nathanael Stock
**Sent:** 15 November 2018 17:52
**To:** Judith Ward; Tim Screen
**Subject:** FW: Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Hi both,

I would be grateful for your comments on the attached landscape scheme, ref. 14/02156/OUT, 18/00193/REM and 18/00352/DISC, and hope to hear from you at your earliest convenience – happy to discuss further as necessary.

Kind regards,

Nat

**Nathanael Stock** BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

**Team Leader – General Developments Planning Team**

Development Management

Place and Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire District Council

Direct Line: 01295 221886

Websites: [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Details of applications are available to view through the Council’s Online Planning Service at <http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications>

Instructions on how to use the Public Access service to **view, comment on and keep track of applications** can be found at <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/viewplanningapp>

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) or [www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil or @SNorthantsC

**From:** Joe Murphy [mailto:Joe.Murphy@crestnicholson.com]
**Sent:** 15 November 2018 12:52
**To:** Nathanael Stock
**Cc:** Marcus Thompson; Tom Heathcote; Jim Newton
**Subject:** RE: Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Nat

I refer to your comments below on our plot by plot justification for the proposed levels.  Our engineering consultant has reviewed your comments but the previous justification provided still stands and we reiterate that the current designs are the most appropriate solution based on the challenging topography of the site.

However, as requested we have accommodated all the additional tree planting on plot boundaries and the landscaping drawings (Phase 1 and 2) have been revised accordingly.  We note the issue with some of the plot numbering on the levels drawing so to avoid confusion provide an updated version with plot numbering matching the planning layout:

       5692-01-C1 Proposed Levels (Ph1)

       Phase 1 Landscaping: 1908 11 J, 1908 12 L, 1908 13 M

       Phase 2 Landscaping: 1908 14 D, 1908 15 E, 1908 16 D, 1908 17 C, 1908 18 D (these will be submitted under the Phase 2 landscape condition, but provided now for your comfort)

On the basis that we have updated the landscaping with tree planting, and as agreed with Jim and yourself during our con call on 8 November, we request that you now discharge the Phase 1 RM condition 8 levels (18/00352/DISC) and Phase 1 RM 16 landscaping (18/00353/DISC) in order to facilitate our 26 November site start.

Regards

Joe

**Joe Murphy**

**Planning Executive**

**Crest Nicholson Midlands**

Pacific House, Relay Point, Wilnecote, Tamworth, B77 5PA

Direct Dial: 0121 435 1133

Mobile: 07769 364433

[www.crestnicholson.com](http://www.crestnicholson.com/)

**From:** Nathanael Stock [mailto:Nathanael.Stock@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 12 November 2018 10:09
**To:** Joe Murphy <Joe.Murphy@crestnicholson.com>
**Cc:** Marcus Thompson <Marcus.Thompson@crestnicholson.com>; 'Tom Ayres' <tom.ayres@rpsgroup.com>
**Subject:** RE: Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Hi Joe,

Thanks for your email re the above.  I have put comments below in red.  Please can you review and amend ramps where indicated.  Also please could you check against your latest landscaping plans to see if all trees are shown as per those mentioned in my comments below.  If not, please add trees in and send across revised landscaping plans.

I hope this assists and look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Kind regards,

Nat

**Nathanael Stock** BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

**Team Leader – General Developments Planning Team**

Development Management

Place and Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire District Council

Direct Line: 01295 221886

Websites: [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Details of applications are available to view through the Council’s Online Planning Service at <http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications>

Instructions on how to use the Public Access service to **view, comment on and keep track of applications** can be found at <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/viewplanningapp>

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) or [www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil or @SNorthantsC

**From:** Joe Murphy [mailto:Joe.Murphy@crestnicholson.com]
**Sent:** 06 November 2018 18:07
**To:** Nathanael Stock
**Cc:** Marcus Thompson; 'Tom Ayres'; Jim Newton
**Subject:** FW: Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Nat

I refer to your recent telephone conversation with my colleague Marcus Thompson (Technical Executive) regarding your 22/10/18 comments below on the Phase 1 levels.  Marcus indicated we were willing to look at these and provide justification.  Our engineers MJA have undertaken a comprehensive review of the comments and provide their robust response below in green text next to your comments.

As you are aware we have a Con Call with Jim Newton and yourself on Thursday morning when we can discuss levels and moving this matter forward.

Regards

Joe

**Joe Murphy**

**Planning Executive**

**Crest Nicholson Midlands**

Pacific House, Relay Point, Wilnecote, Tamworth, B77 5PA

Direct Dial: 0121 435 1133

Mobile: 07769 364433

[www.crestnicholson.com](http://www.crestnicholson.com/)

**From:** Nathanael Stock [mailto:Nathanael.Stock@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk]
**Sent:** 22 October 2018 09:46
**To:** Joe Murphy <Joe.Murphy@crestnicholson.com>; 'Tom Ayres' <tom.ayres@rpsgroup.com>
**Cc:** Bob Neville <Bob.Neville@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk>
**Subject:** Proposed levels at Bodicote, our ref. 18/00352/DISC

Dear both,

It is clear from our previous discussions and from the existing levels at the site that ground and finished floor levels for the development represents a challenge.  To assist Bob I have assessed the submitted FFL plans for Phase 1 and provide comments as per below.

We are well used to the response that FFLs are fixed by road levels, etc. etc.,  *(Correct, levels will always be set by approach constraints to provide appropriate access to homeowner, and within the constraints of individual location on site and in proximity to adjacent levels/plots)* but in this case there must be some give on all aspects of the development as a number of the FFLs currently present a issue, result in significantly harmful impacts and cannot remain as they are, especially in the case of plots already elevated above others due to natural contours which are proposed to be further elevated, and require steps to get to the front door…  It goes without saying that where changes are required to FFLs these are for residential amenity reasons.

*NB: The levels have been considered in detail and represent the best practicable FFLs and approach gradients for a site that proposes challenges because of its existing steep topography.  It is not the intention of the designer to merely mimic existing ground levels but, rather, to identify the constraints and to ensure that any raising or lowering of levels is done so as to provide betterment to the homeowner/resident.  On a site that is naturally steeper than 1 in 10 in some areas, working to existing ground levels would result in a design that is not fit for purpose.  Please consider the following justifications for each plot in question:

Response comments to 5692:P01-G.*

Plot 1 – this could be reduced to 109.150. *Adjacent constraint level of existing adopted footway on Cala side is at 109.812, meaning that this plot is already dug-in, with SCT/RDPC to suit and any further lowering giving more chance of water/damp ingress.  The current level and relationship to plot 2 works well in consideration of the existing ground spot level to the rear being at 109.37, and in respect of primary access from BOF and drive.*  Reasoning accepted.  However, a diagonal or S bend path would enable a lower FFL.

Plot 2 – this is elevated above ground level – it needs to be 108.60  *Standard British building practice (as supported by Building Reg.s and NHBC guidance) will commonly look to provide 150mm clearance from ground level to FFL/DPC to reduce water/damp ingress, with flush level access only being provided at primary access point.  As such, FFLs should typically be c.a. 150mm above the existing ground level, even if external ground levels are to remain as existing.  This is understood / not new information to us!  The current proposal of 108.950 works correctly to provide appropriate access from BOF, give suitable drainage falls to drive and in proximity to adjacent plots; sharing a rear access footway with Plot 3.  Reasoning accepted.  However, a diagonal or S bend path would enable a lower FFL.*

Plot 3 – ditto – it needs to be 108.30  *Current level of 108.950 works well in relation to both Plot 2 & 4, with Plot 4’s corner/BOF being the operative level constraint in this case.  Plot 3 currently works well with regards to primary access, drive access, shared rear access and in relation to adjacent plots. Reasoning accepted.  However, a diagonal or S bend path would enable a lower FFL.*

Plot 4 – ditto – it needs to be 108.250  *Dropping Plot 4 would require digging in of NE corner and the introduction of SCT/RDPC.  The BOF level is set by road levels falling at Highway recognised standard of 1 in 40, cross-falling (intentionally for betterment) from the existing spot level close to boundary of 108.73. FFL accepted.  Tree required for screening purposes between garage and rear boundary.*

Plot 5 – ditto, but no particular issue with it being at the FFL proposed.  It could come down to 107.80 though.  *The current FFL of 108.150 provides a 1 step access route directly from BOF and an additional ramped approach from driveway, providing appropriate access for all user groups.  With a level change of c.a. 2.25m from adopted footway link at boundary with Cala homes to BOF to from of Plot 5, this unavoidable level constraint has been resolved through a combination of retaining elements, useable garden gradients and appropriate stepping/ramps to access points. Proposed FFLs provide appropriate level access to primary access points, rear garden and garage access. Reasoning accepted.  Trees required for screening purposes x 2, one immediately above/north the ‘108.65’ and one below it, in line with the perpendicular boundary between 7 and 8.*

Plot 6 – also elevated above ground level and why the steps up!?  *(see above)* Depending on how much Plot 9 is reduced by, Plot 6 could come down to 107.90  *As above, it represents one element of a multi-consideration approach that lessens garden/drive gradients and retaining structures to provide an optimum design of all elements, attractive street scene and betterment for resident.  Removing the proposed steps to front of plots, where currently promoted, increases the retained heights in rear gardens, which is an objection raised elsewhere.* No – the steps appear to go up not down, so if you reduced the FFL taking away the need for a step up, you would reduce the retained height in the rear garden….  Anyway, the FFL here is accepted, but trees are required for screening x 2, one adjacent to rear boundary behind garage to Plot 6, and the other where ‘108.40’ is written adjacent to the boundary.

Plots 7 and 8 (up to 1.1m) – this is elevated significantly above ground level – it needs to be 109.10  *These are constrained by the Highway adopted foot/cycle at the boundary with the Cala development, which has its level fixed as you cannot unnecessarily retain highway, then crossfalls (at permissible gradient) towards these plots, providing ideal flush level access at the primary access point.  Drives continue to fall at appropriate gradients to facilitate a single step access to the rears, which works well for garden access and putting bins out for collection.  Gardens then continue to fall at appropriate gradients to facilitate complete use of the area, whilst minimising retaining height and overlooking adjacent plots.  NB:  Primary access to the front is currently as low as practicable, without introducing steps down into the building and encouraging ingress of water/damp.  Nearest spot levels to the front of these plots (operative constraint level) are 109.68 and 109.61, which equates to a level change of < 200mm.I understand the reasoning.  However, the ramp for both plots, in particular 7 could start from the corner of the front garden nearest the drive and proceed parallel before turning through 90 degrees instead of how currently shown.*

Plot 9 – ditto (up to 0.9m) – needs to be 109.20  *As above, with FFL already 235mm lower than adopted (proposed) verge level to the west, with ideal flush access to primary access.  The boundary level constraint and nearby spot levels of 109.50, 109.73 and 109.34 show the proposed FFL to be appropriate on this steeply sloping site. The FFL could be lowered if the ramp is L shaped and starts from the point where the path dog legs for the visitor parking spaces, then turns 90 degrees when it gets to the house.*

Plots 10 and 11 – ditto (up to c1.25m) – need to be 109.25  *As above – level constraint along Cala boundary, with all footway, road and parking falls/gradients ensuring that the proposed levels are working towards reducing FFLs as much as reasonably practicable, whilst also providing useable garden gradients and reducing rear retaining heights as much as practicable. The FFL could be lowered if the ramp to both dwellings starts from the highway between 9 and 10, i.e. runs in front of plot 10.  Trees required for screening purposes – to be sited in the garden of Plot 78 (Phase 2).*

Plots 12 and 13 – ditto (up to .1.4m) – need to be 109.60  *As above – level constraint along Cala boundary, with all footway, road and parking falls/gradients ensuring that the proposed levels are working towards reducing FFLs as much as reasonably practicable, whilst also providing useable garden gradients and reducing rear retaining heights as much as practicable. Trees required for screening purposes – to be sited in the garden of Plot 79 (Phase 2).*

*Plots 14-17 – ditto (up to 1.4m) – need to be 109.90  As above – the operative existing spot levels to the front of the 14-17 block are 110.22, 110.28 and 110.54 indicate that the proposed 110.700 FFL is not excessive.  Indeed, falls from level constraint at boundary, parking falls and min. 50mm kerb face to ensure that run-off does not result in damp ingress to 14-17, show the current FFL to be wholly appropriate. Trees required for screening purposes – to be sited in the garden of Plots 80 and 81 (Phase 2).*

Plot 25 – also elevated above ground level and why the steps up!? *(To reduce garden gradient, reduce retaining structure at back of rear garden, yet still provide appropriate Part-M access to primary access point for ambulant visitors.  A Part-M compliant ramp is also provided for non-step approach.)* Needs to be reduced to 107.95 – *this would dig the plot in at the rear NE corner and introduce SCT/RDPC to resist water/damp ingress on this 108.00 existing level contour, as well as making the rear garden steeper and/or increasing retained height (both objectionable to planners alike). This is now Plot 19, so hopefully we are talking about the same plot?  FFL  accepted – you show ramp as well as steps*

Plot 26 – ditto – needs to be reduced to 107.45  *This reduction of FFL would again steepen rear garden gradients and/or increase retained heights.  The current 2 step Part-M compliant access proposal offers betterment to said issues and also reduces the dig-in that the drive and garage would also face.  NB: Rollover introduced to reduce rear retaining on current revision. This is now Plot 18 so hopefully we are talking about the same plot?  FFL accepted.  Tree required for screening purposes – to be sited on the higher garden terrace just right / east of 1/3 arrow i.e. below ‘1/12’.*

Plot 33 – this is proposed to be built up to 1.8m out of the ground, and as currently proposed the footpath to the front door will be 1.5m above the existing ground level.  The FFL needs to be reduced to 110.00.  *The 3 x 500mm contours indicate that this plot would be faced with c.a. 1.5m of existing level difference from one corner to that opposite, regardless of level manipulation. With the garden access and shared drive with Plot 34 making this high corner the operative level constraint (FFL already 145mm lower than external drive level), the relationship to road and adjacent plot levels are paramount.  The suggestion to lower this by a metre would seriously increase the risk of damp ingress, introduce additional retaining and steps coming off the shared drive, and place the kitchen and living room window cills just above the drive level, which would not be acceptable.  The open space to the side of this plot offers an opportunity to accommodate the proposed FFL, whilst maintaining ideal (no step) flush access to primary access point and to grade away the level change into the POS.  Retaining at bottom of garden is unavoidable, but minimised, as the frontage is constrained by road/drive/access levels and the lower side (backing onto Ph2) is constrained by the existing levels around the TPO tree.  NB: Rollover introduced to reduce rear retaining on current revision. This is now Plot 29.  The ramp should start from the POS path, not the footpath, which would then enable the FFL to be reduced.  Any reduction to the FFL here would make the garden more usable.  Tree required for screening – just above the words ‘four risers’.*

Plots 34 and 35 – ditto.  At the moment a 2.2m – 2.3m retaining wall is proposed!  Anyway, the FFL needs to be reduced to 110.35.  *LTH units cannot be accessed via stepped route so these plots are totally constrained by gradient access from road and associated parking – hence not being able to lower these FFLs further and necessitating the retaining at rear.  This LTH access requirement is also another constraint if looking to lower the shared drive with Plot 33. Now Plots 27 and 28.  Reasoning accepted, but the rear garden will need to be stepped so as not to have that 2.2m retaining wall, which is not acceptable.  Tree also required for screening purposes – adjacent to rear boundary equidistant between the two side boundaries.*

Plots 36 and 37 – ditto – the FFL needs to be reduced to 110.90.  *Pedestrian and drive access levels and relationship to adjacent plots are the constraint factors here.  NB: Rollover introduced to reduce rear retaining on current revision. Now Plots 25 and 26.  Trees required for screening purposes – one in Plot 26 garden at the 82 of ‘110.82’ just SW of the steps.  Two required in the garden of Plot 25, one in the SW corner and one just above 1/15.*

Plot 38 – ditto – the FFL needs to be reduced to 111.80.  *The current FFL is already 400mm lower than BOF level, which can be accommodated by Part-M permissible ramped approach, which is preferable in the Part-M order of access preference.  Current FFL proposal puts front of building directly onto the existing ground level contour of 112.00. Now Plot 24.  Reasoning accepted.  Trees required for screening purposes – one just right of the 42 of ‘111.42’ near the side boundary, and one near SW corner of garden 2m in from rear boundary and approx.. 3.5m up from side boundary.*

Plot 43 – acceptable *Noted. Now Plot 37.  Tree required for screening purposes, adjacent to the rear boundary, 4m up from the side boundary.  Another tree required in garden of Plot 38.*

Plots 44 and 45 – acceptable – should they be at a slightly higher FFL?  And what happens at the back of the garden.  Details for means of enclosure needed.  *Proposed levels work well with drive falls and access levels so no benefit from lifting.  The rear boundary requires no retaining as the levels/gradients work from one plot to the next (the beauty of this slightly flatter area of this otherwise extremely steep site).  Now Plot 35 and 36. Reasoning accepted.*

Plots 46 and 47 – acceptable – should they be at a slightly higher FFL?  *No, as above.  NB: 46-49 are LTH units so these should be raised no higher as levels for foot and drive access are correct as they are.  Now Plots 33 and 34.   Reasoning accepted.  Tree screening required, but to be sited in garden of Plot 39 (Phase 2).*

Plots 48 and 49 – acceptable but should be at 112.40 or so.  *As above (LTH units).  Now Plots 31 and 32.  Ditto (except in garden of Plot 40 (Phase 2)).*

Plot 50 – acceptable but should be 118.80 or so.  *This would introduce another 2 steps at the primary access point and result in the 3 step flight requiring the introduction of suitable handrail to comply with Part-M (to be designed out wherever possible). Now Plot 30.  Tree screening required, but to be sited in garden of Plot 40.*

We look forward to receiving your amended FFL plans to reflect those required as set out above.  *I trust that the responses above clarify exactly why these FFLs have been designed as they have, within the constraints imposed by this site, and illustrate that all decisions have been made based on sound engineering principles to deliver the best practicable design for residents/homeowners.  The above responses are not intended to challenge the comments raised for consideration, rather, they are intended to clarify why FFLs have been set as they have, whilst promoting suitable access for all user groups and minimising steps and retaining wherever possible.*

Kind regards,

Nat

**Nathanael Stock** BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

**Team Leader – General Developments Planning Team**

Development Management

Place and Growth Directorate

Cherwell District Council and South Northamptonshire District Council

Direct Line: 01295 221886

Websites: [www.cherwell.gov.uk](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/)  [www.southnorthants.gov.uk](http://www.southnorthants.gov.uk/)

Details of applications are available to view through the Council’s Online Planning Service at <http://www.publicaccess.cherwell.gov.uk/online-applications>

Instructions on how to use the Public Access service to **view, comment on and keep track of applications** can be found at <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/viewplanningapp>

Find us on Facebook [www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil](http://www.facebook.com/cherwelldistrictcouncil) or [www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil](http://www.facebook.com/southnorthantscouncil)

Follow us on Twitter @Cherwellcouncil or @SNorthantsC

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).
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