

## Narinder Jheeta

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 04 May 2017 11:07  
**To:** Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; tim@infrastructcs.co.uk; Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk; 'Ashley Coull'; Daniel Smith; 'Nigel Grayer' (nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk); Quirke, Martin <M.Quirke@prp-co.uk> (M.Quirke@prp-co.uk); Squibb, Robert (Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk); Jared Jones; Simon Neale (Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk)  
**Subject:** FW: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017  
**Attachments:** 15-1859-85-2-P01\_SUDs Feature\_INFORMATION.PDF; 15-1859-85-1-P02\_SUDs Feature\_INFORMATION.PDF

Caroline, good morning. To summarise and hopefully conclude on this email thread please see below. I will try and call you shortly to run through it also.

1. **HYDER SUDS Ponds:** I have attached (hot off our civil engineer's press) our final proposals for the two SUDs ponds originally design by HYDER. As per the correspondence below, the ponds we have been made to work following a revision to the levels as well as the overall shape and length – to maintain previous storage capacity and prevent the works impacting on trees. Also, I note our original intentions were to use a cascading feature between pond and river, however despite best efforts our civil engineer was unable to get this to work with the levels we have in the area. Instead you will see on the attached we have detailed a drainage channel with a raised RHYL bed serving as the out flow from pond to River. You will note this is quite a shallow fall in order for it to fit in with the surveyed levels. If you recall, HYDER's original design for these exiting flows were by way of much larger and obtrusive head wall. We

We are looking to commence with these works this week and as such would hope you have no further comments on the proposals. If you do have any feedback, I would be grateful to receive this back this week. Our civil engineer has also had a brief discussion with Mike Smith at Oxfordshire CC, who returned no adverse comments on the proposals to date.

2. **Boardwalk:** We trust all the submitted information to date was to your agreement and will be looking to proceed with above Pond works on the understanding that Boardwalk will not be constructed.
3. **Spine Road Trees:** I will be submitting for re-clearing the condition today as you advised below and will try and drop the cheque off to you before the week is out. I can confirm that we were able to accommodate the tree removed from outside Plot 249 to Plot 252 as per your request.
4. **Ecological Scrapes:** We trust the revised proposals submitted on 11/04/2017 were to your agreement and will ask our Landscape Architect to complete his designs accordingly. I would be grateful if you could advise back this week should this not be the case.
5. **TENSAR Bank:** We trust the final pack of information submitted on 11/04/2017 and the statement submitted on 24/04/2017 were to your agreement and will proceed along this basis.

Our client will arrange for the submission of Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the above information for formal amendment.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 27 April 2017 17:31  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert ([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))  
**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, good evening. Any luck with all the below? Sorry to chase only keen to wrap up all matters in regards.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 24 April 2017 12:34  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert ([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))  
**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

... this time with attachment.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 24 April 2017 12:33  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert ([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))  
**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, good afternoon. Just a quick email on whether you have had a chance to look at these bits following our conversation last week.

Whilst writing, please find attached a statement from our Structural Engineer on why the Gabion Walls needed to be omitted and replaced with a TENSAR solution. I recall you asked for this a while back, apologies only just found the email.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 11 April 2017 08:38  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert ([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))  
**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, good morning and further to my email below please find attached sketch drawings prepared by our Landscape Architect to illustrate -

- The proposed relocation of the Ecological Scrapes adjacent the Badger Sett
- The area of trees impacted should a crossing over the river as surveyed be required to be installed instead of the boardwalk – hatched red are the trees that must be removed to accommodate, with the dashed oval representing a further area likely to be impacted due to construction activities for constructing the structure. It should be noted that this area would require a full arbocultural report to determine the root protection areas and to assess if any remediation work would be required to the existing trees, e.g. low branches removed. If a structure were to be sought. The sketch is provided for illustration purposes.
- The site layout and cross sections through the TENSAR bank indicated its profile along with location of guarding. Also attached is the TENSAR construction issue drawing.
- In regards to the S38 trees, this is still under review. We have also issued the draft drawings over to Oxfordshire CC Highway's to ensure the proposed tree locations won't foul any visibility splays. Once we have a response from them also I will get back to you on this.

Trust all the above makes sense and is in order. Let me know by reply if you need anything else. I would welcome your comments in regards to the Plot 281 proposals when you have a chance. Thanks and look forward to hearing from you.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 07 April 2017 17:05  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert ([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))  
**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, my apologies but I realised there was a copy paste error on my email response. Where you asked "Can it be accommodated in an amended form (albeit not to the extent of a bridge)?" my response should have read "Unfortunately not as a larger span requires a more robust structure"

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta  
**Sent:** 07 April 2017 16:59  
**To:** [Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk](mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk)  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; 'Nigel Grayer' ([nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk)); Quirke, Martin <[M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)> ([M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk)); Squibb, Robert

([Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk)); Jared Jones; Simon Neale ([Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:Simon@infrastructcs.co.uk))

**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, good morning and many thanks for getting back to me. I have listed some further notes in red to update on progress and in response.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**

---

**From:** Caroline Ford [<mailto:Caroline.Ford@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 05 April 2017 09:51

**To:** Narinder Jheeta

**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; [nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk); [M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk); [Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk); Jason Hanney

**Subject:** RE: W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Narinder,

Apologies for the delay in responding to you. I have now had the opportunity to review the planning file and the information in your various emails and I have the following comments:

Boardwalk, migrated river and existing trees and foliage

I understand from our discussions and your email that the area within the vicinity of the boardwalk does not appear to have been surveyed correctly thus resulting in difficulties in providing the boardwalk due to the position of the river, trees and levels. My understanding is that as it stands it would not be possible to install the boardwalk as approved and that in all likelihood a bridge would be required resulting in significant foundations and the removal of a substantial level of the trees and vegetation.

Having looked at the original plans and the connectivity routes, it is my view that it is unfortunate that the boardwalk cannot now be accommodated as planned given the connectivity it would have provided through the river corridor. That said, I am concerned in relation to the implications of a bridge structure given the substantial disturbance you have advised it would cause. It is noted from the original application that planning condition 84 sought details of any watercourse crossings and that the reason for this was to make sure that flood risk to the development did not increase nor the risk of erosion. At that stage, the soffit level of the bridges had to be set 600mm above the 1 in 100 year flood level with an allowance for climate change. Any new bridge would need to be assessed to make sure that it could be accommodated without increasing flood risk or the risk of erosion taking into account the most up to date guidance – again indicating quite a substantial structure. I note that the alternative route if the boardwalk were not to be installed would not be a substantial diversion and that this route is suitable for pedestrians and cyclists. It is my view that if all other options have been explored and ruled out, then the loss of the boardwalk is likely to be considered acceptable in this case. I would however be grateful if you could explore the implications of installing the boardwalk at the levels now surveyed and setting out the implications with this – i.e. how often would the boardwalk be accessible? [We did explore this and from what we could ascertain from the original HYDER information and then adjusting the boardwalk to the newly surveyed the levels, the boardwalk would be accessibly for the same period of time as HYDER originally intended, which we have understood as being during typically warmer months of the year] Can it be accommodated without increasing flood risk/ erosion? [Having consulted with our Civil Engineer, it could theoretically be however the levels of approaches to the boardwalk would need to be re-considered which would impact on the adjacent SUDs] Can it be accommodated in an amended form (albeit not to the extent of a bridge)? [We did explore this and from what we could ascertain from the original HYDER information and then adjusting the boardwalk to the newly surveyed the levels, the boardwalk would be accessibly for the same period of time as HYDER originally intended, which we have understood as being during typically warmer months of the year] What level of vegetation removal would be needed to provide it? [The landscape architect is updating the mark-up we originally tabled at our meeting on site into a sketch drawing. I will forward this on as soon as it's ready – envisaged next week] We can then make an assessment as to whether this

would be safe or not and the implications of it being provided as to whether its loss is justified (and potentially take into account the comments of technical consultees).

#### SUDs feature adjacent to the boardwalk area

I would support changes to the SUDs pond so that the feature can function as originally intended, however full details of exactly how this would be accommodated will be required and these will need to be the subject of consultation with the Drainage Authority in terms of the technical details. I note your proposals submitted by email on Monday 03/04/2017 and can only advise that this proposal would need to be reviewed by the Drainage team at OCC before I could give my support given that it will be dependent on any solution working in technical terms. I can seek informal comment using your email explanations if this would be helpful, albeit I anticipate that to be able to give a view they are likely to request further information. You may wish to contact the Drainage team directly. [Our civil engineer has opened a line of communication with Oxfordshire CC and we will discuss further with them and advise back]

#### S38 spine road and tree positions

As I mentioned at our meeting, the design concept for the main street included the provision of street trees and I am keen to avoid the loss of trees along here, however appreciate that a number will need to be repositioned and a number will need to be removed. I have reviewed the plans sent through on Monday 20/03/2017 and would agree that this appears to represent a pragmatic response to the problem therefore this is likely to be acceptable (subject to OCC agreement via the S38 process), albeit I wonder whether the tree shown to be lost outside plot 249 could be replaced outside plot 252?. I would advise that the approach to formally agree this change would be the submission of a discharge of condition application to re-discharge planning condition 31 for the infrastructure phase (within phase 2). [Our civil engineer is reviewing to accommodate the lost tree outside Plot 252 and then we will submit for clearing the condition.]

#### Ecological scrapes and proposed trees adjacent badger sett

Thank you for confirming that the locations of the ecological scrapes will be reviewed. Once you have determined any required alterations, I can speak to the Council's Ecologist to gain their view. I am keen not to see the loss of scrapes for ecological reasons, however, if any are to be lost then these will need to be justified in terms of demonstrating that they cannot be re-accommodated and that they are not key to the drainage arrangements across the site. [Our landscape architect is reviewing to relocate. Initial reviews suggest this should be possible. We should have a sketch drawing available for you next week]

#### Tensar solution for bank works adjacent road bridge between phases 1 and 2

I look forward to receiving details of the solution you are proposing for further assessment. Please note sections should also be provided. [Noted. The civil engineer is updating the sections and we will submit as soon as possible]

#### Elevation to plot 281

I look forward to receiving the details of the amended solution for the window detailing at plot 281. [I have attached our proposals. I met with the window manufacturer and also our window installer on exploring alternative boxed out options. We were unable to identify a solution which would appease the requirements of the NHBC. Therefore the logical route here is to simply replace the stone with a continuation of the facing brick courses. The immediate area above and below the bay would need to be a super-lightweight construction such as Brick Slips. I have marked up all onto (a) the detail drawing originally submitted for and cleared under the condition by our architects (b) the approved elevation and (c) a proposed elevation with annotation. We would welcome your feedback on these proposals and if you do not have adverse comments, we can ready the final drawings for submission as part of the NMA]

I trust this is of assistance at this stage. Please accept that this advice is provided without prejudice to any future formal decision the Local Planning Authority may make.

Kind regards  
Caroline

**Caroline Ford** BA. (Hons) MA MRTPI  
Principal Planning Officer

---

**From:** Narinder Jheeta [<mailto:NarinderJheeta@hill.co.uk>]  
**Sent:** 13 March 2017 21:07  
**To:** Caroline Ford  
**Cc:** W062 NWBicester; [tim@infrastructcs.co.uk](mailto:tim@infrastructcs.co.uk); [Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk](mailto:Tim.giddy@a2dominion.co.uk); 'Ashley Coull'; 'Daniel Smith'; [nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk](mailto:nigelgrayer@sdpce.co.uk); [M.Quirke@prp-co.uk](mailto:M.Quirke@prp-co.uk); [Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk](mailto:Robert.Squibb@prparchitects.co.uk); Jason Hanney  
**Subject:** W0062 NWB2 - SUMMARY OF MATTERS RAISED WITH CDC PLANNING 10/03/2017

Caroline, good evening and thank you for your time on Friday attending site. I have summarised below the key points from our discussions. The files which are referred to as attached I will forward under separate cover due to size. I trust the below is an accurate account of our meeting, however if there is anything I have missed then please do not hesitate to let me know by reply.

**(1) BOARDWALK, MIGRATED RIVER & EXISTING TREES & FOILAGE:**

I have attached the overlay drawing which was tabled indicating the migrated river route, the existing trees not covered on the original HYDER design as well as the greatly differing levels – that shown in red information represents our recent topographical survey of this area, extending to pick up the as-built steps on the Phase 1 side of the River. The migrated route of the river has been hatched in for easy reference and our designers have dotted in a proposed revised Boardwalk route (path of least impact on trees whilst crossing the river at a reasonable angle). As we discussed this would require the removal of several trees in the vicinity to accommodate. The levels of the river are also such that the boardwalk may be at a height greater than 600mm fall, therefore requiring guarding and potentially pushing the structure to be of a greater mass akin to a bridge. Our previous site and soil investigations have qualified the ground in this area as soft soils / alluvium type therefore traditional strip foundations cannot be utilised should a larger structure be required – would need to be pile foundations, the rig for which and operational reach would require the removal of further trees and foliage.

*As tabled, we would be grateful if you could review based on the original planning intention as to whether there would be scope for the omission of this boardwalk? The path on the Phase 2 side of the river corridor connects up to the road bridge therefore maintaining a clear route for pedestrians and the like. If you could advise further on this, we can complete a detailed design indicating how the path would run instead and send over for your review prior to formal application for amendment.*

**(2) SUDS FEATURE ORIGINALLY DESIGNED BY HYDER IN ADJACENT BOARDWALK AREA**

As can also be seen on the overlay, the proposed SUDS holding pond feature is currently overlapping slightly with the floodplain and also in very close proximity with existing trees. Furthermore, the levels of the pond are such that as designed the structure in its entirety sits underneath the river level – therefore the original SUDS intention won't work; Inlet to Pond is at a Level of 82.51 and Outlet into River is 82.22, whereas the River Level at point of outlet is 82.73 with the River bed understood as being some 0.6m lower.

As tabled, our civil engineer is reviewing the HYDER design with a view to raise the SUDS pond and review the levels in this area so that the feature can function as originally intended. We would seek to re-orientate the pond so that it does not infringe the floodplain, possibly even adjust the dimensions (albeit retaining the design capacity) for a better fit. Depending on how the final levels works, we may need to consider the proximity of the trees adjacent the SUDS pond allowing for the reach of our construction plant – note that from the original HYDER documentation we have, these trees appear to have not been considered or known. As the revised design of the pond is somewhat influenced by the

adjacent path gradient down to the boardwalk, following resolution of Point 1 above our civil engineer will be able to draw up the proposed amendments again for your review prior to formal application.

### **(3) S38 SPINE ROAD & PROPOSED TREE POSITIONS**

As tabled, the As-Built Water Main and District heating services positions (that were installed by others as part of the Infrastructure Works phase) have made an impact on the trees proposed along the Spine Road. The attached overlays have been prepared by our Civil Engineer using the plotted As-Built information in conjunction with the service routing proposed for Phase 2 - which have been respectively designed by each supplier and typically follow NJUG guidelines. Highlighted Red are the clashing trees which cannot be implemented in their intended positions if services are also required to be installed. As discussed, our Civil Engineer is currently reviewing the positions of these clashing trees with a view to reposition wherever possible so as to avoid losing any that were originally proposed. We endeavour on this revised layout being made available in the next few days and will forward over for your initial review. We will also be submitting the revised layout to OXFORDSHIRE CC for their review and input in regards to Visibility Splays and Street Lighting. Following this, provided there are no additional comments to be made by any party, we will submit for amendment or approval as required - we would be grateful if you could confirm if this would need to be a formal application or could be addressed under a resubmission for condition clearing?

### **(4) ECOLOGICAL SCRAPES & PROPOSED TREES ADJACENT BADGER SETT**

As tabled, in order to reduce groundworks in close proximity to the badger sett our Landscape Architect and Civil Engineer will review the intended locations of these proposed Ecological Scrapes such that they do not fall with the zones identified by our previously submitted Badger Survey. We will also seek to reposition any proposed Tree planting shown on the approved planning drawings such that they too do not fall within said zones.

### **(5) TENSAR SOLUTION FOR BANKWORKS ADJACENT ROAD BRIDGE BETWEEN PHASES 1 & 2**

As tabled, TENSAR are finalising their detailed design drawings and as we have previously discussed, we will submit for the removal of the Gabions shown on the planning approved drawings and substitute for a TENSAR engineered green bank.

### **(6) AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS TO BE SPLIT**

As tabled and as per your request, we will submit for all House Type specific planning amendments as one application, delivered by our consultant Architect. All proposed layout amendments (both Phase 2 and River Corridor) are to be submitted in a separate application.

We would hope to be in a position to submit the House Type specific amendment application through our consultant Architect within the next fortnight. The layout amendment application will be finalised and submitted once a method of addressing Points 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 has been determined.

### **(7) ELEVATION TO PLOT 281 (BLOCK 3A)**

As tabled, the previously approved detailing around the first floor bay window to this plot is proving to be difficult to implement - highlighted on attached. We are being advised by our Timber Framer and Structural Engineer that supporting a facing Brick External leaf and Stone surround is not feasible with Timber Frame construction unless a considerable amount of Structural Steelwork is introduced. As briefly touched upon during our discussion, this will create an ongoing maintenance issue for the resident of the property in that the timber frame will settle through differential movement whereas the Steelwork will remain rigid. Having had a quick conversation with the BEPIT / BIOREGIONAL team, we understand such steelwork carries an Embodied Carbon implication - as Steel is deemed to be one of the worst offending materials in regards.

In order to design this out, we will as discussed keep with the masonry appearance of the wall panels by way of a lightweight 'Brick Slip' cladding system however omit the Stone surround to the Bay Window; introducing instead an extended profile / cill appearance to the bay window. Our Architect is currently reviewing this detail and we will put forward our final proposals as part of the amendment application noted in point 6 above.

Regards

**Narinder Jheeta**  
**Technical Co-Ordinator**  
**07710 304409**



**Multi-award Winner WhatHouse? Awards**

No3 The Courtyard Home Farm Banbury Road Caversfield Bicester Oxon OX27 8TG  
T 01869 360123 F 01869 248964 [hill.co.uk](http://hill.co.uk)

Hill Holdings Ltd is a limited company registered in England - Company Number  
4202304

Registered

office: The Power House Gunpowder Mill Powdermill Lane Waltham Abbey Essex EN9 1BN

-----  
Hill Holdings Ltd - e-mail disclaimer

This e-mail and any files distributed with it are intended solely for the individual or organisation to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or the person responsible for distributing it to them you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. Any opinion or advice contained anywhere in this message is that of the sender and is not intended to bind Hill Holdings Ltd or any member of the Hill Group in any way. Neither can the sender accept any responsibility for any changes made to this e-mail after it was sent. This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by McAfee anti virus. Nevertheless, the sender cannot accept any responsibility for any loss or damage caused by any software viruses transmitted with this email and we advise that you carry out your own virus checks on any attachments included in this message.

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.

