

Planning Committee
6 December 2017

Addendum Report

Item 7 – P17/V056/FUL – Land south of Challow Road and north of Naldertown, Wantage

Updates:

Three additional representations have been received that raise the following material planning considerations as concerns, all of which are contained within the committee report:

- Known parking and access problems in Naldertown;
- Concerns that there will be a serious accident and that there will be conflict between new and existing residents about parking and access;
- Access should be taken from Challow Road;
- There have not been any material changes to the scheme resulting from concerns raised by local residents;
- There are no school places for children, inadequate healthcare; inadequate car parking.

Item 8 – P17/V3227/FUL – Seacourt Tower Retail Park, West Way, Oxford

Updates:

Statement from Ward Councillor Emily Smith:

"Members of the Planning Committee, apologies for not addressing you in person. The application before you this evening to put a large food store at the retail park has come to committee because North Hinksey Parish Council objected under the old process, but if the new rules were in place I would have called it in as I think it warrants your input and consideration.

It is disappointing that the Seacourt Retail Park and the West Way shopping centre development could not have been part of one SPD, and designed to compliment each other, but for various reasons this did not happen and we are where we are.

The new West Way shopping centre will include a Coop, Tesco and Iceland. A few hundred meters along the Botley road is a Waitrose and an Aldi. So this application for a Marks and Spencer's Food Hall is of concern to me from a viability perspective.

You will have heard the concerns raised by MACE, the developer for West Way, about the impact such a food hall could have on the viability of West Way and read the officers report which talks about a 9.8% impact on the West Way shops.

My understanding of planning legislation is that a 'town centre' or 'service centre' has a higher status than a retail park so it is right that the planning committee consider the possible impact on West Way.

While I wish to see both sites flourish, from a community perspective, I do not want to see the success of the West Way development undermined. It is important to local people that our new local centre is successful and provides the shops and services we need at the heart of our community.

Therefore, I ask you to consider carefully the impact of an additional food hall at Seacourt Retail Park on the viability of the West Way shopping area in your deliberations."

Additional Representations:

Committee members have received a representation from the Botley Development Company stating, in their view, the food hall use could be incorporated within the West Way redevelopment. They also consider the trade draw would be a significant impact on their proposal.

A further representation has been received from the Mid Counties Co-operative stating, in their view, the impact on trade is significant and should permission be granted they would have to review their medium to long term commitment to the West Way redevelopment.

An additional letter has been received from a local resident regarding the requirement for a changing places toilet facility if any of the units provide public toilets as part of the proposal.

Officer Response:

Changes to the West Way redevelopment to incorporate the food hall

This issue has been considered in the original report (paragraph 5.8). To accommodate the food hall on the West Way site would require revisions to the approved scheme and a fresh planning application would likely be required. Relevant case law on such matters indicates it is not available for development / occupation to be considered as sequentially preferable under the sequential test.

Impact on trade / investment

The impact on trade has already been addressed in the original report and in your officers opinion is not significant to warrant refusal of the application. In respect of the Mid Counties Co-operative reviewing their commitment, officers consider this further statement remains too ambiguous to reasonably justify refusal of the application.

Changing Places Facilities

The proposal does not provide public conveniences. Thus there is no requirement to provide a changing places facility.

Item 9 – P17/V2268/FUL – Land at Fallowfields Hotel, Faringdon Road, Southmoor

Updates:

Further representations on the amended plans:

Parish Council:

- The Parish Council have concerns over incongruity with village character:
 - The apartment building is wholly out of keeping with the built vernacular of the area.
 - The two blocks of flats (of 9 and 6 units) are out of character with the village housing stock. As they lack gardens and garages, these are not suitable for families. Flats above ground level would be unsuitable for the elderly.

If the Council sees fit to grant permission then the Council wishes to have the following in s106 payments in addition to CIL:

- £50,000 towards a building for community and youth provision
- £20,000 within the next 10 years to secure another burial site for the Parish. The current burial site will be full in an estimated 7-8 years and it is imperative for the Parish to provide a suitable site.
- £10,000 for additional traffic calming on Faringdon Road (despite speed limit the average speeds are too high),

Conditions:

- The north facing side of the main apartment block (facing Faringdon Road) is designed as a facsimile of the old hotel (and origins to the Stuart age when it was first built) to preserve in some way the past heritage of the site.

In total seven letters of objection and a group petition have been received in response to the revised plans. New representations not already referenced in the committee report are summarised as follows:

- Proposals are unclear on whether any three storey apartment blocks are retained; such buildings would be out of keeping
- Nine market units are in a 'block of flats' and two affordable units are in a separate two storey building.
- The arboricultural report refers to a tree preservation order on site. This should be investigated
- The arboricultural report indicates root protection areas are too small for the tree requirements
- Unclear as to the height at which the front boundary hedge will be retained
- Destroy a bat roosting site

Health and Housing team – contamination – no objection

Forestry Officer – satisfied the amendments address his earlier concerns

Landscape Officer – landscaping scheme is generally acceptable. However, suggests:

- A hedge encloses the amenity space for plots 12-18 where currently shown open to parking and footpaths
- Fencing to plots 23 and 25 should be broken by climbing plants
- Boundary treatment to plot 7 should be shown
- Northern boundary to plot 9 should be a wall

Officer Response:

- A three-storey apartment block is proposed and this is clear from the plans submitted.
- There is no tree preservation order on site
- The arboricultural report advises there are some minor incursions into root protection areas and in such circumstances the root protection area has been increased in other directions to compensate in accordance with BS5837 (2012). No dig/low impact specifications is proposed for a small area of parking.
- The landscaping specification advises no vegetation is to be cut without prior agreement.
- Bat roost mitigation is proposed as referenced in the report (paragraph 5.38)
- Recommend a condition requiring a landscape and boundary treatments plan including specifying the retained height of the hedge fronting Faringdon Road
- Financial contributions for community facilities will be caught by CIL and I note the highway authority has not requested a contribution towards reducing traffic speeds.

Statement from Cllr Eric Batts

“Firstly, please accept my apologies for not being able to attend in person to speak in relation to this application, it is due to a combination of factors 1) I was not aware that committee were considering this tonight and would not have been if a local resident had not alerted me to the fact as I had not received any notification from officers. 2) As I was not aware I had already made plans for this evening which I could not alter.

Most members will be aware of Fallowfields Hotel a fine old country house which sits on the western edge of Southmoor, a house that according to some has an interesting past, and for the last few years has been used as a hotel, but unfortunately recently closed due to several factors.

Members will also be aware of an approved application, to the rear for 40 plus houses which are at present under construction. Some would argue that what you are considering tonight is a natural progression from the site at the rear. However, I would urge you to pause and think before you make your decision Should the proposal not have encompassed the house with less units and the house converted into flats or even extra bed care accommodation which there is a great need for across the Vale.

Should efforts not been made to list the building to retain its exterior features. The Vale economic development team raise objections because there is a lack of hotel bed space in the Vale and the loss of the building will exacerbate this and will also remove both fulltime and casual employment opportunities for residents of the village.

Moving to the actual design and type of properties proposed, I welcome especially the smaller size dwelling which there is a need for in the village. The reduction in the number of affordable homes is to say the least regrettable and the reasons for are even more disappointing, whilst Kingston Bagpuize and Southmoor has taken is fair

share of houses over the last few years very few have been of the smaller size affordable homes.

I find the design layout and mix of properties reasonably acceptable, but question the need for a 3-storey building containing large flats again is there a need for them in the village.

Landscaping needs to be well designed and sympathetic to the surrounding semi-rural setting.

I am content with the infrastructure proposals however I would ask that OCC be approached to agree to 106 funding for bus service enhancement to be directed to the 15 Abingdon to Witney Service which with the expansion of the village is becoming a more used service.

Whilst the report mentions requests for Parish amenities will be delivered from CIL contributions in the report no actual figure is given, this would be helpful to the parish as they seek other funding for the projects.

Whilst this application seems quite straight forward on paper I urge members to consider my comments and that of others before accepting the officer's recommendations.

Cllr Eric Batts"

Item 10 – P17/V2898/FUL – Land north of Mably Way, Grove

Update:

This application has been withdrawn from the agenda and will not be considered.

Item 12 – P17/V2884/FUL – Land at Park Farm, East Challow

Update:

Following a request from Councillor Constance I have again raised the concerns of the Parish Council and objectors with the highway authority. The highway authority response received is summarised as follows:

- The proposal for a large roundabout access junction was 'over-engineered' and modified to reduce its size. Even then, some local residents considered the roundabout out of keeping with the rural vernacular of the village.
- Subsequent details of the proposed roundabout submitted have demonstrated that the roundabout junction could not be designed to be compliant with required standards and therefore significant departures from those standards would be necessary to avoid very extensive reconstruction works along a substantial length of A417, probably requiring road closure. Therefore, it became apparent that in design and construction terms, the proposed access works were not deliverable.

- Adopted local plan policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely.
- The highway authority has considered right hand turn lane junctions proposed in highway and transport terms and has concluded that the revised proposals are acceptable in principle. The applicant has confirmed that the revised proposals would be deliverable in accordance with design standards.
- Whilst a roundabout would create a physical imposition to traffic, thereby causing it to slow down, this form of access was not an essential requirement and the creation of a sub-standard junction on A417 could not be considered acceptable.
- The access arrangement now proposed would include informal crossing points with central refuges which would assist pedestrians crossing the road. In addition to the access junction works, the highway authority has required that a reduction in the statutory speed limit on A417 to 30 mph would be implemented, at the developer's expense. This, together with both new and improved footway provisions and a formal pedestrian crossing, are very significant measures in seeking to improve safety along this section of A417 between Wantage and East Challow. Enhanced village signing and gateway features could also be provided to emphasize the built up nature of the environment.
- These comments do not revise my previous transport advice.

Item 11 – P17/V2565/HH - 6 Springfield Drive, Abingdon

No updates.