

BICESTER TOWN COUNCIL



PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Ref: PL05/2021

MONDAY 14TH SEPTEMBER 2020

at

7.00pm

BY ZOOM

(Please see agenda for login details)

Circulation:

Town Mayor: Councillor Jason Slaymaker

Members

**Cllr Nick Mawer – Chairman
Cllr Lynn Pratt – Vice Chairman
Cllr Nick Cotter
Cllr Dan Hallett
Cllr Harry Knight
Cllr Zoe McLernon
Cllr James Metcalf
Cllr Richard Mould
Cllr Robert Nixon
Cllr Les Sibley
Cllr Jason Slaymaker**

Substitute Members

**Cllr Dan Sames
Cllr Alex Thrupp
Cllr Fraser Webster**

Other Circulation

**Cllr John Broad – CDC
Cllr Lawrie Stratford – OCC
Cllr Michael Waine – OCC
Cllr Tom Wallis – CDC
Cllr Lucinda Wing – CDC**



Council Offices,
The Garth,
Launton Road,
Bicester
Oxon, OX26 6PS

Telephone: 01869 252915
Fax: 01869 324554
Email: enquiries@bicester.gov.uk

Monday 7th September 2020

Sir/Madam

To all Members of the Planning Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Planning Committee on **Zoom** on **Monday 14th September 2020** to commence at **7.00pm** for the transaction of the following business.

In line with the Coronavirus Act 2020 and subsequent regulations governing local authorities' meetings, the Council will be holding this meeting via the online video conference facility, Zoom.

To join the Zoom meeting follow this link <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81483932927>

Meeting ID: 814 8393 2927

Password: (to ensure online security it is recommended that meeting passwords are not publicised and are given directly to those intending to attend the meeting. Please therefore email enquiries@bicester.gov.uk for the password at least 24 hours before the scheduled meeting date)

Telephone number to join by audio only: 0203 051 2874 (you will be prompted to enter the meeting ID and password before joining the meeting)

Samantha Shippen
Chief Officer

Members of the public and press are welcome to attend in accordance with the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960

Copy Attached	Agenda item No	AGENDA
	1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
	2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
	2.1	Councillors are reminded to declare any interests on any item on this agenda in accordance with Bicester Town Council's Code of Conduct.
	2.2	Declarations of Interest for District & County Councillors District Councillors and County Councillors on this Planning Committee will make their comments and decisions based upon information available at the time of the Meeting. It is accepted that District and County Councillors

Copy Attached	Agenda item No	AGENDA
✓		may come to different decisions in the light of more information being made available at District or County Planning Meetings.
	3	MINUTES To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on: PL4/2021 - Monday 10th August 2020
	4	PUBLIC SESSION In accordance with Standing Orders 1 d-f, members of the public may make representations, ask questions and give evidence in respect of any item of business included in the agenda. Time allocated shall not exceed 10 minutes. No member shall speak for more than 2 minutes.
	5	UPDATES ON LARGE DEVELOPMENTS AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES 5.1 NORTH WEST BICESTER 5.2 GRAVEN HILL 5.3 GARDEN TOWN 5.4 OTHER BICESTER STRATEGIC SITES
	6	CONSULTATIONS a) TORINO LOUNGE APPLICATION FOR A PAVEMENT LICENCE Bicester Town Council welcomes the application as we believe it will enhance café culture in the town. We would however, request that the application is altered to ensure that it does not impede vehicle access on that side of Sheep Street especially Friday market days when the only vehicle access down Sheep Street is via this side as the market blocks the main side of the street. As CDC Street Scene Officers have suggested a limit of 3.5m maximum from the property frontage the Town Council would support that alteration. The applicant should be required to monitor customers usage of the area to ensure tables and chairs are not moved, thus allowing any pedestrians and vehicles freedom of movement. We would also request that measures are put in place to keep the area tidy and free of litter. b) CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL - PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION RESPONSE Committee is requested to consider the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040 Community Involvement Paper response for comment.

Copy Attached	Agenda item No	AGENDA
✓	c)	MHCLG - CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO PLANNING POLICY AND REGULATIONS
		Committee is requested to consider the consultation for comment.
	7	PLANNING APPLICATIONS FROM CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
		Committee is asked to consider and comment on the attached list of applications.
		<i>Members are advised that the full planning applications are available for inspection on the Cherwell District Council website.</i>
	8	AMENDED PLANS
		None to report.
	9	WITHDRAWN PLANS
		None to report.
✓	10	APPEAL DECISION
		Committee is asked to note the following dismissed appeal.
		19/01621/F – 1 Derwent Road – The development proposed is the replacement of the existing part fence (6 ft 6" high x 17ft long), part hedge (7-8 ft high) boundary on Dryden Avenue, with new 5 ft high 6 ft wide wooden fence panels and 1 ft high concrete gravel boards and concrete posts.
	11	NOTIFICATIONS OF PLANNING DECISIONS FROM CHERWELL DISTRICT
		Committee is asked to review.
✓	12	FORWARD PLAN
		Committee is asked to review and comment on the forward plan.
	13	DATE OF NEXT MEETING – Monday 10th October 2020 – 7pm

Minutes of the Bicester Town Council Planning Committee on Monday 10th August 2020 at 7pm by Zoom.

Present

Cllr Nick Mawer – Chairman
 Cllr Lynn Pratt – Vice Chairman
 Cllr Dan Hallett
 Cllr Zoe McLernon
 Cllr James Metcalfe
 Cllr Richard Mould
 Cllr Robert Nixon
 Cllr Les Sibley

In Attendance:

Samantha Shippen - Chief Officer
 Julie Trinder – Administration Officer

Minute Number	Agenda item No	
067/2021	1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE RESOLVED that apologies were received from Cllr Jason Slaymaker.
068/2021	2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Declarations of Interest for District & County Councillors RESOLVED that Cllr Nick Mawer, Cllr Lynn Pratt and Cllr Richard Mould as District Councillors and Cllr Les Sibley as County Councillor on this Planning Committee will make their comments and decision based upon information available at the time of the Meeting. It is accepted that District Councillors may come to different decision in the light of more information being made available at District Planning Meetings.
069/2021	3	MINUTES RESOLVED that Committee confirmed the following minutes of the Planning Committee meeting: PL3/2021 – Monday 13th July 2020 to be signed at a later date.
070/2021	4	PUBLIC SESSION No members of the public were present.

071/2021	5	UPDATES ON DEVELOPMENTS AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES 5.1 NORTH WEST BICESTER It was reported at the last Strategic Delivery Board meeting that the bridge realignment in Howes Lane is schedule for Easter 2021. Pre-works will be underway in September 2020. 5.2 GRAVEN HILL Nothing to report. 5.3 GARDEN TOWN Nothing to report. 5.4 OTHER BICESTER STATEGIC SITES Nothing to report.
072/2021	6	CONSULTATIONS a) SHOTZ TABLE AND CHAIRS LICENCE CONSULTATION RESOLVED that Committee endorse the comments submitted by the Chief Officer b) CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL – PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION RESOLVED that Committee considered the report. The Chief Officer gave an overview and was commended for her work providing the report. Councillors have been requested to feed comments directly to the Chief Officer to enable a discussion at Council on 1st September. Comments by Friday 21st August to include in a report.
073/2021	7	PLANNING APPLICATIONS FROM CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL RESOLVED that the following comments be made: 20/01513/F – This application was supported by the Environment Committee of the Town Council, the Planning Bicester Town Council OBJECTS to this application due to concerns about safe provisions for pedestrians and drivers in the area should the application be approved. The site is on the intersection of a road where 3 vehicle parking spaces are proposed, concerns were expressed that the footway may be compromised by parked vehicles. If Cherwell District Council is minded to approve then areas that could be parked within should be clearly identified. 20/01651/F – Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01654/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01662/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01697/TCA - Leave to Arboriculture Officer. 20/01713/ADV - Bicester Town Council welcome this application and request that the space for a footpath and cycle path are not compromised in approving the application and provide for a footpath/cycleway.

		20/01760/ADV - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01765/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. <i>Cllr Nick Mawer declared an interest in this application due to knowing the applicant.</i> 20/01788/TCA - Leave to Arboriculture Officer. 20/01830/F – Bicester Town Council support this application but would like to ensure issues with speed and access are addressed by a highway safety audit undertaken by Oxfordshire County Council Highways Department. 20/01837/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01838/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01876/TCA - Leave to Arboriculture Officer. 20/01883/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application. 20/01910/F - Bicester Town Council has no objection to this application.
74/2021	8	AMENDED PLANS None to note.
75/2021	9	WITHDRAWN PLANS None to note.
76/2021	10	APPEAL DECISION RESOLVED that Committee noted the allowed appeal decision.
77/2021	11	NOTIFICATION OF PLANNING DECISIONS FROM CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL RESOLVED that Committee noted there is a software problem effecting the decisions. Chief Officer contacted David Pickford and asked if he could find a solution as soon as possible.
78/2021	12	FORWARD PLAN RESOLVED that Committee reviewed the forward plan and requested Bicester Motion attend September's meeting to present their unified plan.
79/2021	13	DATE OF NEXT MEETING: Monday 14th September 2020 – 7pm CLOSE OF MEETING: 8.53PM

Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040
Planning for Cherwell to 2040 - A Community Involvement Paper
Draft Bicester Town Council Response

Question 1: Purpose of this Document – What planning policies might we need to help us if COVID-19 persists? What lessons can we learn to help us plan for the future?

- Ensuring suitable employment opportunities, including facilities to support more locally based employment;
- Excellent broadband standards to support homeworking;
- Improvements to facilitate active travel and good public transport links;
- Boosting the vibrancy of town centres, particularly for a more “service led” future i.e those things that cannot be bought on the internet. Assisting a café culture and evening economy;
- Defined standards for housing which supports a range of housing types particularly for starter homes, homes affordable by those on lower incomes and suitable homes for older people;
- Protection of green space, preferably in public ownership;
- Building resilient communities where local support and volunteering can thrive.

Question 2: Identification of Issues and Needs – What evidence do you think the Council needs to prepare the Cherwell Local Plan Review?

- Opportunities to meet the needs and aspirations of the “Knowledge Spine” as part of an economic needs survey linked to Cherwell Industrial Strategy and a long term economic vision;
- Comprehensive housing needs survey down to locality level in order to identify the specific needs of individual communities;
- Impact of climate change and planned mitigation on land supply, water availability, biodiversity, power sources and building methods;
- The green capital benefits of green spaces to aid the protection of existing and plans for future needs;

Question 3: District Wide Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the district-wide issues we have identified? Are there any others you would like to raise?

- **Housing** -the focus on affordable housing for key workers is not incorrect but the provision of affordable housing should not be exclusive to that group. Many people that are not considered key workers also need access to affordable housing moving forward. As a Cherwell resident you should be able to access affordable housing regardless what your job is.
- It is important to allow for “suitable” housing range i.e for single people of a variety of ages including younger and older people, key workers and low income families. Provision should include accessible accommodation including bungalows.
- Having housing availability at England average workplace earnings is important when defining affordability.
- Ensuring provision of social rent tenure increases in the district, with some being protected for those with a local connection.
- The location of new homes must be carefully considered so as to preserve access to green spaces that we already knew are valued by residents but the value of access to green space, particularly in terms of benefits to physical and mental health have been further highlighted by the pandemic.
- Really pleased to see a point about meeting the needs of travelling communities. We think it's important to add that policies that aim to meet the needs of these communities are developed in conversation with those communities as we believe we don't want to be imposing solutions on them

but rather working in collaboration with them for the benefit of both their communities and everyone else in Cherwell. We need to involve travelling communities in the development of any policies that are relevant to provision for them.

- Additional housing should have a high level of water saving and grey water reuse.
- **Economy** - Agree with the need for a range of employment B use classes and think that the employment development must be in keeping with the area as much as possible. Over development is a concern here.
- Agree very much with policies to encourage and facilitate higher skilled/higher wage jobs and in particular the access to training workers need to be able to access those careers. Policies should be focussed to enable jobs with better earnings to bring Cherwell in line with the rest of Oxfordshire.
- Agree that a wider tourism offer than currently exists should be encouraged focussing on the unique heritage and landscape of the District and its settlements.
- **Town Centres and Retail** - Whilst encouraging leisure, residential, community and business space in our town centres policies in the local plan should aim to ensure a range of offerings in the town centre. In particular it's important that community space is available, so that community groups can meet together which will help to tackle loneliness in our community. Also leisure offerings particularly those that help to meet the aims of health place shaping.
- Policies should be developed to assist the enhancement of a café culture and evening economy.
- There should be a focus on reducing the number of cars that need to come into the town centre as this will help to make the town centre a more attractive place for pedestrians, cyclists and wheelchair users. This should include policies that reduce the need for space in the town centre to be taken with parking. However consideration should be given to people for whom other ways of accessing the town centre are not accessible and provision should be made for those people, for example, disabled car parking.
- **Community Facilities, outdoor sport, indoor recreation and open green space**- we think the move to larger all age play is probably a positive one but would like to see the views of children and young people sought on this.
- Policies should be developed to ensure that existing sports space is protected and appropriate sports facilities are developed including appropriate "stadia" to allow for higher level sport provision alongside community play in order to meet existing shortfall identified in The Council's strategies alongside expected increased demand as the population grows.
- the provision of community gardens, and allotment provision to enable people and communities to produce their own food contributes to improvements in health and well-being are welcome.
- We welcome the opportunity to identify green areas of particular importance to our community through protection by being designated as a Local Green Space (LGS). We would also suggest these spaces and any additional provision is placed in public ownership where possible to aid long term provision.
- **Transport** – requirements for bus infrastructure improvements as a requirement of development should also link to existing settlements and should be planned to avoid a "standalone" service.
- need to consider how "driverless" technology can enhance Local Transport & Connectivity Plans.
- **Biodiversity And The Natural Environment** - support the proposal to maintain and enhance healthy and stable natural environments natural capital should form a key assessment of development proposals.
- Water stress is evident in Bicester with Langford Brook and the River Bure both running dry frequently in summer. Policies should be implemented to ensure adequate water supplies without the reliance on additional boreholes. Additional reservoir provision regionally should be supported.
- **Heritage** – Bicester's heritage assets are locally important and should continue to be protected and enhanced, there is an opportunity to add more value by encouraging tourism.

Question 4: Banbury Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the Banbury issues we have identified? Are there any others?

No comment.

Question 5: Bicester Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the Bicester issues we have identified? Are there any others you would like to raise?

- Para 2.63 makes reference to Bicester as an historic market town, we believe policies should be developed to encourage more significance and tourism in relation to the heritage aspects of the town, building upon the heritage trail developed by the CDC Bicester Team.
- Para 2.65 references the Garden Town and Healthy Town statuses stressing the importance of access to green spaces which should become an air lung for the town. Policies should be in place to protect existing green spaces and enhance links and corridors between spaces in line with the work undertaken with University of Oxford and the Bicester Team.
- We support the continued attraction of businesses providing good quality local jobs , easily accessible by local transport links including walking and cycling; including the enhanced provision of co-working spaces and would expect policies to support such.
- **Retail & Leisure** – there is little mention of arts and cultural provision despite the public call for such over a period of time; policies which encourage the development of facilities suitable for a town anticipated to grow to a population in excess of 50,000 residents should be developed within the plan.
- We support plans to continue to support the vitality and viability of the town centre and improvements to the public realm and encourage inclusion of flexible policies that strongly support the town centre and achieve identified improvements to the public realm.
- The re-development of the Market Square to facilitate a multi use events space is key to the increased vitality and destination improvements for the town centre.
- Retail provision should be focussed on the town centre rather than additional out of town provision.
- Para 2.72 references the “annual “Flywheel” event – this has not taken place since 2018, contact should be made with Bicester Motion to check the paragraph is correct.
- **Economy** – “The Oxfordshire Industrial Strategy identifies Bicester as an Eco Zone & Corporate HQ Hub providing an opportunity for ‘living labs’ - user-centred facilities where research and innovation is concurrently integrated with the active operational/ economic use of the building often as part of a public-private partnership.” We consider that policies should ensure the quality of employment expected. We also support a reduction in out commuting in order to make the town more vibrant and less dormitory.
- We would support and encourage an Employment Needs Survey being undertaken to ensure provision for growth and expansion of existing businesses within the town and the attraction of new businesses. We are acutely aware of the lack of employment space for businesses wishing to expand for whom large “warehouses” are unsuitable. Evidence can be provided by Bicester Vision of the inability to accommodate a range of expanding and new businesses over the past few years. This is important if as stated in para 2.78 we are to continue transition to a thriving Garden Town.
- We continue to support the plan to become an important self- sustaining economic centre as a location for higher technology and knowledge-based industries.
- Given the amount of employment land recently developed for B8 use, we would suggest a review is undertaken before further allocation of land within the town for similar use, including a vehicle impact study.
- A town centre review, including the current work being progressed by the Bicester Team, should be undertaken to ensure appropriate policies for the future are incorporated into the plan.
- The capacity for the town to benefit a post COVID decline in city living whereby people wish to remain local should be taken advantage of.

- Para 2.74 references the Bicester Marketing Board, we are unsure what this is. Is it the Bicester Strategic Delivery Board? If so, the reference should be altered accordingly.
- **Open Space** – we support the inclusion of policies to protect existing provision of green space and welcome appropriate protection.
- We would particularly support the retention and protection of sports facilities at Oxford Road from re-development for other uses.
- We would welcome enhanced provision for sport including relevant enhanced stadia facilities to provide for higher level provision in the future particularly for football, rugby and hockey.
- We would welcome the requirement for new open space on developments to be transferred into public ownership rather than individual local management arrangements in order to provide an equality of provision across the town.
- The further development of biodiverse informal green spaces like Bure Park Nature Reserve should be encouraged in new developments.
- **Infrastructure** - We support the requirement for solutions to the London Road level crossing which poses a significant severance of the town centre as rail services expand.
- We would wish to see relevant policies to ensure appropriate and adequate health facilities and provision relevant to a growing population across the time of the plan.
- Whilst the eastern link road is an important project, it should not become a target to promote further growth which effectively then cuts off parts of the town from the countryside.
- Ensuring high capacity broadband provision will be key if we are to benefit from the knowledge technology industry and facilitate less centralised working patterns.

Question 6: Kidlington Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the Kidlington issues we have identified? Are there any others you would like to raise?

No comment.

Question 7: Heyford Park Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the Heyford Park issues we have identified? Are there any others you would like to raise?

No comment.

Question 8: Rural Area Planning Issues – Do you have any observations on the rural issues we have identified? Are there any others you would like to raise?

No comment.

Question 9: Key Themes – Do you agree with the Key Themes identified? Are there other Key Themes the Plan should address?

We broadly agree with the key themes identified.

Question 10: Maintaining and Developing a Sustainable Local Economy – Do you have any observations on the issues we have identified for this theme? Are there any others you would like to raise?

We believe there needs to be a focus on support for the arts and cultural industries. This sector has been hit particularly hard by the pandemic and even pre-pandemic believe there was a need to do more to support the arts in Bicester.

Given the need to meet the challenge of climate change and the aim to reduce carbon emissions to net zero, any economic growth should be low/zero carbon sectors. This seems to be partially covered by the third paragraph in the right hand column but should be made more explicitly clear. Fostering local business growth is mentioned and it should be clear that fostering local business growth in a high carbon industry would be incompatible with the aim of meeting the challenge of climate change. Support of local businesses is a

correct thing to do but the district must be part of a just transition to an economy working towards climate change targets rather than against.

Question 11: Meeting the Challenge of climate change – Do you have any observations on the issues we have identified for this theme? Are there any others you would like to raise?

We would like to see an explicit mention of the fact that new major road building projects should be considered in the context of theme two, meeting the challenge of climate change. That is to say that local plan policies should not support the building of major roads that take us further away from meeting climate change targets and should instead back more environmentally sustainable forms of transport such as electrified rail travel.

Water – additional provision should be made for the preservation of water via appropriate policies and provision of reservoir facilities regionally.

Question 12: Healthy Place-shaping – Do you have any observations on the issues we have identified for this theme? Are there any others you would like to raise?

Mental health is not specifically mentioned. Early indications suggest that the pandemic has had a big impact on the mental health of the country, which causes further strain on existing mental health services. It is often said that mental health needs to be given the same importance as physical health and the local plan should reflect this, with policies to ensure that adequate support is available for everyone in our community that needs it.

We welcome the inclusion of policies that prioritise active travel. It's vital that these measures in new developments join up with existing infrastructure and that existing "missing links" are addressed.

Question 13: Establishing a Vision and Objectives – Do we need a new vision for the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040? What should be its key priorities?

We believe the vision and objectives should reflect the NPPF policies relevant to the district.

Question 14: Call for Sites – Do you wish to propose any sites for the Cherwell Local Plan Review 2040? Please provide us with a location plan and details of your proposals. We have prepared a site submission form to help you.

COUNCILLORS SHOULD NOTIFY THE CHIEF OFFICER OF SITES TO NOMINATE AS LOCAL GREEN SPACES

Question 15: Preparing the Plan – Do you have any comments specifically on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report that accompanies this consultation paper?

We broadly agree with the key principles identified.

Question 16: Methods of engagement – Are there any specific methods of engagement you would like us to consider in preparing the Local Plan and updating our Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)?

We would request that consideration is given to the timetable to avoid consultation across August and the Christmas period in any given stage.

We would like to see a consideration of the use of citizens assemblies as a way to engage with the community.

MHCLG - Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

This consultation seeks views on a range of proposed changes to the current planning system including:

- changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need
- securing of First Homes through developer contributions
- temporarily lifting the small sites threshold
- extending the current Permission in Principle to major development

This consultation will last for 8 weeks from 06 August 2020 and will close at 23.45 on Thursday 1st October 2020

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907215/200805_Changes_to_the_current_planning_system_FINAL_version.pdf

SUMMARY

This makes four proposals:

- changes to the standard, much tinkered with, method for assessing local housing need, which as well as being a short term proposal links into proposals for land supply reforms set out in Planning for the Future (proposal 4);
- securing of First Homes, sold at a discounted market price for first time buyers, including key workers, through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system. The Government intends that a minimum of 25 per cent of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions (sec.106) should be First Homes.
- as a short term measure lifting the small sites threshold in sec 106 agreements, below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing, to up to 40 or 50 units to support SME builders as the economy recovers from the impact of Covid-19;
- extending the current Permission in Principle to include major development so landowners and developers have a fast route to secure the principle of development for housing on sites. PiP was introduced in 2017 for allocated brownfield sites and extended in 2018 to small sites under 10 dwellings. The Permission in Principle consent route has two stages:
 - the first stage ("Permission in Principle") establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle for development. This grant of Permission in Principle is for five years and no planning conditions can be attached to it
 - the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed, and conditions can be attached. A grant of Permission in Principle plus a grant of technical details consent together equate to full planning permission.

QUESTIONS

Pillar One – Planning for development

1. **What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?**
2. **Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?**
3. **Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?**

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area?

Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas

Proposal 1

The role of land use plans should be simplified. We propose that Local Plans should identify three types of land – Growth areas suitable for substantial development, Renewal areas suitable for development, and areas that are Protected.

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Proposal 2

Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?

Proposal 3

Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness.

- 7.
- a. Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact?
 - b. How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

Proposal 4

A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

- 8.
- a. Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?
 - b. Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?

Proposal 5

Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building.

- 9.
- a. Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?

- b. Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?
- c. Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?

Proposal 6

Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology

- 10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

Proposal 7

Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.

- 11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans?

Proposal 8

Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.

- 12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

Proposal 9

Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools

- 13.
 - a. Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?
 - b. How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

Proposal 10

A stronger emphasis on build out through planning

- 14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?

Pillar Two – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

- 15. **What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area?**

[Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]

- 16. **Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?**

[Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

Proposal 11

To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development.

17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?

Proposal 12

To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.

18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?

Proposal 13

To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

Proposal 14

We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

Proposal 15

We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.

Proposal 16

We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.

Proposal 17

Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century.

Proposal 18

To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

[More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]

Proposal 19

The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.

22.

- a. Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold
- b. Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?
[Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]
- c. Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?
- d. Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

Proposal 20

The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Proposal 21

The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision

24.

- a. Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?
- b. Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?
- c. If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?
- d. If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

Proposal 22

More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?
- i. If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?

Proposal 23

As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements:

Proposal 24

We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions.

New Applications Received Between 05/08/2020 and 07/09/2020

Item No : 7

Ref No : PL05/2021

Application No	Date Recd	Case Officer	Applicant Name	Location
----------------	-----------	--------------	----------------	----------

New Application

20/01505/F

12/08/2020	Caroline Ford	Banbury Ornithological Society	Graven Hill Wetland Nature Reserve Oxford Road
------------	---------------	--------------------------------	--

Proposal : Ward: South
Proposal: Creation of shallow pools and botanically diverse grassland on a field of very limited existing wildlife value.

Observations :

20/01628/F

06/08/2020	Emma Whitley	Mr Irum Munawar Khan	43 Maple Road Bicester OX26 6QY
------------	--------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------

Proposal : Ward: East
Proposal: Single storey front extension to create new draft lobby and a first floor extension to the rear of the property to create two new bedrooms; 1 No new rooflights installed to the rear of the dwelling.

Observations : RESOLVED that BTC has no objection to this application.

20/01905/F

19/08/2020	Michael Sackey	Mr Nifol Satchell	110 Lyneham Road Bicester OX26 4FD
------------	----------------	-------------------	--

Proposal : Ward: East
Proposal: Formation of access and associated dropped kerb.

Observations :

20/01924/F

17/08/2020	Lewis Knox	Mrs Hilary Dale	11 Medina Gardens Middleton Stoney Road Bicester OX26 2XD
------------	------------	-----------------	--

Proposal : Ward: West
Proposal: Change of Use of amenity land to domestic use, to remove wall and fence panels and to install a closeboard fence to the boundary of the land adjacent the pavement.

Observations :

20/01993/F

12/08/2020	Emma Whitley	Mr Paul Nicol	17 Fair Close Bicester OX26 4YW
------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------------

Proposal : Ward: East
Proposal: Alteration to the existing roof above the garage inline with the main pitch to create an en-suite bathroom to the main bedroom.

Observations :

20/02019/F

13/08/2020	Emma Whitley	Peter Baschan	3 Reedmace Road Bicester OX26 3WN
------------	--------------	---------------	---

Proposal : Ward: South
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension.

Observations :

New Applications Received Between 05/08/2020 and 07/09/2020

Item No : 7

Ref No : PL05/2021

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Date Recd</u>	<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Applicant Name</u>	<u>Location</u>
20/02024/F	12/08/2020	Emma Whitely	Mr & Mrs Hubbard	4 Bath Terrace Victoria Road Bicester OX26 6PR
Proposal : Ward: East Proposal: Single storey rear extension				
Observations :				
20/02048/F	17/08/2020	Gemma Magnuson	Mr Michael Richards	Lovelynych House Middleton Stoney Road Bicester OX26 1RT
Proposal : Ward: North Proposal: Erect a timber garden machinery store onto a concrete base.				
Observations :				
20/02068/F	17/08/2020	Emma Whitley	Mr Martin Allen	20 Priory Road Bicester OX26 6BH
Proposal : Ward: South Proposal: Single storey side extension. Demolition of detached single garage.				
Observations :				
20/02116/F	26/08/2020	Michael Sackey	1 Severn Close	Bicester Oxon
Proposal : Ward: West Proposal: Two storey extension to dwellinghouse (re-submission of 20/01383/F).				
Observations :				
20/02139/F	04/09/2020	Matthew Chadwick	Morleys Stores Ltd	E P Barrus Ltd Launton Road Bicester OX26 4UR
Proposal : Ward: East Proposal: Demolition of existing VOSA buildings and the erection of two new commercial buildings.				
Observations :				
20/02145/F	26/08/2020	Michael Sackey	Mr & Mrs Williams	33 Wye Close Bicester OX26 2NL
Proposal : Ward: West Proposal: Two storey side extension.				
Observations :				
20/02226/F	04/09/2020	Shona King	The Gallery Trust	Bardwell School Hendon Place Bicester OX26 4RZ
Proposal : Ward: East Proposal: New multi-use hall to replace the existing hall, new kitchen facility along with an additional teaching classroom that abuts the existing school.				

New Applications Received Between 05/08/2020 and 07/09/2020

Item No : 7

Ref No : PL05/2021

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Date Recd</u>	<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Applicant Name</u>	<u>Location</u>
-----------------------	------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Observations :

20/02230/DEM

04/09/2020 Shona King

Peter Meadows

Bicester Library
Old Place Yard
Bicester
OX26 6AU**Proposal :** Ward: South

Proposal: Demolition of redundant library building.

Observations :

20/02246/REM

07/09/2020 Nathanael Stock

Mr Sam Cook

The Old Fox Inn
Kings End
Bicester
OX26 2AA**Proposal :** Ward: West

Proposal: Reserved matters for 19/02311/OUT - No development shall commence until full details of the access, layout (including the layout of the internal access roads and footpaths), scale, appearance, and landscaping have been submitted.

Observations :

Applications Received :- 15



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/20/3247331

1 Derwent Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 2JA.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr V Fas against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref. 19/01621/F, dated 16 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of the existing part fence (6 ft 6" high x 17 ft long), part hedge (7-8 ft high) boundary on Dryden Avenue, with new 5 ft high 6 ft wide wooden fence panels and 1 ft high concrete gravel boards and concrete posts.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the replacement fence on the character and appearance of the area in terms of the visual impact in the street scene and the loss of an open amenity area.

Reasons

Background

3. The appeal site comprises a detached house which lies on the corner of Derwent Road and Dryden Avenue in a mainly residential area of similar properties. The property faces Derwent Road but it is the side elevation alongside Dryden Avenue where the fence is proposed.
4. The application is retrospective but it is apparent from the representations that previously there was a wide and high hedge along part of the frontage, which occupied the space between the property boundary and the edge of the pavement, and then a shorter element of timber fence about 1.8m high, again alongside the pavement.

Effect on character and appearance

5. In assessing this issue I have borne in mind the requirements of the development plan, especially Cherwell Local Plan Policy ESD15, that new development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context and that the Council's Residential Design Guide stresses the importance of trees and soft landscaping in all street character types.

6. At the site visit I noted that Dryden Avenue is a main thoroughfare for a relatively new housing development and that the housing layout had been designed with a combination of trees, hedges and fences alongside the road with grassed verges and open areas of varying sizes. This mellows the close proximity of the houses and gardens and produces a verdant and attractive appearance in the housing environment. I did notice a few examples of where more intensive fencing and enclosures appeared to have been erected, possibly as a repair of the original structures, but overall the well landscaped character generally prevails.
7. In contrast the fence the subject of the appeal appears stark and prominent. Its harsh visual form is accentuated by the concrete pillars and gravel boards. Further, as it is sited abutting the pavement there is no opportunity for some form of landscaping/planting to reduce its visual starkness.
8. Overall, I find that the fence proposed and erected does not complement or enhance the character of the area but is a harsh intrusion in the street scene. The work therefore conflicts with the provisions of Policy ESD15 and supplementary guidance to secure a good housing environment
9. I have taken account of the point that the erection of a 1m high fence in this location may not require planning permission. Such a fence could also have a stark visual impact but, even so, this is likely to be less than the one proposed at a higher level. Moreover, a lower fence would not give the appellant the privacy in the side garden that he wishes.
10. In terms of the loss of open amenity area, I note that the photographs provided show that the previous hedge filled most of this space and it does not appear to me that this narrow strip of land had much amenity value other than for the visual effect of enabling vegetation for screening. While the question of land ownership is of limited relevance as a planning issue, I recognise that doubt over the future maintenance of the land could affect its appearance in the long term.
11. However, in the planning balance this concern about ownership and maintenance is not of sufficient weight to override my concern about the visual impact of the proposal. The main factors raised in support of the scheme do not outweigh the considerable adverse effects that arise or the conflict with the development plan. This indicates that the appeal should not be allowed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR

NOTIFICATIONS OF PLANNING DECISIONS FROM Cherwell District Council

Minute Ref

Mon 7 September 2020

District Ref PL05/2021

' C ' Contrary to District 'CD' Contrary Delegated

' D ' Delegated

' E ' Endorsed by District 'ED' Endorsed Delegated

Page No : 1

GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSIONS

20//01823/CLUP	Approved (No Conditions)	64 Shannon Road
20/00837/F	Approved (With conditions)	17 Hudson Street
20/01172/REM	Approved (With conditions)	21 East Circular Road
20/01173/REM	Approved (With conditions)	2 Cherry Walk
20/01174/REM	Approved (With conditions)	1 Cherry Walk
20/01175/REM	Approved (With conditions)	4 Cherry Walk
20/01176/REM	Approved (With conditions)	6 Cherry Walk
20/01192/F	Approved (With conditions)	28 Almond Road
20/01193/F	Approved (With conditions)	17 Merlin Way
20/01273/DISC	Approved (No Conditions)	Phase 2
20/01397/REM	Approved (No Conditions)	Ambrosden
20/01513/F	Approved (With conditions)	Public Open Spaces
20/01522/ADV	Approved (With conditions)	Suhner House
20/01571/TCA	Approved (No Conditions)	The Old Coach House
20/01635/CLUP	Approved (No Conditions)	10 Trefoil Drive
20/01654/F	Approved (With conditions)	Unit A12,
20/01662/F	Approved (With conditions)	16 Lerwick Croft
20/01697/TCA	Approved (No Conditions)	Hometree House
20/01760/ADV	Approved (With conditions)	Telford House
20/01765/F	Approved (With conditions)	34 Cranesbill Drive
20/01788/TCA	Approved (No Conditions)	The Hideaway

NOTIFICATIONS OF PLANNING DECISIONS FROM Cherwell District Council

Minute Ref

Mon 7 September 2020

District Ref PL05/2021

' C ' Contrary to District 'CD' Contrary Delegated

' D ' Delegated

' E ' Endorsed by District 'ED' Endorsed Delegated

Page No : 2

GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSIONS

20/01837/F	Approved (With conditions)	53 Lapwing Close
20/01838/F	Approved (With conditions)	2 Sorrel Mead
20/01876/TCA	Approved (No Conditions)	2 Church Street
20/02201/NMA	Approved (No Conditions)	Parcel 7849 North of
20/02202/NMA	Approved (No Conditions)	7849 of Whitelands Far Adj
R3.0060/20	Approved (No Conditions)	Land Adjoining Whitelands Way

POLICY COMMITTEE		
MEETING DATE	ITEM	COMMENT
November	Closure policy for cemetery	Pending
	London road Level Crossing	Watching brief
	Retention of Assets Policy	Pending
	NW Bicester	
	Future management of open space play areas	
	New burial ground and memorial policy	
	Working of Town Centre Group	On-going
FINANCE COMMITTEE		
MEETING DATE	ITEM	COMMENT
16/2/2021	Business continuity plan	

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE		
MEETING DATE	ITEM	COMMENT
2019	Wheelchair Swing	Referred to Sean Gaul
March 2020	Summer Bedding Update	
May/June 2020	Tree Policy	
May/June 2020	Play Area Improvement Programme	
May/June 2020	Garth Park Improvement Programme	
PLANNING COMMITTEE		
MEETING DATE	ITEM	COMMENT
Dec 2020	East West Rail	Invite East West Rail to Planning Meeting when the consultation process starts
	London Road Level Crossing	Ongoing – Live issue
Sept 2020	Bicester Motion	Invite to Sept meeting