East Area Planning Committee 8 April 2015

Application Number: 14/02940/OUT

Decision Due by: 22 January 2015

Proposal: Outline planning application (with all matters reserved) seeking permission for up to 270 residential dwellings of 1 to 4 bedrooms on 2 to 5 floors to incorporate a maximum of 104 houses and 166 flats. Provision of car parking, cycle and bin storage, landscaping and ancillary works.

Site Address: Littlemore Park, Armstrong Road (**site plan**)

Ward: Littlemore

Agent: N/A **Applicant:** Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust

---

Recommendation:

The East Area Planning Committee is recommended to grant outline planning permission, subject to the satisfactory completion of an accompanying legal agreement and to delegate to the Head of City Development the issuing of the Notice of Permission upon its completion.

Reasons for Approval

1 The proposed development is submitted in outline form with all matters such as access, landscape, scale, appearance, and layout reserved for a later date. The proposed development would make an efficient use of an allocated development site to provide much needed good quality affordable and market housing in a manner that would establish a balanced and mixed community within the existing residential suburb of Littlemore. Although the site is primarily allocated for employment, the Oxford University Hospital NHS Trust has demonstrated that an equivalent amount of B1 employment (employees) could be delivered at the Churchill Hospital site to enable the application site to be used for residential purposes. The illustrative masterplan has demonstrated that the quantum of development could be provided in a manner that subject to minor alterations to the layout would create a coherent sense of place suitable scale and appearance to establish a single neighbourhood that is well integrated into the urban fabric of the surrounding residential area without having an impact upon adjacent residential developments. The application has demonstrated that it would not have an adverse impact in highway safety terms and could provide sufficient off-street cycle and car parking, and pedestrian and cycle links that improve

accessibility to the surrounding network. The outline application contains sufficient supporting information to demonstrate that it would not have an impact upon biodiversity; trees; archaeology; flood risk; drainage; air quality; land contamination; or noise that could not be mitigated through the reserved matters applications subject to appropriate measures being secured by condition or associated legal agreements. The proposal would accord with the overall aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant policies of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, and Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026.

2 Officers have considered carefully all objections to these proposals. Officers have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officers report, that the objections do not amount, individually or cumulatively, to a reason for refusal and that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.

3 The Council considers that the proposal accords with the policies of the development plan as summarised below. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity. Any material harm that the development would otherwise give rise to can be offset by the conditions imposed.

Conditions

1 Time Limit for Commencement
2 Approved plans and documents
3 Reserved Matters Applications
4 Phasing of Development
5 Details of all external materials
6 Landscaping and Public Realm
7 Tree Protection Plan
8 Landscape Management Plan
9 Site Layout to incorporate space for links to the Science Park and wider area
10 Ecological Mitigation, Compensation, and Management Plan
11 Lifetime Homes Standards
12 Car Parking Standards
13 Cycle Parking Standards
14 Sustainability and Energy Strategy
15 Site Wide Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy
16 Archaeology - evaluation
17 Noise Attenuation Measures
18 Flood Risk Assessment Mitigation Measure
19 Contaminated Land - Risk Assessment
20 Contaminated Land - Verification Report
21 Contaminated Land - Unsuspected Contamination
22 Contaminated Land - Foundation Design and Piling
23 Secured By Design Measures
24 Highways - Details of access roads
25 Highways - Construction Traffic Management Plan
26 Highways - Travel Plan

27 Details of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
28 Withdrawal of Permitted Development Right

Legal Agreement:

- Affordable housing
- Employment Land Swap – Churchill Site
- Management of Linear Park
- Bio-diversity off-setting
- Future proof pedestrian / cycle links
- Financial contribution of £50,0000 towards general sports and leisure facilities within Littlemore
- Financial contribution of £795 per dwelling towards Public Transport Improvement.

Principal Planning Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016
CP1 - Development Proposals
CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density
CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context
CP9 - Creating Successful New Places
CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs
CP11 - Landscape Design
CP13 - Accessibility
CP14 - Public Art
CP17 - Recycled Materials
CP19 - Nuisance
CP20 - Lighting
CP21 - Noise
CP22 - Contaminated Land
CP23 - Air Quality Management Areas
TR1 - Transport Assessment
TR2 - Travel Plans
NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows
NE16 - Protected Trees
NE20 - Wildlife Corridors
HE2 - Archaeology

Core Strategy
CS2_ - Previously developed and greenfield land
CS9_ - Energy and natural resources
CS11_ - Flooding
CS12_ - Biodiversity
CS13_ - Supporting access to new development
CS14_ - Supporting city-wide movement
CS17_ - Infrastructure and developer contributions
CS18_ - Urban design, town character, historic environment
CS19_ - Community safety
CS22_ - Level of housing growth

CS23_ - Mix of housing
CS24_ - Affordable housing
CS28_ - Employment sites
CS30_ - Hospitals and medical research
HP16_ - Residential car parking

Sites and Housing Plan
HP2_ - Accessible and Adaptable Homes
HP3_ - Affordable Homes from Large Housing Sites
HP9_ - Design, Character and Context
HP11_ - Low Carbon Homes
HP12_ - Indoor Space
HP13_ - Outdoor Space
HP14_ - Privacy and Daylight
HP15_ - Residential cycle parking
SP30_ - Littlemore Park, Armstrong Road
SP8_ – Churchill Hospital Site and Ambulance Research Centre

Other Planning Documents
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations SPD
- Balance of Dwellings SPD
- Natural Resource Impact Analysis SPD
- Parking Standards SPD
- Accessible Homes Technical Advice Note
- Energy Statement Technical Advice Note
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule

Planning History

93/00391/NOY - Demolition of some buildings on the site, retention of other buildings & change of use from hospital to B1 and outline application for erection of buildings to provide 22,575 sq. m Business Use Class B1 & associated leisure facilities, new access to Sandford Rd (Amended Plans): Approved

07/02314/FUL - Proposed two storey building for new research premises and ancillary uses, (including some clinical work, and associated teaching) for the Institute of Reproductive Sciences. Plant room, storage, car and cycle parking, access to Armstrong Road and landscaping (Amended Plans): Approved

Public Consultation

A summary of all comments received from statutory and third party consultees are set out in **Appendix 2** of this report.

Pre-Application Discussions / Oxford Design Review Panel

The applicant undertook detailed pre-application discussions through a series of meetings with Oxford City Council and a public exhibition at Littlemore Village Hall on

the 14th August 2014.

The proposal has also been reviewed by the Oxford Design Review Panel on the 8th May 2014 and the 18th September 2014. The responses are enclosed in **Appendix 3** of this report.

Officers Assessment:

Background to Proposals

1. The application relates to approximately 6.28ha of open land in the south-western corner of Littlemore and close to Sandford-on-Thames which is accessed from Armstrong Road. The site is bordered by Armstrong Road to the north, A4074 to the south-west, Littlemore Brook to the south-east, and Sandford Road to the north-west (**site plan**)

2. The site is owned by the Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust and was formerly part of the Littlemore Hospital site. It comprises open ground which is covered in rough grass, scrub, and hedgerows. There is a dense copse of trees in the north-west corner adjacent to Sandford Road, and a smaller copse in the central part of the site adjacent to Armstrong Road.

3. Beyond the site boundaries the residential development at St Georges Manor and the SAE Institute lie to the north which were formed from the former Littlemore Hospital buildings. The Oxford Science Park lies to the south-east on the opposite side of the Littlemore Brook. The 'Oxford Nursery' children's nursery is in the north-western section of the site but does not form part of this application.

4. The proposal is seeking outline planning permission for a residential development of up to 270 (1 to 4 bed) units comprising 104 dwellinghouses and 166 flats, provision of car parking, refuse storage and ancillary works.

5. The application is made in outline form with all matters such as access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale reserved for a later date should outline permission be granted.

6. An indicative masterplan has been included with the application to demonstrate how the quantum of development could be delivered on the site through a range of dwelling types and buildings of up to five storeys. The masterplan also provides details of the landscaping strategy, public and private open space, infrastructure, access, and parking strategy.

7. Officers consider the principal determining issues in this case to be:
   - Principle of Development
   - Residential Development
   - Employment
   - Site Layout and Built Form
   - Transport
   - Archaeology
   - Landscaping

- Biodiversity
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Sustainability
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Other Matters

Principle of Development

8. The National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of previously developed land. This is supported by Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS2 which states that development of Greenfield sites will only be allowed where they are specifically allocated within the Local Development Framework or required to maintain a five-year rolling housing-land supply in accordance with Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS22.

9. The site does not constitute previously developed land but is allocated for development in Sites and Housing Plan Policy SP30. The site is allocated for employment (Class B1) use but does support residential development as an alternative provided an equivalent amount of B1 employment (employees) is created elsewhere in Oxford. The policy also lists the following criteria which would need to be addressed in any proposal.
   - Pedestrian and cycle links should be enhanced through and to the site, including to Oxford Science Park
   - The playing field should be re-provided or a contribution made to another facility
   - A biodiversity survey will be expected to ensure that development would have no adverse impact on any UKBAP habitat

10. The way in which the outline application has responded to these points will be discussed in more detail throughout this report. However, the sites allocation would support the general principle of residential use despite it not constituting previously developed land in accordance with Oxford Core Strategy Policies CS2.

Residential Development

11. Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS23 requires residential developments to create a balanced and mixed community in order to meet future household need. The Balance of Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (BoDSPD) identifies the site as being within the Littlemore Neighbourhood Area and provides guidance on the mix of units expected from a 'strategic site' of this size.

12. The application is seeking permission for up to 270 units, which according to the masterplan would be made up of the following dwelling types - 1 beds (15%), 2 beds (30%), 3 beds (40%), and 4+ beds (15%). This mix of units would satisfy the aims of Core Strategy Policy CS23 and the BoDSPD.

13. The Core Strategy recognises that the provision of affordable homes is a key priority in creating sustainable mixed use communities. Sites and Housing Plan Policy HP3 requires sites with a capacity for 10 or more dwellings or with an area of 0.25ha or greater to provide a minimum 50% affordable homes on site.

14. The planning statement submitted with the application states that the scheme is capable of providing 50% affordable housing but recognises that the policy indicates that this threshold can be reduced where it can be demonstrated that it would make the scheme unviable. The applicant has not advanced any such justification and therefore officers would seek 50% affordable housing on site in accordance with the policy.

15. The Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (AHPOSPD) specifies the preferred mix of dwelling sizes for the social rented and intermediate housing within the on-site provision. The affordable housing provision would need to be secured by a legal agreement which agrees the proportion, tenure mix, and dwelling sizes within those tenures under the above-mentioned policy requirements. This would need to specify the following

- A minimum of 50% affordable units (80% social rent / 20% intermediate housing) as defined by the Sites and Housing Plan and AHPOSPD
- The mix of dwelling sizes within those tenures to be Social Rent – 1 bed (0-10%), 2 bed (15-25%), 3 Bed (35-45%), 4 bed (10-20%) and Intermediate Housing - 1 bed (0-10%), 2 bed (5-15%), 3 Bed (0-10%), 4 bed (0%) in accordance with the Sites and Housing Plan and AHPOSPD
- The minimum floor space for the on-site affordable homes within the proposed development to accord with the Sites and Housing Plan and the AHPOSPD
- The phasing and distribution of the affordable housing
- The arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider [or the management of the affordable housing (if no RSL involved)

16. The Sites and Housing Plan prescribes the standards for residential accommodation. Policy HP2 requires all residential development to be designed to Lifetime Homes Standards, with at least 5% of all new dwellings in schemes of this size to be fully wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for full wheelchair use and at least 50% of these to be provided as open market dwellings. Policies HP12, HP13, and HP14 set the indoor and outdoor space requirements for dwellings. This is an outline application which has sought to reserve the layout of the development for a later stage, and so details of the internal and external layouts for the proposed dwellings within the scheme are not included. The planning statement recognises that any reserved matters application will need to ensure that the dwellings satisfy the relevant housing policies of the Sites and Housing Plan.

Employment

17. The site is allocated for employment (Class B1) use within the Sites and Housing Plan, but does state that residential use could be supported provided an equivalent amount of B1 employment (employees) provision is created elsewhere within Oxford.

18. The site is owned by the Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust. The Trust is developing a strategy to make best use of its existing assets such as the current

hospital sites in order to meet its long term aims to improve clinical services and generate new employment. The supporting text to Policy SP30 acknowledges that the Trust has a preference to focus employment proposals that are linked to the hospitals and medical research on their existing hospital sites and if this is achieved then the Littlemore Park site would be better suited to residential development given the demand for housing within the city.

19. The Churchill Hospital site is allocated for further hospital related uses and employment (B1 (b), B1(c), and B2) use amongst others in Sites and Housing Plan Policy SP8. The policy recognises that this site is currently developed at a low density with scope to increase capacity through appropriate redevelopment that makes a more efficient use of land. It also recognises that the site would be better developed for employment uses such as research facilities which have a particular need to be located close to the hospital.

20. The outline application is seeking permission for residential use on the basis that an equivalent level of employment (employees) could be created at the Churchill Hospital site. The ability to develop the application site for housing would enable the capital receipts from its disposal to be reinvested in the provision of patient services in Oxford, whereas at the present time the Trust pay a capital charge to the NHS for the retention of this undeveloped asset.

21. In terms of employment density the planning statement states that Littlemore Park has a developable area of approximately 4.86ha. In 2007, planning permission was granted for 1,899m² of B1 (b) floorspace over 0.71ha under reference 07/02314/FUL. This was never implemented but the figures suggest that on a pro rata basis a total of approximately 13,007m² of employment floorspace would be achievable at Littlemore Park, which according to the 'Homes and Communities Agency Employment Density Guidance' could generate approximately 1300 B1(a), 450 B1(b), and 280 (B1c) employees per respective use.

22. The Trust is currently developing a masterplan for the Churchill Hospital and proposes to separate the site into 3 zones; Clinical / Patient Use; Research & Development and Employment; and Residential. The Employment Zone comprises the existing low density inter-war buildings and has an area of approximately 7ha. This area could potentially provide approximately 18,723m² of B1(b) floorspace using the same 2007 application for B1(b) floorspace at Littlemore Park as the basis of the calculation. This would suggest that there is capacity to provide approximately 1,872 B1(a), 650 B1(b), and 398 (B1 (c) employees which would exceed those estimated at Littlemore Park.

23. Officers consider that these figures represent reasonable assumptions about the employment levels likely to be generated on the Churchill site. Therefore the applicant has demonstrated that the requirement of Policy SP30 could be fulfilled to enable the redevelopment of Littlemore Park for residential use. This would need to be subject to the completion of a suitable legal agreement that sets out the proposed mechanism for securing the delivery of the new employment uses on the Churchill Hospital site.

Site Layout and Built Form

24. The outline application reserves all matters relating to appearance, layout, and scale of the development for a later date. Nevertheless, the application is accompanied by an indicative masterplan which sets out how the development is anticipated to be laid out at reserved matters stage.

25. The site is best viewed in two parts with the western and north-eastern areas separated by the open space between Littlemore Brook and the pinch point of Armstrong Road.

26. Layout: The illustrative masterplan has shown a residential development at a density of approximately 43 dwellings per hectare. This would be formed through a mixture of terraced dwellings and individual apartment buildings that are arranged around a clearly defined street structure. The layout has a clear public/private realm relationship with buildings facing onto the public realm and private rear gardens that are either back to back or enclosed by boundary walls. The scheme will also employ a home zone in the north-east section in order to encourage pedestrian activity and reduce car speeds. The parking strategy includes undercroft parking for apartment blocks, private parking through garages and bays to the fronts of properties, and on-street parking and visitor parking areas.

27. The Oxford Design Review Panel has commended the distinct site layout of terraced houses around a well-defined street pattern. However the panel has recommended that the layout could be more aligned between the north-eastern and western sections to achieve a single neighbourhood. In particular the street layout to the west should be repeated to the north-east. The rows of terraced housing could be extended closer to Armstrong Road to provide more space to deliver the quantum of houses throughout the site and enable the three houses to the south of the nursery to be incorporated into the scheme rather than being isolated from the development. The siting of the apartment buildings adjacent to the public open space in the north-eastern section provide good passive surveillance of the open space but the blocks to the south of the western edge do not overlook the public spaces. The residential character as an attractive and safe place to live would be improved by employing Home Zones across the entire site rather than just the north-eastern section. The mixture of undercroft, street, and private bay parking would help to reduce the impact of cars across the scheme and make parking areas more legible for residents and visitors. The large parking area alongside the A4074 is likely to feel unsafe for both residents and visitors especially at night. These spaces should be incorporated into the development between the terraces and apartment blocks to create more activity, ensuring that parking is overlooked. Similarly the undercroft parking would need to be designed appropriately to ensure that the frontages of the apartment blocks have sufficient activity at street level.

28. Officers support the recommendations of the Design Panel. The layout in the western section is clearly stronger than the north-eastern section which would benefit from a more defined street structure and the same back to back relationship rather than having a home zone creating an area of public space

between rear gardens. The three dwellings to the south of the nursery are isolated and compromise the pedestrian entrance to the site from the copse in the western corner. The home zone concept is welcomed but it is not clear why this has been employed in one small section of the development rather than the whole site. The parking strategy provides a good starting point but needs developing especially the visitor parking areas alongside the A4074 which could attract anti-social behaviour. The layout of the apartment blocks in the western section should be orientated to achieve surveillance of the open spaces. In this regard it is important to bear in mind that the submitted Masterplan is illustrative only of how the site could be laid out, and that all matters are reserved for further consideration at Reserved Matters stage but with the 'parameter plans' providing a framework accordingly. Certainly the concerns expressed above will need to be addressed in full and the applicant required to demonstrate how the layout is informed by basic urban design principles.

29. Scale of Development: The illustrative masterplan includes a parameter plan which shows the proposed heights of buildings in relation to the surrounding the area. The terraced blocks are predominately 3 storeys, increasing to 4 storeys at the end of the terraces to provide articulation to the terraces. The apartment blocks would be between 4-5 storeys dependant on the topography of the site and also their relationship to other surrounding properties.

30. The Oxford Design Review Panel concluded that the building heights across the site are sound and in particular the taller apartment blocks at the end of the terraces to the west provide a suitable termination to the rows whilst also providing a suitable buffer to the A4074. Again officers support these comments. The site is surrounded by larger scale buildings in the listed St Georges Manor, SAE Institute and the Oxford Science Park and the topography of the site would enable slightly larger scale buildings to be provided than the more modest scale dwellings that are generally seen elsewhere in Littlemore. The buildings along Armstrong Road will be important in terms of informing the general character of the development and therefore care will need to be taken with the scale of buildings in this area. Officers would expect any reserved matters application to include a character assessment which justifies any increase in scale beyond these illustrative parameters and identify appropriate locations for the larger scale buildings within the scheme.

31. Appearance: A traditional palette of materials is to be used in the development such as brickwork, stone, and timber cladding which can be seen in the local context of the listed St Georges Manor and Littlemore village. Officers consider that the development will need to respond appropriately to the site context and surrounding heritage assets such as the listed St Georges Manor. The use of traditional materials would be welcomed though it is not clear at this stage whether the buildings would take a contemporary or traditional form. Any reserved matters application should include a character assessment for the development which justifies the design and appearance of buildings to ensure that they suit the setting.

32. Open Space: The layout will maintain the existing landscape buffers to the A4074, western copse, and mature planting to Armstrong Road to protect the

green infrastructure surrounding the site. The copse in the western corner would form an important feature to the site, with a wildflower meadow and woodland walk and provision of picnic space and natural play area at the entrance to the development. A linear park would be established along Littlemore Brook and around the site perimeter to assist in the creation of flood attenuation and provision of public open space and external play areas.

33. The Oxford Design Review Panel considered that the conceptual sketches of the green spaces are strong but needed to be developed further with a stronger focus for the 'green heart' of the development and draw residents and visitors to the space. Officers recognise that the design policies of the Local Plan make clear that a minimum of 10% of the total site area must public open space. The use of the copse at the entrance and the linear park are positive aspects of the scheme but the design needs further consideration as the site is some distance from existing open land, public parks or children's play areas which place greater emphasis on their provision within the scheme. The masterplan has demonstrated that suitable open space for the development can be provided, but again this will need to be developed further through any reserved matters application.

34. In summary, officers consider that the illustrative masterplan has demonstrated that a residential development of the proposed density could be accommodated within the plot and designed in a manner that could follow basic urban design principles and establish a clear sense of place that responds to the special landscape character of the site and the setting of the historic buildings of St George's Manor adjacent to the site along with the wider context of the Littlemore Suburb. Any reserved matters applications would need to demonstrate that the development would satisfy the requirements of Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS18, Sites and Housing Plan Policy HP9, and Oxford Local Plan Policies CP1, CP8, CP9, CP10 and HE3.

Transport

35. The site is accessed from Armstrong Road which has a signal controlled junction with Sandford Road. Sandford Road and Oxford Road are principal routes that provide access through Littlemore. The Eastern By-pass (A4142) and Henley Road (A4074) are located to the north and south respectively and provide access to the rest of Oxford and beyond.

36. A Transport Statement and Travel Plan have been submitted with the application along with a Technical Note that considers the key transport issues with the proposal. The outline application seeks to reserve all matters including access for a later date although the illustrative masterplan, parking strategy, movement and access plan provides details of these matters.

37. Traffic Generation: The site has been allocated for primarily employment use, with residential use being a suitable alternative. The Transport Statement has included an assessment of the estimated trip generation for both uses, and the methodology for this assessment was agreed by the Local Highways Authority. The forecasts show that the residential development will generate 184 2-way trips

in the AM peak (08.00-09.00hrs) and 193 2-way trips in the PM peak (17.00-18.00hrs). This would be considerably less than for a scheme comprising B1 uses which would generate approximately 414 trips in the AM peak hour and 339 in the PM peak hour but less than a scheme comprising Industrial B2 uses which would have approximately 129 in the AM peak hour and 93 in the PM peak, although these trips would include a higher proportion of HGV vehicles than a residential development. Therefore officers consider that the residential development will have far less impact upon the highway network than the employment use the site that it is primarily allocated for within the Sites and Housing Plan.

38. Access: The Transport Statement has considered the impact upon the following key junctions on the adjacent highway - Armstrong Road / Sandford Road signalised junction, A4074/Henley Road junction, and A4142 Eastern By-pass Road / A4158 Oxford Road roundabout. The modelling shows that the Armstrong Road / Sandford Road signalised junction has capacity to accommodate the development without the need for any improvement works to the junction. The development would not create any significant impacts upon the A4074/Henley Road or the A4142 Eastern By-pass Road / A4158 Oxford Road roundabout and any such impact would be minimal. The Local Highways Authority have raised no objection to the proposal on this basis, although they have requested that any Community Infrastructure Levy obtained from the development should be allocated towards possible improvements to the A4142 Eastern By-pass Road / A4158 Oxford Road.

39. The Armstrong Road / Sandford Road signalised junction has suitable visibility splays to accommodate the development. The secondary roads throughout the site will be accessed from Armstrong Road and have carriageway widths of 6m with dedicated footpaths 2m wide. The infrastructure for the site will be subject to further design as part of any reserved matters application and will also be subject to separate s278 consents with the County Council.

40. Pedestrian / Cycle Links: The site is accessed by pedestrians and cyclists from Armstrong Road with a 2.1m wide footway on the northern side of the road. This links with Sandford Road which provides access to Littlemore and has footways on both sides of the carriageway heading towards Sandford-on-Thames village, and northwards up to the Railway Lane junction and then continuing on the eastern side only.

41. The site allocation policy (SP30) states that pedestrian and cycle links should be enhanced through and to the site, including to Oxford Science Park as part of any development proposal. The proposed pedestrian and cycle links are set out within the Illustrative Masterplan. There are a series of green walks throughout the scheme which link up the main thoroughfares. These include footways on the south-western side of Armstrong Road that are separated from the road by landscaping. A footpath would also be provided through the copse at the north-eastern corner onto Sandford Road which would improve connectivity to Sandford Road.

42. The Masterplan allows for other potential pedestrian and cycle access points to be created in order to improve connectivity to the wider area, including a link into Oxford Science Park and also Minchery Road as suggested by the County Council. The ability to deliver these links depends on the agreement of other landowners. To date the owners of the Science Park have been reluctant to allow the creation of a link into their site. Similarly the County Councils suggestion of a link in the north-eastern corner of the site into Minchery Road would require agreement from Network Rail for a crossing over the Cowley Branch Line and County Council for the use of part of the primary school grounds. Officers recognise that there would be benefits to both links being created in terms of accessibility to the wider area and public transport links. However, the ability to provide these links by way of condition or legal agreement depends on there being a reasonable prospect that they could be delivered which given the different landowners would make this difficult at this stage. The potential opening of the Cowley Branch Line by Chiltern Railways is likely to put pressure on the creation of such links to ensure that any station is accessible to the wider residential area. In order to future proof the ability for these links to be established, officers would recommend that land is set aside free of built development within the areas shown on the illustrative masterplan to enable links to be provided to the Science Park, Minchery Road or any potential station on the Cowley Branch Line. The funding for these links could then come from a variety of other sources as other developments come forward including CIL contributions.

43. During the consultation process concerns have been raised about the Illustrative Masterplan showing pedestrian and cycle routes through the gated community of St Georges Manor. This is a private gated development whereby links through the site could not be provided without permission. The masterplan has subsequently been amended to remove these links.

44. Public Transport: The site is served by the Thames Travel T2/T3 services which run between Oxford City Centre and Abingdon and the Kassam Stadium respectively, Monday – Saturday. This service is accessed via the bus stops outside the Littlemore Mental Health Centre on the Sandford Road. There is also the Stagecoach 16/16a Oxford – Minchery Farm service whose stops are a 12minute walk from the site on the Cowley Road.

45. During the consultation process concerns have been raised with regards to the frequency of the bus service within this part of Littlemore. The services currently run hourly although the T2/T3 does not operate in the evening or on Sundays. Officers accept that the location of the site would place more prevalence on the use of the car however there are accessible public transport links available to the site albeit not as frequent as other parts of the city. Nevertheless the site has been allocated for redevelopment whether for employment or residential use and therefore it is reasonable to assume that frequency and patronage of the services will increase as development is brought forward. The potential opening of the Cowley Branch Line by Chiltern Railways would point to other public transport improvements in the area that may come forward in the future.

46. The County Council has suggested that a financial contribution should be sought towards improving the existing bus service in the absence of the site being able to provide alternative footpath links to Minchery Road. This would be used to procure additional daytime or evening journeys and Sunday service for the Littlemore section of the routes only. The applicant has agreed to provide this contribution at an agreed rate of £795 per dwelling.

47. Car Parking: The parking standards for residential development are set out in Policy HP16 of the Sites and Housing Plan. The supporting text to this policy makes clear that large scale housing development in areas such as this should provide at least 1 allocated space per dwelling (1-4 houses or flats) although in certain areas it may be necessary to achieve the maximum standards which can be 2 spaces per 2-4 bed house / flat. The unallocated parking provision should be calculated according to the number and mix of dwellings and shared between all residents and visitors.

48. The parking strategy states that a total of 445 allocated and unallocated spaces would be provided within the development. There would be approximately 220 allocated and unallocated spaces serving the dwellings which would include 'driveways', 'garages', and 'on-street and group parking'. The allocated spaces would be at a ratio of 2 spaces per dwelling. There would be approximately 225 allocated and unallocated spaces for the flats through 'undercroft' and 'on-street group parking' with the allocated spaces being at least 1 space per unit. The unallocated provision must be available to be shared between all residents and visitors in the development.

49. As this is an outline application the number of spaces are an indicative figure, and the actual numbers of spaces per unit will come forward in the reserved matters application. The parking strategy would broadly accord with the standards set out in Policy HP16, but would need to be refined as part of the subsequent detailed design stage. A condition should be attached requiring the parking provision to reflect the parking standards set out in Policy HP16.

50. Cycle Parking: The cycle parking standards for residential development are set out in Policy HP15 of the Sites and Housing Plan. The minimum provision would be at least 2 spaces for houses and flats up to 2 bedrooms, and 3 spaces for houses and flats up to 3 bedrooms. All cycle storage must be secure, under cover and preferably enclosed and provide level unobstructed external access to the street.

51. The Transport Statement confirms that 2 or 3 spaces would be provided per dwelling and 2 spaces per apartment within the scheme in accordance with the minimum standards. A condition should be attached which requires details of the cycle parking provision to be provided at reserved matters stage and that this should reflect the requirements of Policy HP15.

52. Travel Plan: A Travel Plan has been submitted which proposes a package of measures to promote sustainable transport options and reduce reliance on the car. This includes the provision of Welcome Packs with details of sustainable transport options, provision of pool bicycles, consideration of the provision of high

quality bicycle storage and the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator. As this is an outline application, the Travel Plan would need to be developed further at detailed design stage. This should be secured by condition.

Archaeology

53. The site is adjacent to a known multi-period archaeological site on the opposite side of Littlemore Brook at Oxford Science Park. The excavations at the Science Park have identified palaeo-archaeological, prehistoric and extensive early Saxon remains, while limited trial trenching within the Littlemore Park site has produced evidence of Roman field system and remnants of Roman pottery manufacturing waste. The pottery evidence is significant because the site is located within an extensive arc of dispersed pottery manufacturing sites associated with the regional Oxford pottery industry which is of national significance in the field of Roman studies.

54. The site is also significant because an extensive 19th cemetery associated with the former Oxfordshire County Asylum survives within the grounds. Such burial grounds are increasingly being recognised as having high archaeological value because of the potential contribution that scientific analysis of human remains make to our understanding of 19th century population movement and health outcomes. The Illustrative Masterplan shows that the recorded cemetery is not being developed and is to be retained within the grounds of the forthcoming scheme. As such some consideration of long term tree management in the cemetery area would be warranted as the site is now heavily wooded. This should include archaeological input into the landscaping strategy for this area. A new cemetery was created in 1901 and this took 1,318 burials. These are located outside the area of the proposed site.

55. A desk based assessment has been produced by John Moore Heritage Services (2014). In addition to the above this notes that medieval activity is indicated by antiquarian maps and finds on the northern part of the site and that lynchets running in a northwest to southeast direction are shown on Davis of Lewknor's map of 1797. Furthermore demolished or overgrown features associated with the Oxfordshire County Asylum (constructed 1843-46) are noted, including paths and terracing, an engine house, gasworks and reservoir. The potential biodiversity constraints of the site also have had a bearing on the extent of pre-determination archaeological evaluation that has been carried out at this stage. A condition should be attached which requires a full archaeological evaluation of the site to be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation that takes into consideration the potential biodiversity constraints, and secures a scheme of mitigation for any significant archaeological impact. The archaeological investigation should take the form a geophysical survey (post scrub clearance) followed by targeted trial trenching and be undertaken by a professionally qualified archaeologist working to a brief issued by ourselves.

Landscaping

56. A series of Area Tree Preservation Orders covers the site. These were made when the land was originally allocated for development to enable proper

assessment of the trees in the planning process. The L-shaped site falls away to the south where the A4074 marks the south-western boundary, and a stream marks the south-eastern boundary. These boundaries enjoy robust tree cover providing a buffer to the A4074 and a riparian corridor to the stream. These are important landscape features and likely to have ecological significance. The remaining boundary is Armstrong Road, which has an overgrown mixed hedge and semi-mature lime trees that have potential to add value as a degree of landscape maturity for the scheme providing they are retained. The wooded area at the west of the site contains some exotic specimen trees that strongly indicate being planted as part of the landscaping of the former Victorian asylum (1840s). The copse includes several excellent quality mature trees and the cumulative value of the copse is high given the group has relevance to the Grade II Listed St Georges Manor.

57. The Landscape Strategy for the development shows the western copse retained as public open space to some shrub clearance to create a woodland glade. A pedestrian route through the copse into the site has also been incorporated. The general layout of the site is configured so as to leave sufficient space between the south-western and south-eastern boundary vegetation buffers and buildings and gardens. This will avoid problem associated with shade, overbearing impact and general nuisance such as leaf litter, encroaching branches etc.

58. Having reviewed the landscape strategy, along with the recommendations of the Oxford Design Review Panel, officers consider that the following points should be addressed at reserved matters stage. The landscape design appears to indicate an informal treatment for the middle section of Armstrong Road. A more formal approach to the design here would better integrate the scheme with the soft landscape of St George's Manor to the north and help define the route through the scheme from west to east. If the semi-mature lime trees growing within the existing hedge are retained, they could be key features and the core element in a formal avenue, providing some instant landscape maturity.

59. The proposed public open space at the pinch point along Armstrong Road has merit, but the western end will be divided off and heavily shaded at times by the existing mature trees (T12, T13, T14). The best tree within this group is the lime (T13) but the remaining two trees could be removed which would make a specimen tree of the lime and integrate the western end with the rest of the public space. This would also create a suitable environment for appealing hard landscaping to be incorporated, including benches. Notwithstanding these comments the outline application is generally acceptable in landscape design terms in accordance with Oxford Local Plan Policies CS18, CP1, CP11 and NE16, subject to conditions requiring further development of the landscape strategy at reserved matters stage.

Biodiversity

60. The NPPF makes clear that new development should minimise biodiversity impacts and take the opportunity to incorporate biodiversity enhancements. There is also legislation and European directives to avoid harm to biodiversity interests and to have regard to conserving habitats. At a local level, Oxford Core

Strategy Policy CS12 requires no net loss of sites of ecological value, and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Sites of Local Importance to Nature Conservation (SLINC), and wildlife corridors to be protected from development that has an adverse impact. It also recognises that species and habitats of importance for biodiversity will be protected from harm, unless the harm can be properly mitigated.

61. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Biodiversity Offsetting Report, and Reptile Method Statement have been submitted. The appraisal identifies that the site is adjacent to the Littlemore Brook Site of Local Importance to Nature Conservation [SLINC] and in close proximity to the Iffley Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest [SSSI]. The site is principally formed from poor semi-improved grassland, hedgerow, woodland, tall ruderal vegetation, short perennial vegetation, amenity grassland and scrub. In terms of protected species the survey identifies that some of the trees have potential for bats; otters and water voles may be present in the Littlemore Brook SLINC; and there is suitable habitat for reptiles such as slow worms and invertebrates. As the application is made in outline form the appraisal recommends that further survey work will be required to assess the impact on protected species and habitats. It puts forward provisional mitigation measures to minimise biodiversity impacts but recognises that these will need to be made in more detail at reserved matters stage, and allows for opportunities to improve local habitat resource for protected species.

62. The Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust [BBOWT] have raised an objection to the proposal on the grounds that there is insufficient mitigation against the loss of legally protected species and their habitats in line with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; insufficient measures to ensure that biodiversity interests are maintained, enhanced and restored in line with the NPPF; insufficient buffering of Littlemore Brook SLINC; and a lack of evidence of a net gain in biodiversity. Natural England has raised no objection to the proposal.

63. Having reviewed the submitted studies officers consider that the site has been shown to be of low ecological value. The surveys provide a good understanding of the ecological character of the site for outline stage and identify a number of constraints that will need to be addressed in any reserved matters application. In the event that there is a small residual risk from the development upon biodiversity interests then provided a mitigation plan is developed that addresses the worst case scenario further survey works should not necessarily be required. According to the information supplied to date, officers consider that there is a minimal risk of protected species being negatively impacted by the development. However, if appropriate protocols are carried out and approved through an Ecological Mitigation Compensation and Management Plan (EMCMP) and compensatory offsite habitat creation provided as detailed, before a reserved matters application is decided then officers are satisfied that any risk will be mitigated and potentially a net beneficial effect and a net gain to biodiversity achieved.

Protected Species

64. Bats: The survey identifies a tree on the boundary of the site (TN41) that has a medium to high possibility of harbouring bats and all other trees have a low to medium score. Officers are satisfied that bat roosts would not be adversely affected if certain protocols are implemented through the EMCMP. These would include locating bat roosts and movement corridors around the fringe of the site while also protecting this fringe during and after construction and avoiding light pollution to this area, along with providing roosting opportunities within the built environment. This will result in a net gain in roost sites for bats and not significantly compromise feeding opportunities.

65. Otters/Badgers: Officers consider there is no reasonable likelihood of Otters being disturbed by the development if protocols for lighting are produced through the EMCMP. It is not reasonable to suggest that Otter holts will be present on the site and the mitigation proposals for badgerswould also protect Otters in the unlikely event they forage over the site at night.

66. The survey evidence suggests that Badgers do not forage extensively over the site. Although foraging opportunities exist these are highly unlikely to be of importance to the local population given the type of habitat. Badgers preferentially forage over short grassland because it is easier to locate their earthworm prey in this environment. There is a small risk that badgers may occasionally use a hole identified in the survey as an outlier or that badgers could move on to the site. However this small risk can be adequately addressed by the submission of a survey and mitigation plan at reserved matter stage.

67. Reptiles: The Reptile surveys have not been fully completed but worst case scenario mitigation has been proposed based on the presumed presence of Slow Worm, Common Lizard and Grass Snake. It is the reptiles that are protected and not their habitat, and on the basis that a suitable relocation strategy is developed then there should not be any impact on reptiles. This could be secured through the EMCMP which would offer assurance that the development could not take placed until the reptiles have been trapped and relocated to a suitable site.

68. Water Voles: If the habitat likely to be used by Water Voles is conserved and not impacted by the development then it is not necessary to conduct a further survey. The watercourse does not provide the optimal habitat for Water Vole given it is wooded and shaded and the nature of this space will remain unchanged and a 10m (minimum) buffer from the water's edge provided. This provides sufficient assurance that these species will not be negatively impacted by the development.

69. Birds: It is highly unlikely that site is of significance for breeding birds. It is likely to hold a semi urban assemblage due to the nature of the habitats present and its location. The retention of the habitat around the edge of the site and clearance of bramble and scrub outside of the nesting bird season, along with bird box provision within the built environment would mitigate any impact.

Buffering of Littlemore Brook

70. The masterplan identifies that a minimum buffer of 11m would be provided to the Brook and considerably more in parts. Officers are satisfied that the development will not have a significant impact on the SLINC, or the species that currently utilise it. The Environment Agency has required an 8m buffer to the brook and so this would exceed their requirements. The current wooded buffer is to be enhanced and conserved and so further details will be required through the EMCMP.

71. BBOWT have raised concerns that the Littlemore Brook is vulnerable to the input of sewage and other forms of water pollution which could have an impact upon the ecology of the watercourse. Thames Water has indicated that a drainage strategy detailing on and off-site drainage works will be needed before development commences. Therefore this impact could be managed through any drainage scheme. Natural England has also recommended a Sustainable Drainage condition.

Biodiversity off-setting

72. The Biodiversity Offsetting Report has assessed the habitat impacts of the development and provided details of the off-site compensation and net gain in biodiversity in accordance with national best practice. Officers consider that the submitted scheme offers sufficient assurance that there will be a net gain in terms of ecological units. The BIA calculator represents the most robust system available of achieving this because it objectively assesses ecological value before and after development. In this instance it clearly demonstrates that the development will result in a net gain for biodiversity after the development and mitigation measures have been completed. It is accepted that the botanical survey was not conducted at the optimum time of year however given the habitats identified the risk of misidentification by a competent botanist is minimal. The pictures supplied are consistent with the habitats identified. The recommended condition will ensure that an offset scheme will be delivered before the development can proceed.

73. In order to adequately mitigate the biodiversity impacts in accordance with the aims of Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS12, an Ecological Mitigation Compensation and Management Plan should be provided before any reserved matters application, development or site clearance can proceed. This would include
    - A biodiversity offset agreement resulting in a neutral or positive ecological unit score as outlined in Littlemore Park biodiversity offsetting report.
    - A legal agreement to ensure the offset area is retained and managed in perpetuity.
    - Monitoring and reporting mechanisms for the offset area including necessary remedial action identified by monitoring to achieve stated condition.
    - Details of habitat creation and management of onsite mitigation measures including mechanisms to ensure management in perpetuity.
    - Details of native species to be used in planting schemes.

- Timetable for reptile survey and relocation programme as outlined in Littlemore Park reptile method statement.
- Location and detailed description of reptile translocation site including management and monitoring regimes.
- Management of translocation site must be appropriate and guaranteed in perpetuity by legal agreement.
- Details of site clearance protocols.
- Details of protection measures for retained flora.
- Working methods including lighting regimes to ensure minimum disturbance of onsite fauna identified in reports.
- Details of pre development badger survey requirement.
- Location and details of make and model of 10 integrated bat and 10 integrated Swift boxes to be incorporated into the fabric of the development.

Flood Risk and Drainage

74. The main area of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 which has a low probability of flooding. The parts of the site alongside Littlemore Brook are within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which have a medium to high probability of flooding.

75. A Flood Risk Assessment and Addendum has been submitted with the application which assesses the impact upon flood risk and recommends the following mitigation measures tol be addressed at reserved matters stage to ensure the development does not pose a flood risk.
    - The site layout will be reviewed to assess whether the dwellings and infrastructure could be located entirely within Flood Zone 1, with encroachment into Flood Zone 2 minimised.
    - No dwellings in Flood Zone 3.
    - There will be no basements or below ground parking located within Flood Zone 2.
    - The finished floor levels will be set no lower than 300mm above the climate change flood level
    - A buffer zone of 8m from the Littlemore Brook will be kept free from development including sustainable urban drainage features.
    - All above ground sustainable urban drainage features will be sited outside the 1 in 100 year plus climate change outline.
    - Surface water and fluvial flood flow routes will be considered at reserved matters stage in conjunction with landscaping to ensure safe dry access and egress from the site can be provided
    - The detailed design will incorporate floor resilient materials and construction methods
    - A site specific flood evacuation plan will be produced, and include properties at risk being encouraged to sign up to the EA flood line.

76. The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the development subject to these mitigation measures being used to inform the detailed design of the development at reserved matters stage. These should be secured by condition.

77. The Flood Risk Assessment Addendum also recognises that a sustainable urban drainage scheme will need to be developed at reserved matters stage. Thames Water, Natural England, and the Environment Agency have all requested a condition be attached to secure such a scheme. Officers also recognise that BBOWT have raised concerns that the ecology of Littlemore Brook is vulnerable to water pollution. This could also be secured by condition.

Sustainability

78. Oxford Core Strategy Policy CS9 has a commitment to optimising energy efficiency through a series of measures including the utilisation of technologies that achieve zero carbon developments. The Sites and Housing Plan Policy HP11 then goes on to state that a development of this size will need to include at least 20% of its total energy needs from on-site renewables or low carbon technologies.

79. A full energy statement which demonstrates how the development would achieve the 20% target would only be possible at the reserved matters stage through the detailed design of the development. A condition should be attached to any permission which requires these details to be submitted at detailed design stage and incorporated into the design.

Community Infrastructure Levy / S106 Contributions

80. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a standard charge on new development. The reason that CIL has been introduced is to help fund the provision of infrastructure to support the growth of the city, for example transport improvements, additional school places and new or improved sports and leisure facilities.

81. The proposed development would be liable for a CIL charge but this would not come into effect until the reserved matters application is submitted. The Oxfordshire County Council have requested that CIL charges for this development be spent on non-transport infrastructure priorities such as extensions to the existing primary, secondary, and 6th form schools, special needs accommodation, and improvements to the capacity of the Westgate library, early intervention centres, children's centres and elderly day centres. They have also requested funds towards roundabout replacement or re-phasing of the traffic signals at Littlemore Roundabout (A4142). There are no longer any direct allocations towards specific infrastructure projects from applications. The CIL contribution from this application will go into a central fund and the Council will decide the spending priorities in consultation with the County Council through the infrastructure planning and budget setting process.

82. The site allocation policy recognises that there was a former playing field on site which should be re-provided within the scheme or a contribution made towards improving facilities elsewhere. The scheme does not make provision for a new playing field within its layout, and therefore it is envisaged that this will be dealt with by means of a contribution. There is currently no other suitable area within the locality whereby a new cricket pitch could be developed or replaced. As a

result it is considered that any contribution of should be linked in general to leisure and sport provision within the wider surrounding area.

Other Matters

83. Ground Conditions: A 'Preliminary Risk Assessment' has been submitted which includes a thorough preliminary risk assessment and identifies a number of potential contaminant linkages. The report recommends that an intrusive site investigation is undertaken prior to the commencement of development. Officers agree with the findings of the report and recommend that this is secured by an appropriately worded condition. The Environment Agency has also requested similar conditions to ensure that the development does not pose an unacceptable risk to ground water.

84. Noise: The Noise Assessment identifies that the primary source of noise at the development site is from the A4074. It goes on to state that the internal noise levels will meet British Standard (BS8233), and that appropriate noise mitigation measures could be incorporated at reserved matters stage to make this suitable for residential development

85. Officers would advise that any scheme will need to ensure that the internal noise levels meet the BS8233 standard and where this is not possible with opening windows that an adequate ventilation system is provided. With regards to noise levels in external recreational areas there are difficulties in reaching these values in busy urban environments. A condition should be attached which states that all residential accommodation should meet the agreed noise level of 30 dB LAeq in living rooms and bedrooms, with no single events to exceed 45 dB LAmax. In addition all windows need to be remain closed to achieve the agreed levels and acoustic ventilation provided to ensure suitable fresh air into the properties.

86. Air Quality: The Air Quality Assessment considers the potential impacts on air quality during both the construction and operational phases of the proposed development. The assessment identifies a medium risk of impacts on sensitive receptors from dust during the construction phase. It concludes that a number of mitigation measures have been adapted for the development site. These should be reviewed prior to the commencement of construction works and incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan which should be secured by condition. The assessment concludes that existing air quality is such that the location is suitable for the proposed development and that impacts on pollutant levels as a result of operational phase vehicle exhaust emissions were not predicted to be significant at any sensitive location in the vicinity of the site.

87. A key theme of the NPPF is that development should enable future occupiers to make "green" vehicle choices and "incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emissions vehicles". Oxford City Council's Air Quality Action Plan 2013 commits to seeking to ensure that new developments make appropriate provision for walking, cycling, public transport and low emission vehicle infrastructure. As a minimum requirement, new development schemes should include the provision of electric vehicle recharging provision and any mitigation

requirements arising from the exposure assessment, where applicable. To prepare for increased demand in future years, appropriate cable provision should be included in the scheme design and development. The recommended provision rate is 1 charging point per unit (house with dedicated parking) or 1 charging point per 10 spaces (unallocated parking, i.e. flat development). This should be secured by condition.

88. Construction Management: In the event that outline permission is granted for the proposed development, it should be subject to a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which would address issues such as working hours, signage, site hoardings, site security measures, piling methods, earthworks, routing arrangements, arrival and departure times for construction vehicles, control of dust and emissions, vibration, materials storage, waste management, and complies with the British Standard BS5228: Noise and Vibration. This should be secured by condition with the principal contractors and plot developers also registering with the considerate contractor's scheme.

Conclusion:

89. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the relevant policies of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026, and Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and therefore officer's recommendation is to approve the development in principle, but defer the application for the completion of a legal agreement as set out above.

Human Rights Act 1998
Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant outline planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant outline permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Contact Officer: Andrew Murdoch
Extension: 2228
Date: 24th February 2015

This page is intentionally left blank