



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 14 - 16 January 2014

Site visit made on 16 January 2014

by Mike Robins MSc BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/G3110/A/13/2206058

Land to the rear of William Morris Close, Oxford, OX4 2JX

- 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 Cantay Estates against the decision of Oxford City Council.
 - The application Ref 13/01096/FUL, dated 18 May 2013, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2013.
 - The development proposed is two all weather playing pitches. New residential development (6 x 1 bedroom, 15 x 2 bedroom, 15 x 3 bedroom and 4 x 4 bedroom), 71 car parking spaces, access road and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development set out above varies slightly from that originally put forward. This is as a result of the revision to the scheme agreed with the Council prior to their determination of the application.
3. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU), signed and dated 15 January 2014, was provided by the appellant. This sought to address the affordable housing and all weather pitch (AWP) elements of the scheme.
4. While the description of development refers explicitly to the provision of two AWP, the appellant offered an alternative at the Inquiry. Instead of the AWP, this would provide for a publically accessible grassed area with trim trail and exercise area and the ability to lay out grass pitches. The scheme also proposed a contribution towards replacement sports pitches or the improvement of existing sports facilities elsewhere in Oxford.
5. A planning application¹ was submitted to the Council which, in outline form, reflected the housing part of the proposal now at appeal, but substituted this alternative approach to the non-housing element. This was considered by the Council, who refused this application on the 4 December 2013, citing similar reasons, in part, to the appeal scheme.
6. The appellant has requested that were the AWP provision considered to be unacceptable, and I was minded to prefer the alternative proposal, then a split decision could be considered. This could, it was suggested, be achieved

¹ 13/02500/OUT

through a condition and an alternative UU, which was also submitted at the Inquiry, signed and dated 15 January 2014.

7. It is not possible for this appeal to address the later application directly, as this has not been formally appealed; nor has the appellant modified their scheme, merely offered an alternative. Although parties should rely on their original submissions at appeal, this does not mean that the appropriateness of accepting a revision to the original scheme to reflect the alternative should not be assessed. Such assessments generally refer to the case of *Wheatcroft*², which, in essence, sets out the principles of whether a change to a development is so substantial as to lead to prejudice to any party.
8. The appellant considered that, as part of the outline application, local residents and statutory consultees would have had the opportunity to comment on this alternative as part of the scheme. Sport England maintained an objection to the proposed alternative scheme, although the Council's Leisure Services Section would appear to have welcomed the proposal. The Council accepted, during the course of the Inquiry, that, setting aside their in principal objection to the proposal, the alternative open space provision would be preferable.
9. However, this does not mean that there would be no prejudice in my considering the alternative, and I note the concerns of the local residents. Indeed I can understand that for local residents, presented with a scheme that was refused and then appealed, while another earlier scheme had also been appealed but withdrawn, and then presented with a revised scheme for consideration by the Council, which is not the subject of the appeal, but was introduced at the start of the Inquiry, this could have been somewhat confusing. This was borne out in comments made at the Inquiry.
10. With the AWP's explicitly referred to in the description and therefore clearly stated in the notification letters related to the appeal and Inquiry, I consider there to have been a risk of confusion and potential prejudice for local residents. Furthermore, despite the Leisure Services Section's position, Sport England or another statutory consultee may have wished to comment further at appeal, on what would be a significant change to almost a third of the site area.
11. Furthermore, although a split decision is an option available to an Inspector, it can only be used where the two parts of the scheme are clearly severable, both physically and functionally. A condition cannot be used on its own to achieve a split decision. In this case, the introduction of housing onto part of the site and open, sporting or recreational space on the other part is linked by policy requirements. While the appellant suggests that the condition and UU gives reassurance that some form of publically accessible area will be provided, I am not persuaded that this can adequately separate the parts of the scheme. Overall, I consider that the scheme cannot be severed in this way and the introduction of this substantial change to the proposal cannot be considered at this appeal.
12. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was submitted, signed and dated on the first day of the Inquiry. In this it was agreed that the development plan for the area comprises the Oxford City Local Plan (the Local Plan), adopted 2005, the Oxford City Core Strategy (the Core Strategy), adopted 2011 and the

² *Wheatcroft (Bernard) Ltd v. Secretary of State for the Environment and Harbrough DC* [1982] P&CR 233

Oxford City Council Sites and Housing Plan (SHP), adopted 2013. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) reaffirms, at paragraph 2, the statutory duty to determine planning applications and appeals in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework itself is a material consideration.

Main Issues

13. Accordingly I consider the main issues in this case to be:

- The effect of the proposal on the provision of open space for formal and informal sport, recreation and amenity;
- The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- The effect on the highway safety of users of the local road network.

Reasons

14. The appeal site is an area of open land of approximately 1.24 Hectares, mostly laid to grass, but with an area of car parking to the west. The site was formerly part of a sports and social club, most recently the Lord Nuffield Club, but for many years preceding that, the Morris Motors Club. In recent years, the original clubhouse was replaced with a new facility, with housing provided on part of the site. Following the club going into receivership, the new clubhouse was taken over by the Tyndale Free School. Planning permission, granted on appeal by the Secretary of State, has established full use of the clubhouse and some surrounding land for this purpose³.

15. The remaining grassed area is now fenced to prevent access, although the car park areas remain open. Barracks Lane lies to the north, beyond the school, and provides the only access to the site. It is a cul-de-sac, leading to William Morris Close, Turner Close and a few properties on the road itself. At its western end it provides a footpath link to Oxford Spires Academy and the Cowley Marsh Playing Fields. It is signposted as a walking and cycling route at the junction with Hollow Way.

16. The proposal comprises housing to the southern part of the site with two AWP's proposed to the northern part adjacent to the school.

The Effect on Open Space Provision

17. Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy sets out the strategic approach to development in this area, with a clear focus on previously developed land. It accepts that there is a need for some greenfield areas to be identified for development and allocated as such. The policy explicitly allows for the development of greenfield land only where it is specifically allocated or is required to maintain a five year rolling housing land supply (HLS).

18. Although the appellant pointed to a 'huge' unmet need for market and affordable homes, which the Council acknowledged, it was agreed by the appellant that the Council have a five year HLS. The Council argued that, taking account of the constraints in the area, this approach balanced the conflicting demands in Oxford; it was an approach found sound in the recent development plan examinations. Specific allocations on greenfield sites were

³ APP/G3110/A/13/2195679

set out in the recent SHP; the appeal site was not allocated. The appellant considered that there was a clear reason for this in that the site was in receivership. They also argued that the circumstances of the appeal site are very similar to those sites that were allocated, in terms of the Council's reasoning for such allocations. I deal with these matters in more detail later.

19. The whole of the original Morris Motors Club site is also identified in the Local Plan as Protected Open Space, with particular reference to Policy SR2, which deals with the protection of open air sports facilities. The accompanying text to this policy identified that Oxford's playing fields are an important recreational resource and that most are of special significance for their amenity value and their contribution to the green space of the urban environment. It notes that many are privately owned by Colleges or private schools and are not necessarily available for public use, but considers that the policy applies equally.
20. Green spaces for leisure and sport are also addressed through Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy. It was common ground that exceptions to the preclusion of development on such sites were generally consistent with Policy SR2, which I agree. The Framework similarly sets out⁴ that existing open space, sports and recreational land, including playing fields should not be built on unless they are surplus to requirements, they can be appropriately replaced or the proposed development clearly outweighs the loss.
21. A former member and officer of the sports and social club gave evidence that the once thriving club provided not only a facility for workers at the nearby motor works, but for the local community. Associate membership would have allowed direct access to the facilities, and the open space itself was generally accessible for use by local residents. Following closure of the club, although there was a period when this open access remained, since the erection of the fence there has been no public access onto the grassed area.
22. It is necessary at this point to draw some distinction between the appeal before me and that recently considered for the Free School. In that scheme the Council acknowledge a direct need for primary school places in the area, and it involved only a relatively small part of the open air sport facility. Indeed the Secretary of State's decision explicitly concluded, on the evidence in that case, that the reduction in open space would not compromise the integrity or viability of the remaining area of open space. Any loss was accepted to be mitigated by the public access that could be provided to the school facilities that were to be developed.
23. Notwithstanding this, evidence was provided to this Inquiry, and accepted by the Council, that the open land remaining, following the confirmation of the school development, is insufficient to meet Sport England's comparative sizes for senior cricket and rugby pitches and only just sufficient for a football pitch. Nonetheless, the Council considered that the site has the potential to provide for football or hockey or indeed junior or mini pitches for various sports.
24. The Council have produced a Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy which categorises in some detail the provision and need for facilities across Oxford. Main parties were generally in accord that the need was for junior or mini football pitches. However, the Strategy also outlines the high numbers of

⁴ Paragraph 74

- facilities that are privately owned and acknowledges the risk of undersupply should the informal or adhoc basis for community access be withdrawn.
25. In this context there was a general acceptance of an ongoing need for certain open air sport facilities, and the appellant argued that the AWP's would provide a qualitative and quantitative improvement over the existing site, offering community access where there is currently none, and a greater capacity on the all weather surface, as opposed to grass pitches.
 26. While an all weather surface has the potential to allow for longer periods of use, such use would be contingent on access. In this proposal the AWP's would be passed to the school to be managed and a Community Access Agreement set up under condition. The Council may be able to influence this agreement, but I have no evidence indicating the school's acceptance of this role, nor what such an agreement would entail. Although the appellant argues that the Council did not require submission of this detail, it is for the appellant to supply appropriate information to support their application.
 27. Furthermore, no floodlighting for the pitches is proposed within this appeal application. I consider that permission for such could not be guaranteed to be forthcoming, in light of the position of the pitches relatively close to surrounding residential development. In light of these matters, and assuming that community access may be limited to periods outside of the school's use, there are questions over whether the full capacity envisaged by the appellant could realistically be achieved. Furthermore, this is only part of the reason why such areas were protected under policy; I turn therefore to the effect on informal recreation.
 28. The Council suggested that the appeal site is of socio-historic value to the community and has potential to provide for community use, analogous to a Local Green Space (LGS) as set out in the Framework⁵. I do not consider that the protection of open space under the Local Plan can be considered to be directly related to the Framework's intention for the designation of LGS; as it says such designation will not be appropriate for most green or open space. Nonetheless, the policy protection afforded by Local Plan Policy SR2 and Core Strategy CS21 extends beyond just the functional sporting provision to the wider amenity value, and many local residents will have enjoyed the benefits of this facility over the years, either as a member or informal user. Furthermore they will have appreciated the presence of a large and open area within what is a relatively densely developed area.
 29. The appellant points out that the land has no public access now and therefore no public benefit at present; something, it was argued, that could be rectified, in part, by the proposal. Furthermore, they stated the Council was unwilling to assume responsibility for the site and no-one had come forward to take on any part of the site, to continue its use, following the club going into receivership. To my mind, these points would carry more weight if the specific use of the appeal site as an open air sports facility had been tested.
 30. The appellant indicated that the whole site had been clearly marketed, including a large banner on the clubhouse. However, I consider that there is a difference between the offer of an open space with a very large clubhouse facility, and the open space on its own, not just in terms of the overall value of

⁵ Paragraphs 76 and 77

the site, but also in its implications for ongoing maintenance and costs. While a member of the local community did indicate at the Inquiry that he was prepared to purchase the site, I have no evidence on which to base the likelihood of such an offer being completed, and can therefore give this little weight. Nonetheless, the absence of marketing of the land on its own limits the weight I can give to the presumption that a community use for the land is either not needed or not wanted.

31. The plans submitted to the appeal, associated with the Oxford Green Space Study 2012, indicate that there are areas near the appeal site outside of the 400m walking distance to formal and informal sites. However, the development of the appeal site will not directly affect the measures set out in the Council's Green Space Strategy for unrestricted use, and as referred to in Policy CS21. Nevertheless, the AWP's would provide little benefit to this measure, as they also would not be unrestricted. It is necessary therefore to also consider the role the site plays in the overall character and appearance of the area.

Character and Appearance

32. The fact that an otherwise significant open space has been fenced and is becoming overgrown is not a good reason in itself for allowing it to be developed. In my opinion, there is value in open vistas and open character in a residential area. This site is undeveloped and the fact that it enjoys views from surrounding development and, to a small part, from Barracks Lane means that, even in its current slightly overgrown state, it makes a contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Local residents place a high value on this open space.
33. The level of access previously enjoyed by the community to the area is not now available, nor can it be considered to be something that will be reinstated. Nonetheless I consider that there is value to the site, and the proposed development would introduce some harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Highway Safety

34. Local residents set out their concerns regarding the potential increase in traffic that the development would generate, particularly when considered against that potentially arising from the new school, and the effect that it would have on the safety of the local road network. The Council have appraised the appellant's Transport Assessment, which takes account of projected traffic associated with the school and 43 houses, as proposed in an earlier scheme, and have accepted that it was robust; no issue was taken on this matter by the Council.
35. I have some sympathy with local residents, as prior to the building of the new clubhouse, traffic using the lane would have been solely for the residents of Turner Close and the lane itself. Since that time housing has been introduced at William Morris Close and the school has opened; to this it is now suggested that there would be 40 further houses and two sports pitches. Nonetheless, it is not a change in traffic levels that is determinative, but whether they result in material harm.
36. Although the school has only been open since September 2013, and therefore has only a small proportion of the overall numbers that will attend, local

residents suggest that it is already causing significant traffic problems. I took the opportunity during the course of the Inquiry to carry out unaccompanied visits to the site during the morning school drop off period, from approximately 8,30am to 9.00am. Furthermore, the timing of the accompanied site visit allowed observation of the afternoon pick up period.

37. While these can only reveal a snapshot of activity, I have no reason to believe that these days would have had any less children attending the school, or any altered pattern of transport. While there was activity, it was not, in my view, such as to significantly interfere with traffic flows here or with safety. However, I am aware that the existing parking is not part of the school's long term provision.
38. Looking forward, the traffic associated with the school will grow, but the impacts of this have been assessed as part of the recent Secretary of State's decision and are not before me. My decision must focus on whether the traffic from the 40 houses, either alone or in combination with the school, would lead to harm.
39. There are some existing issue with the road network here, including the level of parking in Turner Close. The houses here are terraces with only a few having off-road parking in front of the properties. Although there would appear to be a nearby garage block, there was evidently a considerable level of on-street parking which narrowed the road significantly. However, the proposal would not materially affect this, as it would be unlikely that future residents of the proposed scheme would choose to park their cars in Turner Close, particularly as parking in this application has been increased to 71 spaces, which the Council accept is in line with their parking standards.
40. At the top of Barracks Lane informal parking takes place near to the traffic light junction with Hollow Way. It is not clear as to why there is parking here, but the absence of driveways and off-road parking for some houses on Hollow Way may be a reason. Nonetheless, this does narrow the road here, although this is an existing situation, which, for the reasons I refer to on parking above, the proposal is unlikely to exacerbate.
41. During the Inquiry, I was provided with a copy of an Oxfordshire County Council consultation response, dated 29 October 2013, to the later outline application. This appeared to raise concerns regarding the parking, although this related to the scheme with 55 car parking spaces. Matters relating to the projected traffic from the school and its impact on queuing lengths were also referred to. This response does not appear to reflect the position set out in the committee report for that scheme, which states that there were no highways objections to the revised plans. On the evidence before me, I must accept that there was a change in that view, possibly resulting from the revision to the plans for parking, such that this position was neither taken forward by the Highway Authority in relation to that scheme, nor introduced by them or the Council as an issue in this appeal.
42. This does not mean that there will be no impact from these schemes. It is likely that there will be some delays and queues associated with the free school, much as there is at many schools during the drop off periods. The question for me is whether the additional traffic would lead to an unacceptable level of congestion, or direct highway safety risks associated with conflict with the school traffic or children walking to school.

43. The existing road network issues slow the traffic, where parking creates pinch points on Barracks Lane, and there would be further traffic to the school, and potentially this development. However, on the evidence before me, I have no reason to consider that flows would become saturated such that congestion would extend significantly beyond the peak hour periods.
44. In terms of potential conflict there may be some overlap of peak traffic movements during the morning period, although school traffic will often be slightly later. The school, when it has implemented its planning permission and Travel Plan, will have a dedicated drop off area, away from the access road, and while some queuing may occur, visibilities are good both along the access and at the exit onto Barracks lane; I do not see material harm arising from the additional traffic for the scheme in relation this. There are footways along the length of Barracks Lane, and ones proposed to link the footpath to Crescent Road and the access road from the appeal site past the school. Consequently, there should not be significant increased risk for those walking to the school.
45. I have no reason to disagree with the Council and the Appellant's professional advice that the proposal would benefit from a safe means of access to and egress from the site. Some queuing may occur, and there would be higher levels of traffic during the drop off and pick up periods, albeit the proposal's contributions to this would not be significant. Overall, the proposal before me would not conflict with the Framework, paragraph 32, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Other Considerations

46. The appellant considered that Policy CS2 is a coarse grained policy that needs be read in light of other policies and, in particular, Policy CS21 and Local Plan Policy SR2, and that the scheme responded to the overall objectives of the plan and the Framework to boost housing supplies. The appellant indicated that the Council had significantly underplayed the important issue of housing need in Oxford, and in particular affordable housing, for which the scheme exceeded the policy requirements set out in Core Strategy Policy CS24. On balance, it was argued that the scheme was in accordance with the development plan, and that material considerations outweighed any conflict with individual policies.
47. To support this, evidence was given on the very significant levels of need identified for housing and, in particular, affordable housing. The Council acknowledged that there is a need for housing greater than the target set out initially in the Core Strategy, and supported now with the SHP. Over the plan period, this target was for 8,000 homes, 400 per year, and reflects a figure based on constraint, notably Green Belt, flood plain and open space protection in the city area. The Council have policy that seeks 50% of these homes to be affordable. Despite some variation in individual year performance, it was accepted by the appellant that the completions over the period 2006 and 2013, had averaged over 400 per year.
48. Much was made of the fact that no residential permissions were granted, which included affordable homes, in the years from 2010/11 to 2012/13; a position also accepted by the Council. It is also relevant that during these periods completions included a much lower proportion of affordable homes than the 50% sought by policy. In this context, the appellant suggested that a scheme

delivering 25 out of 40 units as affordable, should carry very substantial weight in its favour.

49. The data on permissions was updated by the Council at the Inquiry for the period 2013 to date. These figures indicate a considerable upturn in permissions including affordable housing. While the appellant questioned the inclusion of Luther Court, where a larger number of affordable homes were to be replaced, this showed that permissions were in place for over 600 affordable homes. Permissions cannot be taken as a guarantee of delivery; nevertheless, this does show a considerable uplift in potential delivery.
50. My own review of the submitted evidence suggests that there is a genuinely pressing need for affordable housing in Oxford, borne out not just by the number of houses that have been assessed as being needed, but also by the demand for properties when they do become available. However, it is acknowledged by the main parties that the amount required far exceeds that which can be practically delivered within the City itself, and indeed the Council identify that they are actively working with surrounding councils for solutions.
51. Three previous appeal decisions⁶ were submitted by the appellant, showing that a need for affordable housing should carry substantial or significant weight. I do not disagree, and consider that significant weight does arise in this case in relation to the potential for delivery of a relatively higher proportion of affordable housing than sought by policy. However, the issue is whether this weight should be considered to be overriding of the identified policy conflict, and in this the submitted decisions do not assist, as in each case the decision maker was also considering development in locations where there was no identified five year HLS.
52. I have no reason to doubt that the Council, when considering this application, were aware of the very considerable need facing Oxford in terms of affordable housing. It was an issue that was understood during the preparation and adoption of the Core Strategy and the SHP. In these, the Council had to take a balanced view in assessing the demand for housing against the considerable constraints within their area. This balancing act was played out in the preparation and examinations of these plans, which lead to the housing targets currently within the development plan, which is accepted to be up-to-date.
53. The Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing, but requires that Council's meet their objectively assessed needs as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework itself. I have found consistency between the relevant development plan policies and the Framework in terms of open space protection and a priority on the strategic development of previously developed sites.
54. The housing target of 400 units should not be considered as a maximum and the Council should strive to overachieve against that level, particularly in light of the acknowledged need. However, housing delivery in such circumstances cannot override all other considerations, and should be considered within the context of a plan led system. Nonetheless, I have accorded significant weight in favour of the scheme, as regards the provision of affordable homes.

Other Matters

⁶ APP/M2325/A/13/2196027, APP/C3105/A/13/2189896 and APP/A0665/A/11/2167430

55. The Council and interested parties emphasised their concern that were this site, currently an area of protected open space, allowed to be developed for housing, it would set a precedent for other privately owned areas of open space or sport facilities, to similarly argue that the need for housing should lead to their development for such purposes.
56. No similar sites to which this might apply have been put forward, and each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits. Consequently, I do not consider that such a generalised fear of precedent can be central to my decision.
57. In relation to the UUs submitted, I have addressed that relating to the proposed alternative in this case. That submitted to support the affordable housing element and delivery of the AWP was accepted by the Council. In light of my decision on the main issues in this case, it is not necessary for me to address compliance of this UU with the Framework.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

58. This proposal needs to be considered against the development plan policies, and in particular Policy SR2 of the Local Plan and Policies CS2, CS21 and CS22 of the Core Strategy. The appellant, by direct reference to the *Rochdale* case⁷, indicates that it is necessary for the decision maker to have regard to the plan as a whole, and conflict with one or more relevant policies does not necessarily mean the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.
59. Turning to Policies SR2 and CS21, there remains a need for sporting facilities in the city and an acknowledgement that the loss of existing facilities should be resisted because of the reliance on private facilities to provide for community use. I consider that the loss of this site, which has value to the local area, as well as the potential to provide for open air sports facilities, would not be adequately mitigated by the provision of the AWP. They would be hard surfaced, hard edged features with little opportunity for sympathetic landscaping and would add little value to the character of the area. Community access would be limited to only a small part of that community, and, even then, restricted by the proposed relationship with the school and the lack of floodlighting. On balance, I consider that the proposal would conflict with Policies SR2 of the Local Plan and CS21 of the Core Strategy.
60. With regard to Policy CS2, the site is not allocated for housing. It was accepted that there is a five year HLS and the housing completions have not reached the trigger of 15% below the trajectory that would lead to a review of the planned sites, as set out in Policy CS22. The fact that the justification for the allocation of other areas of open space or open air sports facilities, is considered by the appellant to apply equally to this site does not, in my view, carry significant weight. The site was not proffered at the time, nor was it therefore reviewed by the Council, who have confirmed in their adopted SHP that sufficient sites are now available to meet the five year HLS. While a need for a review of allocations may prompt the site's inclusion, it is not currently allocated and therefore conflicts with Policy CS2.
61. Policy CS2, supported by the recently adopted SHP, sets out the clear strategic approach to development in Oxford, an approach that is consistent with the

⁷ *R(Milne) v Rochdale BC* [2001] Env LR 22

Framework, which seeks the reuse of previously developed land⁸. In this case, the site is specifically protected. I have identified conflict with the policies relevant to this protection. These are not minor policies, but ones that go to the heart of the Council's strategic approach to development; consequently, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan.

62. For reasons set out above, while there may be some improvement to the scheme associated with the proposed alternative, I considered that it was not appropriate to take it into account in my decision. While I noted significant weight in favour of the scheme arising as a result of the delivery of affordable housing, I find that this does not outweigh conflict with the recently adopted development plan.
63. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Robins

INSPECTOR

⁸ Framework Core Principles and Paragraph 111

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Simon Pickles
of Counsel

Instructed by the Head of Law and Governance,
Oxford City Council

He called

Fiona Bartholomew
BA(Hons) DMS MSc MRTPI

Planning Officer – Oxford City Council

Laura Gioddard
BSc(Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Planning Officer – Oxford City Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Richard Kimblin
of Counsel

Instructed by The John Phillips Planning
Consultancy

He called

George Venning
MA(Cantab)

Affordable Housing Consultant
Levvel Ltd

Richard Grady
BA(Hons)

Sports Consultant

Nicholas Lyzba
DipTP DipCP MRTPI

Planning consultant
The John Phillips Planning Consultancy

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor Malik
Mr Konopka
Mrs Konopka
Mr Davies
Mr Smitham

Ward councillor
Local resident
Local resident
Local resident
Former treasurer and chairman of the Lord
Nuffield Club
Local resident and businessman
Local resident

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Updated figures for affordable housing permissions
- 2 Extract from Sites and Housing Plan examination report
- 3 Local Plan Policies Map
- 4 Extract from Oxford City Green Space Study (2005)
- 5 Appellant's opening statement
- 6 Council opening statement
- 7 Oxford City Council Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy
- 8 Environment Agency comment on Wolvercote Mill application
- 9 Oxford Green Space Study 2012 update
- 10 Oxford Green Spaces Strategy 2013 - 2027
- 11 Aerial view of area (approx 1993) (Mrs Harley)
- 12 Mr Davies written submission
- 13 Mrs Harley written submissions
- 14 Unilateral Undertaking – original scheme
- 15 Unilateral Undertaking – alternative scheme
- 16 Suggested condition
- 17 Policy CS17
- 18 Council closing submission
- 19 Appellant's closing submission

This page is intentionally left blank