

EAST AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday 7 March 2013

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Darke (Chair), Altaf-Khan, Clarkson, Hollick, Lloyd-Shogbesan, Sinclair, Cook, Turner and Gotch.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Martin Armstrong (City Development), Fiona Bartholomew (City Development), David Groves (Oxfordshire County Council), Michael Morgan (Law and Governance) and Sarah Claridge (Trainee Democratic and Electoral Services Officer)

136. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received by Cllr Van Coulter (substitute Cllr Colin Cook), Cllr Steve Curran (substitute Cllr Ed Turner) and Cllr David Rundle (substitute Cllr Mike Gotch). Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan.

137. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

138. PARKING AREA AND PART SPORTS FIELD, WILLIAM MORRIS CLOSE: 12/02967/FUL

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) which detailed a planning application for the construction of two all weather playing pitches, plus a new residential development consisting of 6 x 1 bed flats, 15 x 2 bed flats, 6 x 3 bed flats, 13 x 3 bed houses and 3 x 4 bed houses, together with access road, parking, landscaping etc accessed off Barracks Lane.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, the Committee noted that Judith Harley and Gus Bianchini spoke against the application and Nik Lyzba spoke in favour of it.

After taking all written and oral submissions into account, the Committee resolved (by 7 votes to 0) to REFUSE the planning application for the following reasons:

1. The application site has been in use for formal and informal sport and recreation until recently. Although the site is now fenced it has not been clearly shown that the site is surplus to requirements for sport or recreation. The site retains the potential to provide for types of open air sport and recreation for which there is a need in the City. The replacement sports facilities in the form of all-weather mini-pitches with restricted community access are not equal to or better than retaining the potential of the site to provide for open air sport and recreation. Further it is not essential that the all-weather mini-pitches are provided on this particular site to satisfy local

need. For these reasons the proposal does not accord with the NPPF, Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy, or Policy SR2 of the Oxford Local Plan.

2. The site meets the requirements of the NPPF as a local green space, valued local amenity which will be lost by developing housing on part of the site and diminished on the mini-pitches part of the site. The all-weather mini-pitches do not form an acceptable alternative to retention of this green space. This is contrary to guidance in the NPPF and Policies CS21 of the Core Strategy and SR2 of the Oxford Local Plan.
- 3 The development is contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy in that the site is not allocated for development nor is it needed to meet the NPPF 5 or 10 year housing land availability requirements. There are no other balancing reasons or mitigating circumstances why housing should be allowed on this site. It is not essential that the housing or all-weather mini-pitch developments are developed on this particular site which it is preferable to retain as open space for the well-being of the community it serves.
- 4 The proposed number of dwellings constitutes an overdevelopment of the site in that it restricts the opportunity to create a high quality housing layout. The largely rectilinear disposition of buildings, the scale, bulk and massing of the block encompassing plots 26-43, and the absence of landmark buildings or features would fail to create a strong sense of place. The public realm would not be a visually attractive environment as it would be dominated by on-street parking with few front gardens, very little green space and no opportunities for landmark or focal-point planting/features. The gardens to plots 26, 27, 32, 33, 38 and 39 which include family units would be too restricted in size. Bin and cycle storage provision would be inadequate and not always conveniently located for use by all occupants of the houses or flats, and there would be inadequate room at the front of the houses/flats to make up these deficiencies. For these reasons the proposal does not accord with guidance on the design of development set out in the NPPF, Policies CP1, CP6 and CP8 of the Oxford Local Plan, Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy or Policies HP9, HP13 and HP15 of the Sites and Housing DPD.
- 5 The proposed layout would result in a loss of amenity to some existing properties adjacent to the site boundary namely: inter-visibility between plot 2 and number 11 Crescent Close; overlooking the garden area of 11 Crescent Close from plots 6, 7, and 10 to 13; and noise and light disturbance to properties in Beresford Place arising from the location of the access road near to north facing habitable rooms. For these reasons the proposal does not accord with guidance on the design of development set out in Policies CP6 and CP8 of the Oxford Local Plan, Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy or Policies HP9 and HP14 of the Sites and Housing DPD.
- 6 Although the layout is unlikely directly to affect the viability of the important amenity trees on the site periphery, there are concerns that the trees will come under pressure for reduction due to overshadowing the gardens to plots 26, 27, 32, 33, 38 and 39; and reducing the daylight available to plots 26 to 43. The tree work that will be necessary to significantly improve the light situation is likely to have a significant harmful effect on amenity in the area. For these reasons the proposal does not accord with guidance on the design of development set out in Policies CP6 and CP8 of the Oxford Local Plan,

Policy CS18 of the Core Strategy or Policy HP9 of the Sites and Housing DPD.

- 7 The proposed development fails to comply with the guidance of the NPPF concerning using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, adapting to climate change and moving to a low carbon economy; and fails to meet the standards of resource efficiency required by the Council's adopted planning policies on energy, natural resources, waste and recycling, namely Core Strategy Policy CS9, Sites and Housing Plan Policy HP11, and Local Plan Policies CP17 and CP18.

139. FORMER LORD NUFFIELD CLUB: 12/02935/FUL

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) which detailed a planning application for a change of use from a Leisure Centre (use class D2) to a Community Free School (use class D1), works to the external appearance of the existing building, boundary treatments, provision of play areas including Multi Use Games Area, access and parking along with associated landscaping.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, the Committee noted that Cllr David Williams, Gus Bianchini and Judith Harley spoke against the application and Grace Manning-Marsh, Steven Jones and Michael Magri spoke in favour of it.

Cllr Lloyd-Shogbesan arrived but did not take part in the debate or determination.

After taking all written and oral submissions into account, the Committee resolved (by 6 votes to 1) to REFUSE the planning application for the following reasons:

1. That having regard to the traffic generation arising from the development, and the design of the proposed school access and pupil drop-off facility, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon the free-flow of traffic and general safety of other road users such as pedestrians and cyclists in Barracks Lane, William Morris Close and at the busy junction of Barracks Lane/Hollow Way/Horspath Driftway. This would be contrary to guidance in the NPPF, and to Policies CP1, CP10 and TR1 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016.
2. The application site has been in use for formal and informal sport and recreation until recently. Although the site is now fenced it has not been clearly shown that the site is surplus to requirements for sport or recreation. The site retains the potential to provide for types of open air sport and recreation for which there is a need in the City. The replacement sports facilities in the form of community access to the proposed school's external areas and facilities are not equal to or better than retaining the potential of the site to provide for open air sport and recreation. For these reasons the proposal does not accord with the NPPF, Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy, or Policy SR2 of the Oxford Local Plan.

3. The external areas proposed for school use are insufficient to serve the needs of the proposed number of pupils. This would be contrary to Policy CP10 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

140. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee resolved (by 8 votes to 0) to NOTE that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday 16th April 2013.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.50 pm