

West Area Planning Committee

11th July 2012.

Application Number: 12/00249/FUL

Decision Due by: 3rd May 2012

Proposal: Demolition of existing building on site. Erection of 83 bedroom hotel on 3 and 4 floors accessed off Old Abingdon Road. Provision of 45 car parking spaces plus bin and cycle storage. (Amended description)

Site Address: Former Motor World, Abingdon Road, **Appendix 1.**

Ward: Hinksey Park

Agent: Kemp and Kemp.

Applicant: Anglo Holt Construction Ltd
And Travelodge Hotels Ltd

Recommendation: Planning permission be refused.

Reasons for Refusal.

1. Having regard to its height, mass, layout and overall appearance the proposed development would constitute an overlarge and over dominant feature at a prominent location at the southern edge of the city, close to open land and Oxford Green Belt. The development would therefore be contrary to policies CP1, CP8 and CP9 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016 and policy CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026.
2. Having regard to the location of the proposed Travelodge in close proximity to the strategic road network, the amount of car parking provided is considered to be inadequate to serve the amount of accommodation proposed. The development would therefore be contrary to policy TR3 and Appendix 3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016.

NB: Notwithstanding the recommendation to refuse planning permission, if committee is nevertheless minded to support the proposals, then the application should be deferred in order to complete an accompanying legal agreement securing the following:-

1. Highways infrastructure: £26,600.
2. Affordable housing: £10,009.
3. Off - site landscaping: £12,000.
4. Public art: £15,785.

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
CP18 - Natural Resource Impact Analysis
CP22 - Contaminated Land
TR1 - Transport Assessment
TR2 - Travel Plans
TR3 - Car Parking Standards
TR4 - Pedestrian & Cycle Facilities
TR9 - Park & Ride
TR14 - Servicing Arrangements
NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows
NE23 - Habitat Creation in New Developments
TA4 - Tourist Accommodation

Core Strategy

CS2 - Previously developed and greenfield land
CS9 - Energy and natural resources
CS10 - Waste and recycling
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
CS24 - Affordable housing
CS28 - Employment sites
CS32 - Sustainable tourism

Other Policy Documents.

1. Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
2. Affordable Housing SPD.
3. Natural Resource Impact Analysis (NRIA) SPD.
4. Parking Standards, Transport Assessments & Travel Plans SPD.
5. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Public Consultation.

Statutory Bodies:

- Environment Agency (i): Do not have in principle objection but recommend

refusal on basis of Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) as submitted; FRA fails to consider effects of a range of flooding events or requirement for emergency planning including flood warning and evacuation including extreme events; FRA needs to demonstrate that the site would not flood in 1 in 100 year event plus climate change; if it does flood “sequential approach” to site selection needs to be demonstrated, and also that there would be no loss of flood storage up to 1 in 100 year event plus climate change; and that access and egress routes would not be affected.

- Environment Agency (ii): In absence of acceptable FRA objection maintained; revised FRA still fails to offer sufficient mitigation to ensure no flood risk to others, in particular it fails to demonstrate that existing ground levels should not be raised to ensure there is no loss of flood storage; otherwise flood risk mitigation acceptable.
- Environment Agency (iii): Objection removed; suggest conditions that development only constructed in compliance with revised FRA, and other conditions relating to ground contamination and remediation, foundation design and disposal of surface water.
- Highway Authority (i): Application should be refused; unable to support proposals on basis of indicated parking provision; car parking requirements based on TRICS data and on comparison with existing Travelodge in Manchester with 50 car parking spaces available in adjacent car park managed and controlled by others; not considered to be an appropriate basis for predicting demand for this site - Manchester site is also centrally located with no dedicated parking provision, and not adjacent to a Park and ride site or residential area; majority of users likely to arrive here by car with parking potentially overflowing into Park and Ride or residential areas; cycle parking should be extended and moved to alternative location in covered, secure conditions; traffic generation model has incorrect data inputs on timings at traffic controlled junction and therefore unable to assess if proposed development would have adverse impact on traffic controlled junction; existing oil interceptors to be replaced; porous paving should be utilised; various comments on draft travel plan; no indication of how construction traffic would be managed; replacement trees in highway verge at £1200 each including future maintenance; if permitted various financial contributions required.
- Highway Authority (ii): Now content with additional information provided on traffic flows; additional flows through junction of A4144 and Old Abingdon Road minimal; if permitted contribution of £26,600 required towards highway infrastructure in view of additional peak hour movements; additional cycle parking requested in safe, secure conditions.
- Thames Water: Due to history of flooding in the area, Thames water would require developer funded impact study to be carried out through Developer Services Department.
- Environment Development (i): Land known to have a previous potentially contaminative use; as a minimum a desk study required to ensure site is suitable for us; condition suggested accordingly.
- Environmental Development (ii): Condition suggested requiring scheme for treating cooking smells.

Third Parties:

- Oxford Preservation Trust: Objects to poorly designed building at gateway site

from the south; pays no heed to the character of the city - it could be anywhere in the country and lacks local distinctiveness; will impact adversely in framing views from western hills and A34; existing building sits discreetly in its surroundings.

- 24 Edith Road: Object; sensitive location on southern gateway to Oxford; previous appeal turned down on this site as development considered out of scale and overdominant; 3 storeys with pitched roof should be maximum height; object to loss of willow tree; contribution to landscaping required if approved; do not object to hotel in principle; 1 parking space per two rooms should be maximum with overspill into Park and Ride by arrangement with Council; support CHP system but would welcome PV too; also concerned about water pollution, flooding issues etc.
- Others: Although pre application discussions took place between representatives of the applicants and officers of the local planning and highways authorities in the normal way, and contact was made with ward councillors and portfolio holder for Planning, there appears to have been no consultation with the local community or businesses by the applicants prior to the submission of the planning application. Since submission however a series of standard letters all dated 15th March 2012 have been received from 22 city centre shops, restaurants and bars all supporting the planning application. In addition early in May the applicant undertook post application consultation with occupiers and householders in the locality, by letter drop and subsequent conversation with consultees. Of the 5 businesses / charities contacted 2 indicated general support for the proposals whilst a third indicated there would be no impact on their business. Of the 14 residents responding, the majority are reported as being neutral, raising no objection or were supportive in principle. Three were concerned about traffic or access issues however and one concerned about the height of the development.

Officers Assessment:

Background to Case.

1. The application site consists of a rectangular parcel of land measuring approximately 0.21 ha. (0.5 acre) located at the junction of Abingdon Road and Old Abingdon Road. **Appendix 1** refers. Immediately to the south and west is the Redbridge Park and Ride site. Access is taken from Old Abingdon Road a short distance west of the junction. The site is currently occupied by a single storey building housing a bathroom warehouse, having previously been a car showroom.
2. Although the existing building has existed on the site for a number of years, since 2000 there have been two planning applications to redevelop the site. The first was in 2001 when application 01/01371/NFY sought to demolish the car showroom building and construct in its place a 3 storey office building consisting of 2,431 sq m of office accommodation served by 67 car parking spaces. The application was not permitted however but refused planning permission on the basis that commercial office development would be contrary to policies of employment restraint in operation at the time and that the building was overlarge in its context, being adjacent to open land and the Oxford Green Belt. The case was appealed but dismissed, the Inspector not accepting the arguments in relation to employment restraint, but concurring with the local planning authority

that the building was overlarge in its context.

3. Subsequently a scaled down proposal for offices was submitted in 2003 under reference 03/01773/FUL. This was for 1,712 sq m of office accommodation on two floors served by some 36 car parking spaces and 40 cycle spaces. The application was granted planning permission, and although details were submitted subsequently in compliance with imposed conditions, the development has not been completed. As a start had been made on site however then the permission remains “extant” and could be completed without the need of a further permission.

Current Proposals.

4. This latest proposal is for a Travelodge rather than offices and proposes 2,475 sq m of accommodation mainly on 3 floors but with a fourth floor element at the northern end of the site where the building addresses the corner of Abingdon Road and Old Abingdon Road. Lift access is provided to all levels with some 83 double, twin or family bedrooms proposed plus bar / café area with 54 covers for the use of guests only. No meeting rooms or other facilities are proposed. Of the bedrooms, four are to full disabled standard, two rooms being located on each of the ground and first floors. 45 car parking spaces are intended to serve the development including 4 for disabled use, plus 4 cycle parking spaces.
5. There are a number of trees which would be required to be lost to allow the development to proceed, though mitigation is offered through replacement planting. Access would continue to be from Old Abingdon Road as now. As the building would be located closer to its Abingdon Road boundary than is currently the case with the bathroom warehouse, then that planting would be in the adjacent highway verge in the main. A financial contribution of £12,000 is offered accordingly.
6. Subject to all other material considerations Local Plan policy supports the provision of short stay visitor accommodation on the principal radial routes into the city, including Abingdon Road. Moreover although the planning permission for office use had commenced on site, only a minimal amount of work was undertaken and therefore there is no actual loss of employment land involved in these proposals. The small amount of employment at the bathroom centre would be matched by that at the Travelodge.
7. Officers therefore consider the key determining issues in this case to be:
 - highways, access and parking;
 - scale and form of development;
 - landscaping;
 - flood risk; and
 - sustainability

Highways, Access and Parking.

8. Vehicular access to the application site is taken via Old Abingdon Road approximately 45m from the controlled junction with the A.4144 Abingdon

Road. **Appendix 1** refers. Entrance to the car park is from the western side of the site to some 45 car parking spaces, including 4 for disabled use. Cycle parking is provided for 4 cycles. A transport assessment accompanying the planning application assessed the additional amount of traffic through the controlled junction to amount to 11 movements in the morning peak and 4 in the evening peak. This increase in traffic generation is described by the Highway Authority as minimal and to have no material impact on the workings of the junction. Nevertheless in the event of planning permission being granted, then due to the overall increase in traffic movements compared to existing conditions a contribution would be sought by the Highway Authority towards highways infrastructure in line with the Planning Obligations SPD. The applicant is agreeable to such a contribution.

9. In terms of the level of car parking provision, the adopted Local Plan distinguishes between hotels and motels. Although there is no definition of either within the Plan, officers would consider a motel to be a specialist form of hotel with limited facilities catering predominantly for car borne guests. Accordingly the parking requirement for motels is set at 1 space per bedroom, and for hotels at 1 space per 2 bedrooms plus 1 space per 2 resident staff. In this case 45 car parking spaces are provided to serve 83 bedrooms. (There would be no resident staff in the current proposals). In this regard it is noted that other hotels on the periphery of the city possess a far greater ratio of car parking spaces to bedrooms than proposed here, whilst accepting that they may also provide additional facilities.
10. In pre and post application negotiations the applicants have insisted that the proposed Travelodge at this location should be regarded as a hotel rather than motel and therefore attract only the lower parking requirement. It is argued that unlike a typical roadside motel it would cater for business customers and tourists visiting Oxford and would not cater to any great extent for travellers en route to destinations elsewhere.
11. More important however than any precise label to be attached to the Travelodge, or whether guests are bound for other destinations or not, are the actual circumstances pertaining to this particular case. In this regard the proposed Travelodge would be sited at a highly accessible position on the strategic road network, being located in close proximity to the Southern By Pass / Oxford Ring Road, A.423 Henley road, and A34 trunk road. Officers are therefore of the view that it would be most attractive to car borne customers, whether business customers, tourists or other guests. Whilst it is acknowledged that a proportion of guests may arrive by modes other than the private car, in view of the excellent accessibility by road it is envisaged that such guests would represent only a very small proportion of the total. It is recognised that following their arrival guests seeking access to the city centre may use public transport to gain access rather than the vehicle they may have arrived in.
12. In the Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application the applicants make comparison between the car parking needs of the proposed development and what it considers to be the company's most similar

establishment located in Manchester. In that case the Travelodge there provides 181 bedrooms served by 50 car parking spaces. The comparison with the current case was based on a pro rata analysis of a parking accumulation exercise and concluded that predicted parking demand for the Abingdon Road facility would be 34 spaces, well within the 45 spaces to be proposed to be provided. The Highway Authority did not consider it appropriate to use this parking accumulation exercise as the basis for determining the predicted parking demand for the current application site however as the Manchester Travelodge is located at a more central site; there is no dedicated parking provision for its guests (though it was noted that parking in the car park beneath operated by Britannia Parking Limited was free for hotel users during the evening and overnight); and the Manchester Travelodge is not located adjacent to a Park and Ride facility and residential streets where there is potential for overspill.

13. Whilst City and County Councils are committed to policies of traffic and parking restraint, officers are concerned that with 45 car parking spaces only provided for 83 double rooms then at certain times the potential exists for car parking to indeed spill over into Redbridge Park and Ride or uncontrolled residential streets nearby such as Bertie Place. Such a potential is especially so if as advised the Travelodge may seek to charge its customers separately for car parking at a price equivalent to Park and Ride charges. The applicants have been advised that officers cannot support the use of Park and Ride for these purposes as it is a facility specifically intended to serve city centre not local needs and has steadily grown in usage over the years and continues to do so.
14. For all these reasons Planning and Highways officers have concluded that too little car parking is provided to serve the proposed Travelodge and the development cannot therefore be supported.
15. In terms of cycle parking, as 11.5 full time equivalent staff are intended to be employed (4 full time, 15 part time), then the Local Plan requirement for 1 cycle space per 5 non residential staff is met. However officers would welcome some additional provision to encourage staff to cycle to their place of work if possible and to cater for any very occasional guest who arrives by cycle. It is also suggested that the cycle parking should be provided in covered, secure conditions which is not currently the case.

Scale and Form of Development.

16. The application site is located at the southern edge of the built up area of the city on a principal radial route and in close proximity to the Southern By Pass / Ring Road. To its north are residential areas whilst in other directions open land. To the south and west is the large Redbridge Park and Ride site which is generally well screened by perimeter planting, whilst to the east beyond the Abingdon Road are fields and meadowland leading to the River Thames and its tributaries within the Oxford Green Belt. The application site therefore occupies a prominent position at the southern entry to the city.

17. The proposed building is rectangular in form within a rectangular site. It is located along the site's eastern boundary with car parking to the western side where vehicular access is taken. The entrance to the building itself is also from this western side, near the building's north - west corner. The building would be constructed generally on 3 floors but with an additional fourth floor to its northern end. The building is flat roofed throughout. Following negotiation with officers various elevational treatments have been suggested, but essentially within the same palette of materials, namely facing brickwork and render under a flat single ply membrane roof. Windows would be nearly square in shape within grey powder coated aluminium frames. To the corner of the building facing the junction of Abingdon Road with Old Abingdon Road full height tinted glazing is proposed to the main stairwell which is located at this point. Along the northern edge of the site are located 2 cycle stands to accommodate 4 cycles, plus enclosed bin storage areas.
18. Of the three alternative elevational treatments, the first consists of buff brickwork in the main, with a central section only in cream render. A degree of verticality is introduced by linking some of the windows at each level by timber boarding. The second alternative, in contrast, consists of rather more render, largely in the form of horizontal banding interspersed with the buff brickwork at ground floor level and timber boarding at second floor level. In this version some of the windows central to the main elevations possess projecting surrounds. The third alternative combines elements from each of the other two with some projecting window elements and some use of timber. The majority of the elevations are in render on a brick plinth at ground floor level, the render in this option possibly being in a light blue colour. Again timber links some of the windows whilst sections of darker blue perforated panels are also introduced at various points.
19. The applicants indicate that the various alternatives have been drawn up as there are a variety of building styles with render and brick faced elevations both present in the locality rather than a single or predominant type. A simple architectural form is proposed which is stated to be a response to the prominence of the site, but encompassing a number of specific design features including the feature glazed corner, a stepped form, a projecting eaves line, and window surrounds and detailing.
20. The Travelodge would be rectangular in shape running along the majority of the eastern side of the site and would rise to 9.8m along the greater part of its length and to 12.5m for the 4 storey element at its northern end. This is some 0.8m taller generally than the permitted office development and 2.8m taller at the northern end. The office development was also rather different in its form in that it occupied 2 floors only and was essentially L shaped as it turned the corner into Old Abingdon Road. This allowed a curved architectural feature to be incorporated to emphasise the corner point.
21. The Travelodge is reduced in size from the dismissed appeal proposal however which had proposed a 3 storey development with undercroft car parking at ground floor level and 2 floors of offices above. The general height of that building was 11.0m rising to 15.0m at the top of its central curved roof.

A comparison of the basic features of the 3 proposals is attached as **Appendix 2** to this report.

22. The appeal case and the subsequent approval of a more modest office development are important material considerations in this case. In terms of the appeal the Inspector had concluded in terms of the impact of the development on the character of its surroundings:

“While the relationship of the appeal building to the nearby houses is acceptable in terms of height and scale, I consider that its impact on the open, green and low key character of the wider surroundings would be harmful. This would be particularly so because of the height and mass of the building and the fact that most of the site would be enclosed to form the ground floor parking area. Minimal space would be left on the eastern side for tree planting and the landscaped area on the northern side would not be generous. In my opinion, this would make the development appear stark and over dominant by comparison with the green and open surroundings which characterise this area. The proposed building would intrude into views from the Green Belt and take away from its open character. For these reasons, I consider that the impact of the proposal on its surroundings would fail to accord with SP policy G2 and LP policy EN76 such that permission should be refused.”

23. The full text of the appeal is attached as **Appendix 3** to this report. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development is of a lesser height and mass than the dismissed appeal, it remains the officers’ view that the Inspector’s concerns have not been fully addressed in the current proposal in same way as the second (permitted) office development.
24. There has been much guidance in recent years about the desirability of seeking good design in new development, the latest within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published earlier this year. The NPPF emphasises the importance attached to good design and that innovation, originality and initiative should not be stifled. Rather evaluation of proposals should concentrate on guiding principles of scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access.
25. In this case the development is located at a prominent site in an area which enjoys an open character. It would not abut other buildings but would stand alone. However the proposal in its various alternatives is not innovative or original in concept as such a site might demand. Rather its height, massing, layout and rectangular form would result in a dominant structure, but one which lacks distinctiveness and character. Moreover despite its glazed corner feature, the building fails to address the corner of Abingdon Road and Old Abingdon Road, with bin stores, cycle parking and an emergency exit all located at this northern end. The entrance to the building is taken from western side facing the car park, doubtless where guests are anticipated to arrive.

Trees and Landscaping.

26. The application site is located at the southern edge of the city and some 12 trees of various sizes and species currently exist on the site or in its immediate environs. These consist of 3 willows, 6 cherries, 1 pear, 1 crab apple and 1 cotoneaster. These have been surveyed using British Standards recommendations in respect of trees in relation new buildings with 3 being assessed as category B (where retention is desirable) and 9 category C (trees which could be retained). In these proposals 9 are proposed for removal with 3 only retained, a category C pear tree to the north - west corner of the site, and two category B willows just outside the site beyond its south - west corner. These two willows have a life expectancy in the range of 20 to 40 years.
27. Of particular concern however is the loss of the prominent weeping willow to the south - east corner of the site. This category B tree is the most significant specimen on the site, also with a life expectancy in the range of 20 to 40 years. It was retained in the extant office development and ideally Officers feel it should be retained in these proposals. The applicant argues however that it cannot be incorporated into the development without a major redesign and the likely loss of car parking spaces which would make the development unviable.
28. Whilst these losses, particularly the weeping willow, are regretted, and there is little or no scope for new planting within the application site as proposed, they can be mitigated by new planting within the adjacent highway verge. To this end the applicant is prepared to contribute £12,000 towards off site planting which would allow 12 new trees to be planted and maintained by City and County Councils for the future.

Flood Risk.

29. The application site is located within Flood Zone 2 as defined by the Environment Agency which equates to a medium risk of flooding. The site was in fact flooded in the worse recorded flood of 1947 but not in more recent flood events. Moreover since the 2007 flood various localised flood mitigation measures have been carried out in the vicinity by the Oxford Area Flood Partnership. Existing ground levels within the site are within the range of 55.90 AOD to 56.30 AOD.
30. In these proposals it is intended that finished floor level to the building would be set at 56.50 AOD, or over 360 mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event level of 56.14 AOD with allowance for climate change. This would protect the building from flooding itself. In order to not increase flood risk elsewhere ground levels would be reduced below the building to compensate for a small loss of flood storage in levelling the site. This would increase the flood storage capacity of the site slightly by a net volume of 119 cu m. Voids would also be created beneath the building to allow floodwater to move freely under it in an extreme flood event. This is achieved by placing 1m wide openings with grills at 5m intervals around the external walls to the building. In a 1 in 100 year event with climate change the car park would then be flooded to a depth of 200mm, still allowing evacuation of the building in accordance with an Evacuation Plan to be drawn up. In any event the site is vulnerable to fluvial

rather than flash flooding, giving good prior warning of the onset of flood conditions.

31. Subject to these provisions being in place and the imposition of appropriate conditions as outlined above, the initial objections of the Environment Agency have now been withdrawn.

Sustainability.

32. An Energy Strategy Report and Natural Resource Impact Analysis accompany the planning application. Although a partial air source heat pump system is contemplated in terms of on - site renewable energy plus a gas fired CHP system, generally the emphasis of the development in sustainability terms is in incorporating energy efficiency measures into the building wherever possible. This is achieved by minimising energy consumption through passive measures; by utilising efficient building services; and including low and zero carbon technologies. This translates into the use of naturally ventilated double glazed window units throughout with mechanical ventilation only required in specific areas such as the cafe area. Insulation and air permeability would meet or exceed Building Control requirements with low energy lighting and control systems in place throughout. All appliances would be A rated.

33. Timber would be sourced from a Forestry Stewardship Council (FSC) supplier. Other materials would be sourced from the UK wherever possible, with the demolished building reused as aggregate. A site waste management plan would be operated with recycling facilities on site. Dual flush WCs and low flow water systems would be utilised throughout.

34. With these features in place an overall a score of 7 out of a possible 11 is achieved on the NRIA with the minimum score exceeded in each of the categories of energy efficiency, renewables, use of materials and water resources.

Other Matters.

35. Planning Obligations in the Event of Approval. Notwithstanding the recommendation at the head of this report that planning permission be refused, if committee is nevertheless minded to grant planning permission, then various contributions are payable in line with the requirements of the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The applicant is agreeable to such contributions. In addition a further sum has been agreed with the applicant for off - site tree planting and landscaping in the highway verges adjacent to the development as mitigation for the trees lost to construction. The contributions would be as follows, index linked:

- Highways infrastructure: £26,600.
- Affordable housing: £10,009.
- Off - site landscaping: £12,000.
- Public art: £15,785.

36. **Biodiversity.** A phase 1 habitat survey of the application site indicates no evidence of protected species or reptiles, and only low potential for bat roosts. The existing trees on site, especially the willows, provide some potential habitats for bird life. In the event of planning permission being granted mitigation of the lost trees is provided by new tree planting whilst bird and bat boxes can be incorporated into the development, secured by condition.

Conclusion:

37. Whilst the provision of low cost visitor accommodation can generally be supported along the main radial routes into the city centre, in this case the development is sited at a highly prominent location close to open land and Green Belt, and to the strategic road network. In view of these features Officers have concluded that the height, massing and layout of the development and its low provision of car parking are features which render the development unacceptable. The planning application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to refuse this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

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 refuse planning permission, officers would nevertheless consider that the proposal would not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Background Papers: Planning applications 01/01371/NFY, 03/01773/FUL and 12/00249/FUL.

Contact Officer: Murray Hancock

Extension: 2153

Date: 28th June 2012