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| --- | --- |
| **West Area Planning Committee** | 25th May 2016 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application No:** | 16/00142/CT3; |
|  |  |
| **Decision Due by:** | 15.03.2016; Agreed Extension till 01.06.2016; |
|  |  |
| **Proposal:** | Provision of new pavement surface and hard standing at Redbridge Temporary Coach Park; |
|  |  |
| **Site Address:** | Redbridge Park And Ride, Abingdon Road, Oxford (site plan: Appendix 1); |
|  |  |
| **Ward:** | Hinksey Park Ward; |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agent:** | Mr. Steve Smith | **Applicant:** | Oxford City Council |

**Recommendation:**

The West Area Planning Committee is recommended to resolve to grant planning permission subject to conditions for the following reasons:

# Reasons for Approval:

* 1. The proposal is acceptable in terms of highways impacts and will not cause a loss of existing parking within the Park and Ride. The proposal will not cause flooding or contaminated land issues, with any impacts mitigated through condition. The proposal conforms to policies CP1, CP6, CP10, CP22 and TR.9 of the ‘*Oxford Local Plan’* 2001-2016, and policy CS11 of the ‘*Oxford Core Strategy’* 2026.
  2. 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:

# Development begun within time limit;

# Develop in accordance with approved plans;

1. Maintenance and Monitoring Plan;
2. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems;

# Principle Policies;

* 1. This application has been assessed against the following policies:

National

National Planning Policy framework 2012 (paragraphs 39, 109, 186-187, 196-197, 203-206);

National Planning Policy Guidance

Oxford City Council’s ‘Local Plan’ 2005 (as amended 2013)

CP.1 - Development proposals;

CP.6 - Efficient use of land and density;

CP.10 - Siting development to meet functional needs;

CP.22 - Contaminated Land;

TR.9 - Park & Ride

Oxford City Council’s ‘*Core Strategy’* 2011

CS11 - Flooding

* 1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan and relevant supplementary documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

# Relevant Site History

* 1. A planning history search exercise has been carried out, there are applications that are considered of material relevance with this submission.

# Comment;

* 1. No comments received from members of the public.

# Consultation

* 1. Oxford County Council Highways, no objections as the proposal will not result in the long term loss of coach parking spaces or result in coaches being displaced during the surfacing works.
  2. Oxford City Council Flood Mitigation Officer, no objection, subject to a suitable condition being added to ensure that the final detailed design of the drainage is feasible over the lifetime of the surfacing.
  3. Oxford City Council Environmental Development, no objection in terms of land quality but recommends a suitable condition and informative are added in respect of maintenance of permeable paving and measures if landfill waste is discovered respectively.

# Site Description and Surrounding Area

* 1. Redbridge Park and Ride is located on the west side of Abingdon Road. A bus stop serves the Park and Ride with the part single, part two storey Park and Ride building located adjacent to the bus stop, which contains a waiting room and toilets. This is the only building on site. To the west of the Park and Ride building is an extensive car, HGV and coach park. To the south of the Park and Ride is the Southern Bypass.
  2. The site was agricultural fields until the early 1960s. With the construction of the A423 Southern By-Pass Road and the associated side road links to the old Abingdon Road, areas of the site were excavated probably to provide material for the construction of the bypass. The borrow pit was subsequently filled with domestic waste between 1967 and 1971.
  3. After the tip closure in the 1970s, the northern section of the site was developed as a park and ride. It was subsequently extended southwards during the 1980s and 1990s in several phases until the entire area up to the southern bypass had been turned over to car parking.

# Proposed Development

* 1. The application proposes the re-surfacing of five existing unbound, stone surface areas with porous bitumen bound surfacing. Four of these areas of are located at the south-west corner of the car park and one area of asphalting is located at the north end of the site. The resurfacing of a small grassed area with porous asphalt is also proposed at the north-east corner of the site.
  2. No changes proposed to the number of coach and HGV spaces or parking layout or the operation and management of the temporary coach park which is connected with the Westgate development currently under construction.
  3. It is proposed to retain the new surfacing upon closure of the coach park and reinstatement of the site as a park and ride car park. The surfacing works will be incorporated into the reinstated car park layout.

# Main Issues:

* 1. Officers consider that the determining issues with regards to the proposal are as follows;
  + Highways;
  + Flooding;
  + Contaminated Land;

# Highways:

* 1. Policy TR9 of the Oxford Local Plan states ‘Parking provision at the Peartree, Redbridge and Seacourt park and ride car parks will be protected for park and ride purposes, including additional capacity.’
  2. Oxfordshire County Council Highways have been consulted on the proposal and have raised no objections and have stated that the proposal will not result in the long term loss of coach parking spaces or displace coaches during works.
  3. Overall, officers consider the proposal is acceptable in respect of highways impacts and comply with Policy TR9 of the Oxford Local Plan.

# Flooding:

* 1. Policy CS11 states *‘…all developments will be expected to incorporate sustainable drainage systems or techniques to limit runoff from new development, and preferably reduce the existing rate of run-off. Development will not be permitted that will lead to increased flood risk elsewhere, or where the occupants will not be safe from flooding.’*
  2. The Council’s Flood Mitigation Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objections to the proposal subject to a condition being imposed for sustainable urban drainage systems.
  3. Due to the site being underlain by a landfill further details are required to be provided to ensure final detailed design of drainage is feasible and can manage the surface water run-off for the lifetime of the works.
  4. In comparison to the previous approval on the site, this development does not extend as far to the rear, retains the existing building line and therefore retains a large set back from the streetscene Whilst it is wider than the approved dwelling, this increase in width in marginal. Side extensions to the existing dwelling have also been previously approved on this site.
  5. The condition imposed requires drainage details to show how surface water will be dealt with on-site through sustainable urban drainage systems to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council prior to the commencement of development on site.
  6. Overall, officers consider the proposal is acceptable in respect of flooding impacts and complies with Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy.

# Contaminated Land:

* 1. Policy CP22 states ‘*Planning permission will only be granted for development on, or near to, former landfill sites or on land which is suspected to be contaminated, where the City Council is satisfied that there will be no threat to the health of future users or occupiers of the site or neighbouring land and that there will be no adverse impact on the quality of local groundwater or surface water quality.’*
  2. Environmental Development (Land Quality Officer) has been consulted on the application and has raised no objection to the proposal on grounds of contaminated land but have recommended the imposition of a condition and an informative.
  3. Permeable paving requires maintenance to remain permeable and, as such, a condition requiring a maintenance and monitoring plan to be submitted prior to the operation of the development. This condition is to ensure that the development does not have a negative impact on surrounding environmental quality.
  4. The Site Feasibility Study reports on ground conditions at the site. The thinnest material covering landfill waste was found outside of the site to the north-west at 400mm. The deepest proposed excavation proposed is 310mm. As a result, an informative has been added to ensure that precautionary measures are taken in the event that landfill waste materials are exposed during construction.
  5. Overall, officers consider the proposal is acceptable in respect of contaminated land issues and complies with Policy CP22 of the Oxford Local Plan.

# Conclusion

* 1. The proposed works to form the area of hard-standing would not affect the character and amenity of the area or the convenience and safety of other highway users, or flooding. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the relevant policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and Oxford Core Strategy 2026.

# Recommendation

Officer’s recommendation to the Members of the West Area Planning Committee is to grant planning permission for the development, subject to conditions.

**Human Rights Act 1998**

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant 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 planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

**Background Papers:** 16/00142/CT3

**Contact Officer:** Matthew Watson

**Date:** 12th May 2016