|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EAST AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Number:** | 18/01329/FUL |
|  |  |
| **Decision Due by:** | 20th August 2018 |
|  |  |
| **Extension of Time:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Proposal:** | Construction of two-storey building for training purposes and associated external works such as creation of access road, car park and means of enclosure. |
|  |  |
| **Site Address:** | Land South Of, Oxford Road, Horspath, Oxford |
|  |  |
| **Ward:** | Lye Valley Ward |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Case Officer** | Michael Kemp |  |
| **Agent:**  | Mr Guy Roberts | **Applicant:**  | Mr R. Blackmore |

**Reason at Committee:** The proposals constitute major development.

**COMMITTEE REPORT ADDENDUM**

**IMPLICATIONS OF REVISED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (JULY 2018)**

* 1. Since the publication of the agenda for this committee, the government has revised the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This replaces the version published in March 2012 which was quoted throughout the committee report:
	2. The following table should supersede the table listed under paragraph 8.1 of the committee report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | Local Plan | Core Strategy | Sites and Housing Plan | Other Planning Documents |
| **Design** | 12 | CP1, CP8, CP9, CP10, CP11 | CS18 |  |  |
| **Natural Environment** | 12, 13 |  | CS4  |  |  |
| **Social and community** | 8 |  | CS21 |  |  |
| **Transport** | 9 | TR1, TR2, TR3, TR4,  | CS13 |  | Parking Standards SPD |
| **Environmental** | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| **Misc** |  | CP.13, CP.24, CP.25 |  | MP1 |  |

* 1. Paragraph 10.3 of the officers report references Paragraph 70 of the 2012 NPPF, which supports in principle the provision of sports and recreation facilities. The provisions of Paragraph 70 are identically replicated within Paragraph 92 of the superseding NPPF and consequently there are no additional considerations to account for when determining the in principle acceptability of sports and recreation based development such as that proposed within this application.
	2. Paragraph 10.5 of the officer’s report references Paragraph 89 of the 2012 NPPF. Paragraph 89 of the 2012 NPPF considers that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate though this paragraph lists exceptions to inappropriate development; this includes the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt. Paragraph 10.9 of the officer’s report concludes that the development complies with Paragraph 89 of the 2012 NPPF.
	3. Paragraph 89 of the 2012 NPPF is directly superseded by Paragraph 145 of the amended NPPF, which replicates word for word the specific exceptions of superseded Paragraph 89. Consequently the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt remains an exception to inappropriate development.
	4. In summary the provisions of Paragraph 145 of the superseding NPPF, when dealing with the provision of new buildings in the Green Belt are no more or less restrictive than those of Paragraph 89 of the superseded framework. Taking this into account, there are no additional implications to consider when determining the application on the basis of the superseding paragraphs of the NPPF.