

Agenda Item 6

Oxford City Planning Review Committee

16th June 2026

Application number: 25/01859/OUTFUL

Decision due by 5th November 2025

Extension of time 30th June 2026

Proposal

- i. Outline application (with all matters reserved save for "access"), for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a graduate college for the University of Oxford comprising Student accommodation (Sui Generis), ancillary college buildings (Sui Generis), provision of landscaping, bin and cycle parking, car parking, public realm and open space.
- ii. Full application for demolition of existing buildings and partial demolition of existing walls, erection of a hospital building (Use Class C2), a research building (Use Class E(g)(ii)), a hospital research link building (C2/E(g)(ii)), and erection of relocated POWIC/SANE building (Use Class E(g)(i) and (ii)) and pavilion building. Provision of associated car parking, cycle parking, bin storage, access, landscaping, public realm works and associated infrastructure works. Refurbishment and repair of the Gate Lodge and use for residential accommodation associated with the College (Use Class Sui generis)

Site address Warneford Hospital, Warneford Lane – see **Appendix 1** for site plan

Ward Churchill Ward

Case officer Chloe Jacobs

Agent: Becky Hartley **Applicant:** Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust

Reason at Committee Called into planning review committee by Councillors Rawle, Mundy, Kerr, Jarvis, Muddiman, Hunt, Miles, Djafari-Marbini, Robinson, Pressel, Regisford and Morris.

1. RECOMMENDATION

1.1. Planning Review Committee is recommended to:

1.1.1. **Approve the application** for the reasons given in the report and subject to the required planning conditions set out in section 12 of this report and grant planning permission subject to:

- The satisfactory completion of a legal agreement under section.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers to secure the planning obligations set out in the recommended heads of terms which are set out in this report; and

1.1.2. **agree to delegate authority** to the Director of Planning and Regulation to:

- seek amended plans to show:
 - The revised pedestrian route from the new north gate being diverted around the historic embankment and the 2no trees within this embankment retained. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.
 - To show the retained trees T245 within Zone 02 and T65 within Zone 01. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.
 - The revised pedestrian route from the new north gate, moving east – this will show a large gap for pedestrians between the car parking spaces. Including any updates to any related architectural, parameter or landscape plans which show these elements.
- seek amended technical documents to reflect the above changes including:
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - Landscaping and Planting Character Report
 - Landscaping Management Plan
 - Delivery and Servicing Plan
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Design Code
 - Transport Assessment
 - Travel Plan
- finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report including such refinements, amendments, additions and/or deletions as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary; and
- finalise the recommended legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other enabling powers as set out in this report, including refining, adding to, amending and/or deleting the obligations detailed in the heads of terms set out in this report (including to dovetail with and where appropriate, reinforce the final conditions and informatives to be attached to the planning permission) as the Director of Planning and Regulation considers reasonably necessary; and

- complete the section 106 legal agreement referred to above and issue the planning permission.

1. Background

- 1.1. At the Oxford City Planning Committee on the 21st April 2026 Members resolved to grant planning permission for the redevelopment of Warneford Hospital including a new mental health hospital, research centre, POWIC building, and associated landscaping and works. It also allowed for the provision of a new graduate college.
- 1.2. A copy of the officers committee report has been attached to **appendix 2** of this report. The original committee report has been updated to include the verbal update and corrections which was provided to members at the committee. A copy of the minutes from the Oxford City Planning Committee meeting (21st April 2026) are also attached to appendix 3 of this report.
- 1.3. The application has been called in to Planning Review Committee by Councillors Rawle, Mundy, Kerr, Jarvis, Muddiman, Hunt, Miles, Djafari-Marbini, Robinson, Pressel, Regisford and Morris.
- 1.4. The grounds for call-in are as follows:

The proposal does not meet the requirements of policies M1 and M3 in the local plan due to the number of car parking spaces included in the development, and because of the detrimental social, health and environmental effects that this could lead to in the area.
- 1.5. The purpose of this supplemental report is to provide specific comments on the matters listed above and should also be read in conjunction with the officer's committee report in **appendix 2** of this report which sets out the main assessment of the application in support of the recommendation to approve planning permission for the application.

2. Car Parking and Highways Safety

- 2.1. The decision of the Oxford City Planning Committee has been called in to the Planning Review Committee on grounds that the proposal does not meet the requirements of policies M1 and M3 in the Oxford Local Plan due to the number of car parking spaces included in the development, and because of the detrimental social, health and environmental effects that this could lead to in the area.
- 2.2. The committee report in **appendix 2** provided a full assessment of the application against Oxford Local Plan Policy M1 and M3 and conclude that the parking provision within the scheme did accord with the requirements of these policies. To assist members further, officers have provided a response to the call-in in two parts, the car parking policy requirements and the impact on the increase in parking.

A. Local Plan Policy and background

- 2.3. The existing site currently has 360no. car parking spaces. As explained in the original committee report, the proposal would result in an overall increase of 186no. car parking spaces across the site.
- 2.4. The proposed development will have 548no. car parking spaces which includes 480no. staff spaces and 66no. visitors' spaces, which would be broken down across the uses as follows:
- 2.5. The hospital will have 208no. staff car parking spaces, including 17no. operational spaces, for 500 members of staff (38%) plus 22no. visitors spaces. This is an actual reduction in parking when compared to the existing provision which is approximately 264 staff spaces. It is also a reduction per employee ($264/400 = 66\%$).
- 2.6. The research centre will have 208no. staff spaces for 1,200 members of staff (17%), as well as 13no. visitors spaces.
- 2.7. For the college, 44no. spaces have been proposed, 14no. of these would be visitors spaces, including 10no. disabled spaces, and the remaining 30 no. spaces would be for staff with a small number of operational spaces (unspecified).

Breakdown of car parking spaces:

Application stage		No. of parking spaces existing	No. of parking spaces proposed
Full Application: Hospital, R&D and POWIC/SANE	NHS Trust	284	272
	University	66	80
	Biotech & Start-Ups	0	140
	POWIC/SANE	10	10
Outline Application	College	0	44
TOTAL		360	546

Current Local Plan Policy

- 2.8. Policy M1 states that planning permission will only be granted for development that minimises the need to travel and is laid out and designed in a way that prioritises access by walking, cycling and public transport.
- 2.9. In accordance with policy M2, a Transport Assessment for major developments should assess the impact of the proposed development and include mitigation measures to ensure no unacceptable impact on highway safety and the road network and sustainable transport modes are prioritised and encouraged.

- 2.10. Furthermore, Policy M3 states that the parking requirements for all non-residential development, whether this be an expansion of floorspace on existing sites, the redevelopment of existing or cleared sites, or new non-residential development on new sites, will be determined in the light of the submitted Transport Assessment or Travel Plan, which must take into account the objectives of this Plan to promote and achieve a shift towards sustainable modes of travel. The presumption will be that vehicle parking will be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development.
- 2.11. In the case of the redevelopment of an existing or previously cleared site, Policy M3 states that there should be no net increase in parking on the site from the previous level and the Council will seek a reduction where there is good accessibility to a range of facilities.
- 2.12. Where the proposal is for the expansion of an existing operation on an existing large site, Policy M3 states that a comprehensive travel plan should be submitted that looks at the development in the context of the whole site, and demonstrates that opportunities will be sought to enhance and promote more sustainable travel to and from the wider site. The Travel Plan will be kept under review to ensure that future opportunities to encourage a shift toward sustainable modes of travel are taken.
- 2.13. It is this last part of Policy M3 that is of relevance to the application before members. The application relates to the expansion of an existing large site, when considering what is a suitable level of parking.
- 2.14. The site allocation Policy SP22 aligns with these transport policies in that it states that applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the development mitigates against traffic impacts and maximises access by alternative means of transport.

The Oxford Local Plan 2036 – Examination

- 2.15. It is important to understand the background to these policies and the process that they went through during the Local Plan examination. Upon submission of the current Oxford Local Plan 2036 at examination, Policy M3 originally stated:

Planning permission for non-residential redevelopments will only be granted if it is demonstrated that there will be no increase in parking provision.

- 2.16. In response to this, the Examining Inspector reported that:

Policy M3 is not clear enough in respect of the parking required for non-residential developments. It refers to no increase in parking, but it is not clear what baseline this would be gauged against, particularly where redevelopment is involved, and it is inconsistent with the requirement to reduce parking contained in a number of site allocation policies, a clause which would not have due regard to the operational needs of some of the

businesses. There is also inconsistency between the requirement for existing employment uses, other types of use, extensions to development on existing employment sites and parking on new employment sites.

MM32 therefore modifies the policy by stating that the parking requirements for all non-residential development, including extensions, redevelopment or new development, will be determined in the light of the submitted Transport Assessment or Travel Plan, taking into account the objectives to achieve a shift towards sustainable travel modes. The presumption is that parking will be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development. In conjunction with this, MM51 removes the requirement for a reduction in parking on a number of site allocations. This is effective because it enables the circumstances of each case to be considered whilst continuing to promote sustainable transport modes, and gives additional purpose to Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. MM32 also clarifies the position in respect of redevelopment and the expansion of existing operations on large sites, and, together with MM131 and MM123 it introduces various consequential clarifications and deletions, including case-by-case parking provision for disabled people.

- 2.17. In respect to the site allocation Policy SP22, this upon submission of the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate specified:

The development will be expected to minimise car parking spaces on site. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the development mitigates against traffic impacts and maximises access by alternative means of transport.

- 2.18. However, the Examining Inspector struck out the reference to minimising car parking spaces at the Warneford site, leaving in the requirement that applicants will be expected to demonstrate how the development mitigates against traffic impacts and maximises access by alternative means of transport.

- 2.19. It is also worth noting that for other site allocations, the Examining Inspector allowed for different car parking policies having regard for the individual requirements of each site. For example, SP20 - Nuffield Hospital specifies 'No increase in parking'. This is clearly not the case for the Warneford site.

Assessment:

- 2.20. The key take home points of the Oxford Local Plan transport policies are:

- The development must be designed in a way to prioritise sustainable modes of travel such as walking and cycling in accordance with Policy M1.
- A Transport Assessment must be submitted which assesses the impact of the proposed development and includes mitigation measures to ensure no unacceptable impact on highway safety and the road network and

sustainable transport modes are prioritised and encouraged in accordance with Policy M2.

- All non-residential development will be determined in light of a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan which must promote and achieve a shift towards sustainable modes of travel in accordance with policy M3.
- The parking provision should be based on the particular circumstances of each proposal accounting for the need to promote sustainable modes of travel.
- The presumption will be that vehicle parking will be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development in accordance with policy M3.
- There should be no net increase in parking where the proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing or previously cleared site.
- It must be demonstrated how the development mitigates against traffic impacts and maximises access by alternative means of transport in accordance with Policy SP22.

2.21. In this case, the development has been designed in a way which prioritises sustainable modes of travel such as walking and cycling in accordance with Policy M1. 75% of travel to and from the site is proposed via active and sustainable modes of transport with significant contribution to be made to the local bus services to improve their service and with significant upgrades to the surrounding cycle and pedestrian network including a CYCLOPs at the Warneford Lane, Gipsy Lane, Old Road and Rosevelt Drive junction.

2.22. A Transport Assessment has been submitted which assesses the impact of the proposed development and includes mitigation measures to ensure no unacceptable impact on highway safety and the road network and sustainable transport modes are prioritised and encouraged in accordance with Policy M2. A Transport Assessment has been submitted which concludes that the additional 186no car parking space and associated vehicle movements would not have a severe impact on highway safety and the road network. Notwithstanding this, a series of mitigation works and improvements have been proposed by the applicant and would be secured through the S106 and S278 agreements.

2.23. As a non-residential development, the application has been determined in light of a Transport Assessment which promotes and achieves a shift towards sustainable modes of travel in accordance with policy M3. Again, there would be a shift towards 75% active and sustainable modes of travel with a reduction of car share to 25%.

2.24. The presumption is that vehicle parking has been kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development in accordance with policy M3. Further measures to reduce the parking in the basement and thus the overall parking on the site will be secured as part of the S106.

- 2.25. Policy M3 states that there should be no net increase in parking where the proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing or previously cleared site. In this case, the full application is delivering an expansion to the existing hospital site, through the creation of a new hospital and research centre and the outline permission would allow for a new graduate college. Therefore officers consider that this part of policy M3 would not apply to the application before members.
- 2.26. In any event, the existing hospital benefits from approximately 300 car parking spaces on site and the proposal would result in a reduction to 208 car parking spaces for the proposed hospital use. There would therefore be a reduction in car parking spaces in relation to this use.
- 2.27. It has been demonstrated through the transport assessment that the development mitigates against traffic impacts and maximises access by alternative means of transport in accordance with Policy SP22.
- 2.28. The Transport Assessment has also demonstrated that the the car parking spaces proposed on site, have been kept to a minimum to ensure the successful functioning of the proposed hospital, research centre and the graduate college. The scheme promotes sustainable modes of travel with a 75% mode share for active travel including walking, cycling and bus/rail usage. Furthermore, to support this increase in sustainable modes of travel, significant contributions are being made to the existing bus services and to cycle infrastructure improvements within the locality. Oxfordshire County Council highways have been consulted on the application and have raised no objections to the proposed development The proposed development therefore accords with Local Plan policies M1, M2 and M3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036.

B. Impacts of the proposed increase in car parking

- 2.29. The second part of the call in reason makes reference to the detrimental social, health and environmental effects that the increase in parking could lead to in the area. It is important to make clear that the local plan policies M1 and M3 that deal with ensuring that developments prioritise a range of access arrangements to a site, and also establish how parking provision will be considered, do not make reference to any test regarding social, health and environmental impacts as part of the assessment process for considering what level of car parking would be acceptable. The call in does not qualify what the potential social, health and environmental effects of concern are considered to be. Officers are satisfied that these issues have been assessed within the original committee report (**Appendix 2**) as part of the general assessment of the economic, social, and environmental impacts for the development as a whole however, for the avoidance of doubt, officers have expanded on this in more detail below.
- 2.30. At the planning committee meeting on 21st April 2026, the speakers against the scheme raised concerns were in regard to the impact that the

proposed development and the increase in parking and thus vehicle movements within the locality would have on pedestrians and cyclists.

Congestion

- 2.31. During the course of the application, numerous concerns have been raised in relation to the increased vehicle trips on the local highway network in terms of increased congestion and delays.
- 2.32. A car park accumulation exercise has been conducted which demonstrates how the peak hour trip rates tie in with the proposed car parking. The total network peak hour person trip generation is 1,090 AM two-way person trips and 1,072 PM two-way person trips. The total network peak hour vehicle trip generation is 272 AM (241 in /31 out) two-way vehicle trips and 270 (32 in/238 out) PM two-way vehicle trips. This results in an increase of 151 two-way AM peak hour vehicle trips and 137 two-way PM peak hour trips.
- 2.33. Overall, the total development peak hour vehicle trip generation (slightly later than network peaks) is 367 AM two-way vehicle trips and 270 PM two-way vehicle trips. This increase of 178 two-way AM peak hour vehicle trips and 137 two-way PM peak hour trips. Oxfordshire County Council Highways Authority have advised that these additional vehicle trips would not result in a severe impact on the local highway network and have raised no objections.
- 2.34. Concerns were also raised in regard to the impact the increase vehicle movements would have on the existing, and struggling bus service. These comments are noted and the applicant is providing significant contributions towards upgrading the existing bus services within the locality. These improvements would be of significant benefit to Headington and wider Oxford.

Highways safety impacts

- 2.35. During the multiple consultations on the application, concerns have been raised in regards to the impact the proposed development including the increase in parking on site would have on the local highway network, pedestrians and cyclists safety.

- 2.36. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

- 2.37. In this instance it has been demonstrated that the proposed increase in parking on site would not have an unacceptable impact on highways safety, and therefore it cannot reasonably be held that the proposed level of

parking would give rise to the severe impact that the National Planning Policy Framework clearly identifies as being the only reason to withhold planning permission on highway grounds.

2.38. Whilst the proposal would result in an increase in parking and thus vehicle movements within the surrounding area, the submitted transport assessment clearly demonstrates that there would only be a 25% car mode share with the remaining 75% of journeys being carried out via active travel and sustainable modes such as rail and bus.

2.39. The submitted TA includes a table demonstrating what the “Business as usual / Do Nothing” trips would be. The updated Assessment explains that 6 scenarios have been modelled (including 3 network peak hours and 3 development peak hours), including a scenario with a peak hour profile based on site surveys, a scenario with a profile based on site surveys for NHS Trust and University, and TRICS data for the commercial research and a scenario with a 25% reduction in background traffic to allow for the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan target. The submitted TA demonstrates that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network as a result of the additional vehicle trips, generated by the additional 186no. car parking spaces would not be severe.

2.40. Whilst the impact would not be *severe*, the application includes various mitigation to the highway network including:

- Southbound Bus Stop Roosevelt Drive
- A CYCLOPS junction at the Warneford Lane / Old Road / Gipsy Lane
- Roosevelt Drive junction.
- An off-road southbound cycle lane on Gipsy Lane.
- An on-road northbound advisory cycle lane on Gipsy Lane
- Off-road sections of cycle lane on Warneford Lane
- Two parallel crossings on Warneford Lane
- One further uncontrolled crossing across Warneford Lane
- Relining of eastbound on-road advisory cycle lane on Old Road and crossing with Valencia Road.
- Advisory cycle lanes along both sides of Roosevelt Drive and an informal crossing.

2.41. Therefore, in line with paragraph 116 of the NPPF, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact in relation to highways safety nor would the development result in a severe impact.

2.42. Without the proposed development, there would be no CYCLOPS. The proposed CYCLOPS would significantly improve the Warneford Lane/Gipsy Road/Old Road/Rosevelt Drive junction for both pedestrians and cyclists, allowing safe and simultaneous travel for active commuters with minimal conflicts with car users.

2.43. The call in reason, does not provide any information to dispute this claim or the views of Oxfordshire County Council, as the Highways Authority and therefore as the cumulative impact of the proposed increased parking and thus vehicle movements would not be severe, officers cannot substantiate a refusal reason on this basis.

2.44. It is also worth noting that the applicant is committed to reducing the amount of car parking on the site. The proposal seeks to reduce the amount of car parking within the proposed basement with the parking spaces to be converted into much desired laboratory space and space for scanners. The application is subject to a parking management plan and a mechanism to reduce the number of parking spaces over time. This will be secured via the S106.

Air Quality

2.45. The main potential air quality impact once the proposed development is complete and occupied is likely to be emissions from road traffic (i.e. changes in traffic flow volume and distribution) associated with the increase in parking. Air pollutant concentrations were predicted at the most relevant receptor locations using ADMS-Roads dispersion model for the base year 2023, for the proposed opening year 2030 with and without the proposed development (phase 1 only (the hospital and research centre) and phases 1 & 2 (the hospital and research centre and the graduate college)) in place. The impact of the proposed development on NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations at existing and proposed sensitive human receptors, without mitigation, was considered to be 'negligible' at all locations when the development is operational. Therefore, it is not considered that any specific mitigation measures will be required for the operational phase.

2.46. The proposed car driver mode share has been reduced from approximately 30% as originally submitted to 25%, which lowers overall daily traffic flows and ensures that the air quality assessment reflects a robust, worst-case scenario. An updated trip generation assessment was also undertaken, confirming that daily development traffic flows remain unchanged or are likely to decrease. Junction modelling has been independently reviewed, with minor adjustments improving operational performance. These revisions demonstrate that the development's transport impacts have been adequately assessed and mitigated, and the air quality modelling remains valid without requiring further reassessment. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in any adverse impacts in regards to air quality and emissions.

Noise Pollution

2.47. Whilst the proposal would result in an addition of 186no car parking spaces and thus vehicular movements to and from the site, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed additional cars would result in a significant increase in noise pollution within the locality.

Health impacts

- 2.48. A Health Impact Assessment was submitted as part of the application (as set out in the original committee report) and this does not identify any health impacts arising from the proposed additional parking. It is therefore concluded that the additional parking would not result in any significant health impacts to warrant refusing the application.

3. CONCLUSION

- 3.1. As previously concluded, the proposed development would be acceptable in both national and local development plan policy terms and it is not considered that the increase in parking would result in any adverse impacts to warrant refusing the application. Moreover, it is considered that the increase in parking would not give rise to any economic, social, or environmental impacts that would be considered to outweigh these national and local development plan policies.
- 3.2. Officers would also draw members attention to the fact that this scheme would deliver significant public benefits in terms of economic, social, and environmental matters that need to be given considerable weight in the scheme as a whole, but also in relation to the grounds for the call-in. These are detailed within the original committee report but are summarised as follows:
- A new mental health hospital serving Oxfordshire and surrounding area.
 - A new research centre providing space for research into mental health.
 - The colocation of both the new mental health hospital with the adjoining research centre allowing for shared knowledges, experiences and treatments to take place.
 - Potential to be one of Europe's leading mental health campuses
 - The existing hospital is to be repurposed as a new graduate college allowing the listed building to be retained and allowing for further investment and long term conservation.
 - Highways improvements to the local highway network in Headington.
 - Improvements to bus services in the locality.
 - New and improved cycle infrastructure and connections.
 - Further improvements to biodiversity on Warneford Meadow.
- 3.3. Without any detailed evidence to support these claims made in the grounds for the call-in, as to what the specific economic, social, and environmental impacts of the level of parking provision in the scheme would be, it is difficult to attribute any weight to these concerns as material consideration in the determination of the application. The officers report contained in **appendix 2** of this report has however set out a comprehensive assessment of the application including the benefits of the

scheme that are considered as part of the general planning balance of the application as a whole, and to the support the application for a new, state of the art mental health hospital.

- 3.4. Having regards to the matters discussed in the report, officers would make members aware that the starting point for the determination of this application is in accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which makes clear that proposals should be assessed in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 3.5. The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development. NPPF paragraph 11 states that proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay, or where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant plans are out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted. Policy S1 of the Oxford Local Plan 2036 repeats this.
- 3.6. In terms of highways and parking, Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that *development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.*
- 3.7. In this instance it has been demonstrated that the proposed increase in parking would not have an unacceptable impact on highways safety. It is also been demonstrated through the submission of a Transport Assessment that the impact of the additional vehicle trips, generated by the proposed addition of 186 car parking spaces, is not severe. Oxfordshire County Council Highways Authority have been consulted on the application and raised no objections to the proposal including the increase in parking.
- 3.8. In light of the above, it is recommended that the Committee resolve to grant planning permission for the development proposed subject to the satisfactory completion (under authority delegated to the Director of Planning and Regulation) of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Site location plan

Appendix 2 – Officers Committee Report (21st April 2026)

Appendix 3 – Oxford City Planning Committee Minutes (21st April 2026)

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 consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community.