Public Document Pack

Supplementary Papers

South Oxfordshire District Council

Listening Learning Leading

Contact Officer: Alison Burdett

Tel: 01491 823619

FOR THE MEETING OF

Planning Committee

held in the Council Chamber, South Oxfordshire District Council Offices

on Wednesday 23 July 2014 at 6.00 pm

Open to the public including the press

This pack contains the complete appendices 3 and 4 for Item 7 on the agenda published on 15 July 2014. Some pages were missed from the original pack and are included here.

Please bring this with you to the meeting.

Alison Burdett, Democratic Services Officer

7 **P11/W2357 & P11/W2358/LB Former Carmel College Mongewell Park Mongewell** (Pages 3 - 14)

Application summary:

Redevelopment to provide 166 residential dwellings (C3), refurbishment of Grade II and Grade II* listed buildings including provision of a restaurant community cafe and swimming pool and retention of boating facilities and associated landscaping, access and parking arrangements.

Amended by drawings, reports, plans and supporting documents dated 5 December 2012, 30 July 2013, 1 and 8 October 2013, 4 March 2014 and 6 June 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank

Mongewell Residents Association

Chair: Fiona Thompson and Stella Power-Brown
Secretary: Carolyn Ventress

Collective response to amendments to application P11/W2357

Redevelopment to provide 166 residential dwellings (C3), refurbishment of Grade II and Grade II listed buildings including provision of a restaurant community cafe and swimming pool and retention of boating facilities and associated landscaping, access and parking arrangements.(as amplified and amended by drawings and reports accompanying letters from agent dated 5 December 2012 & As amended by plans & supporting documents accompanying agent's emails & letters in July and October 2013 and March 2014).*

It is the position of the Mongewell Residents Association that the additional detail and plan amendments submitted by the agent in March 2014 do not provide any information that addresses the concerns raised by the residents. We therefore maintain our OBJECTION to the development plans and all previous comments remain relevant.

The views represented below were discussed at the Mongewell Residents meeting held on 6th April 2014 and are made in consultation with all members of the Mongewell Residents List.

There remains unanimous OBJECTION from local residents to the amended proposal. Specific objection falls into 4 areas with Access still being the primary concern:

1.) Access: **Using the existing infrastructure as access for the development will cause serious safety, congestion and disruption issues for new and existing residents of Mongewell and the surrounding villages. The amendments attempt to convince the committee that the private drive can support 2 way HGV traffic. This position is not reflective of reality and the supporting drawings are inaccurate. Further information is provided in the detailed notes. An access linking the site to the bypass via Monument Field is supported as a solution.**

2.) Flood Risk: The residents remain concerned about the increased flood risk to existing properties by raising the development platform and building basement car parks.

3.) Design: The main design concern is the height of the Amphitheatre and Lake View flats. They are much higher than the current buildings and will overlook existing properties. This is compounded by the additional height of the raised development platform which will make the intrusion even greater. The design of many of the buildings are unattractive and out of keeping with AONB.

4.) Facilities: We remain concerned about the appropriateness of proposed use of the Gallery and Synagogue and have provided alternative suggestions.

Please Note: The feedback provided by the Rev David Addison is a personal statement and does NOT reflect the views of Mongewell Residents, who remain deeply concerned with aspects of this proposal. His comments are NOT made on behalf of, or in consultation with, residents of Mongewell.

Additional Detailed Notes:

Objection	Notes	Suggestions
Access	**The proposed improvements to the Private Drive will NOT make it able to support 2 way traffic** ▪ The illustrations provided in the additional information aim to justify the developers' position that the private drive is capable of supporting two way traffic flows. ▪ This is not a realistic position. ▪ The 3 illustrative widths are comparable to the stages of progressive narrowing of Goldsmith Lane in Wallingford (the lane adjacent to Waitrose car park entrance – appendix A) ▪ The widest point on the private drive is 5.5 metres and this is dependent on permission being given to move the Listed Gateposts ▪ This distance is the same as 3rd narrowest point of Goldsmith Lane ▪ The illustration attempts to claim that two HGVs can pass safely at this width. ▪ Whilst you might try and have 2 cars carefully pass each other towards the widest point of Goldsmith lane, you would not attempt to take a HGV down there, or pass it with a car let alone pass it with another HGV. ▪ **Further:** In the additional information provided in the Construction and Access note, the Illustration in section 1.2. attempts to claim that you can have 2 cars pass each other at 4.1 metres ▪ The current distance between the Grade II Listed gateposts is 4.53 metres wide. ▪ NO driver would attempt to pass a waiting car between these posts. ▪ It is not appropriate for 2 way traffic as stated by OCC Highways in their original feedback and supported by existing driver behaviour. ▪ As you can see from the picture in Appendix B a HGV fills this width ▪ Widening this opening by an additional 97cm to 5.5 metres will not make it possible for 2 HGVs to pass each other as is claimed in the illustration. ▪ It is our position that car drivers will not be willing to pass larger vehicles at 4.8 metres or 5.5 metres.	**All local residents would support a different access option that avoids Carmel Terrace and avoids funnelling traffic on to A4074** **Monument Field has been identified as the best solution available**

	The drawings on page 5 of the Construction and Access note are inaccurate ▪ The drawings on page 5 of the Construction and Access note indicate that the drive entrance will extend to a widening of 6 metres ▪ This is not accurate as the proposal states that the entrance will be 5.5 metres ▪ This is confusing and erodes confidence in the accuracy of the whole proposal ▪ This inaccuracy needs to be resolved as soon as possible ▪ This also has an impact on the application to move the Listed Gate Posts to extend the gap between them to 5.5 metres. This is being applied for separately. ▪ Moving the Gate Posts is against the advice of the conservation officer who has indicated that an alternative option should be sort	**Resolve the inaccuracy**
	Use of the word Kerb is misleading ▪ There is no information to indicate the make-up of these 1.5 metre wide kerbs ▪ Our assumption is that they are the current grass verges ▪ We anticipate a great deal of over run from vehicles attempting to use the private drive as a 2 way road and over hanging HGVs ▪ There is already considerable evidence of overrun damage to the verges which sees HGVs driving perilously close the protected trees on unsupported surfaces ▪ This significantly increases the impact on root protection zones ▪ People also park on these Kerbs. Recently notices have been put up saying "Please do not park on the verges".	
	Traffic access management ▪ Experience of the small amount of construction vehicles used to construct the wall house properties has proven that access management schemes are rarely practical and their impact is minimal ▪ During the construction of the wall house properties construction companies were also instructed to use the private drive, call before	**An alternative access solution is required, especially during the construction phase**

	entering the drive and to use non articulated delivery vehicles. ▪ These instructions were often ignored and the damage and disruption caused by HGVs has been extensive. Their impact has been reported to SODC, Comer Homes and the SODC forestry department. ▪ Following the construction phase what access management measures will ensure effective vehicle flow and the safety of residents and ridgeway users?	
Flood Risk	**The flood mitigation plans do not take into account the Lake which feeds into the site** ▪ The environment Agency have confirmed that the proposal does not address any flood implication from the lake above the site ▪ The only considerations in the report are risk from the river level and ground water ▪ This lake has a significant impact on the water levels in the area **Raising the height of the development platform behind Carmel Terrace** ▪ There is still particularly concern that raising the land to build the Amphitheatre Blocks will cause increased flooding in the existing Carmel Terrace. **Size and position of surface water storage tanks** ▪ We believe that these will not be sufficient for the water displacement required. ▪ There will not be enough 'fall' for these to drain into the lake naturally ▪ The lake is already full all year round. Draining into the lake will cause further flooding around the lake area	**Further flood risk assessment needs to be done to take into consideration the impact of the lake**
Design Issues	**Height of the development platform** There are a number of buildings within the site design, specifically Lake View and the Amphitheatre which are not in keeping with in keeping with an AONB. They are very high in comparison with the buildings which they are replacing and will overlook the current properties effecting their light	**Reduce the height of these buildings with the potential to redistribute units to make maximum use of horizontal space.**

	and privacy. The additional impact of the raised development platform will make the impact of these buildings even more significant	
Security Gates	**Security gates are mentioned but no detail is provided as to where they are or their operation and duration** ▪ The Construction and Access note refers to security gates to the site ▪ Where will these gates be located ▪ If at the top, this will cause queuing on main road. ▪ If at the bottom they will obstruct access to Carmel Terrace and the Ridgeway which crosses at this exact point. ▪ Who will operate them? ▪ Will they be operational throughout the construction period? ▪ If so, will site residents use this secure entrance or a different entrance? ▪ If the security gates are intended to be at the top of the drive will current residents who have access rights be inhibited? If these gates are adjacent to 1a Carmel Terrace will there still be access for the general public to St John the Baptist church during the construction period.	**Details of these security gates and their operation must be provided**
Tree Strategy	**There are a number of issues with the detail of the tree planting strategy** ▪ Removing existing hedge between 10 Carmel Terrace and Mongewell Court and new Carmel Terraces – This will have a high impact on the existing residents privacy and increase the impact of noise from the construction site ▪ The plan still proposes to remove the Weeping beech which has now been pruned and is much more healthy ▪ The plan is proposing to compose views to the Church – this ruins the historic aspect of the site as the church is supposed to be hidden from the house. ▪ The removal of 52 protected trees is of great concern. Like the Listed Gateposts they are protected for a reason.	

SCHEDULE OF DRAWINGS - MONGEWELL PARK

13th June 2014

		Description	Scale	Drawing No.	Rev
00	MASTER PLAN / SITE SECTIONS & ELEVATIONS				
		Site Location Plan	1:1250	00 - SL - 001	C
		Existing Layout Plan showing footprint	1:500	00 - E/SP - 01	A
		Proposed Master Plan (Sheet 1 of 3)	1:500	00 - P/MP - 02	T1
		Proposed Master Plan (Sheet 2 of 3)	1:500	00 - P/MP - 02-2	A
		Proposed Master Plan (Sheet 3 of 3)	1:500	00 - P/MP - 02-3	A
		Proposed Master Plan - Areas to be Raised	1:500	00 - P/MP - 02A	A
		Proposed Master Plan Showing Section Lines	Not to Scale	00 - P/MP - 02B	
		Proposed Underground Parking Plan	1:500	00 - P/UG - 03	G
		Proposed Site Section A-A & B-B	1:100	00 - P/SS - 04	C
		Proposed Site Section C-C & D-D	1:100	00 - P/SS - 05	D
		Proposed Site Section C1-C1	1:100	00 - P/SS - 05A	A
		Proposed Site Section E-E & F-F	1:100	00 - P/SS - 06	D
		Proposed Site Section G-G & H-H	1:100	00 - P/SS - 07	D
		Arborucultural Constraints - Development Plan	1:500	00 - P/MP - 08	E
		Existing Topograhic Survey Plan	1:1000	00 - E/T - 09	
01	MONGEWELL HOUSE & MONGEWELL ANNEXE				
		Existing/Retained Lower Ground Floor Plan	1:100	01 - E/G - 00	
		Existing Ground Floor Plan	1:100	01 - E/G - 01	C
		Existing First Floor Plan	1:100	01 - E/1 - 02	B
		Existing Second Floor Plan	1:100	01 - E/2 - 03	B
		Existing Roof Plan	1:100	01 - E/R - 04	B
		Existing Sections A-A, B-B & C-C	1:100	01 - ES - 05	B
		Proposed Ground Floor Plan	1:100	01 - P/G - 06	D
		Proposed First Floor Plan	1:100	01 - P/1 - 07	C
		Proposed Second Floor Plan	1:100	01 - P/2 - 08	C
		Proposed Roof Plan	1:100	01 - P/R - 09	C
		Proposed Sections A-A, B-B & C-C	1:100	01 - PS - 10	B
		Existing Elevations	1:100	01 - EP - 11	D
		Proposed Elevations	1:100	01 - EP - 12	E
		Proposed Sectional Elevation I-I & J-J Park Views in relation to Mongewell House	1:100	01 - PSE - 13	E
02	CARMEL COURT & PARK VIEWS				
		Proposed Ground Floor Plan with surrounding area	1:100	02 - G - 01	F
		Proposed First Floor Plan	1:100	02 - 1 - 02	G
		Proposed Second Floor/Roof Accommodation Plan	1:100	02 - 2 - 03	G
		Proposed Park Views Elevations (1 of 2)	1:100	02 - 3 - 04	G
		Proposed Park Views Elevations (2 of 2)	1:100	02 - 4 - 05	G
		Proposed Carmel Court Elevations	1:100	02 - 5 - 06	G
03	MONGEWELL PARK TERRACES				
		Proposed Ground Floor Plan	1:100	03 - G - 01	D
		Proposed First & Roof Accommodation Floor Plans	1:100	03 - P/S/E - 02	D
		Proposed Sectional Elevations P-P & Q-Q, Section & Side Elevations	1:100	03 - P/SS - 03	E
04	DRY BOAT HOUSE & GOTTLIEB GALLERY				
	WET BOAT HOUSE	Existing Ground Floor Plan	1:100	04 - E/F/ 01	D
		Existing Terrace Level	1:100	04 - E/F 02	D
		Existing Elevations and Sections	1:100	04 - E/F/ 03	D
		Proposed Ground Floor Plan	1:100	04 -E/F/04	D
		Proposed Terrace Level	1:100	04 -E/F/05	D
		Proposed Elevations and Sections	1:100	04 -E/F/06	D
		Existing Restored Ground Floor Plan Wet Boat House	1:100	04 - EP/G- 07	B
		Existing Restored First Floor & Roof Plan Wet Boat House	1:100	04 - EP/1R- 08	B
		Existing Restored Elevations Wet Boat House	1:100	04 - EP/E- 09	B
05	HANCOCK PAVILION (SYNAGOGUE)				
	& AMPHITHEATR	Existing Floor Plans & Section A-A - Synagogue	1:100	05 - E/FS/S- 01	A
		Existing Elevations - Synagogue	1:100	05 - E/E/S - 02	A
		Proposed Floor Plans & Section A-A - Hancock Pavilion	1:100	05 - P/FS/HP - 03	A
		Proposed Elevations - Hancock Pavilion	1:100	05 - P/E/HP - 04	A
		Existing & Proposed Sections - Hancock Pavilion	1:100	05 - EP/S/HP - 05	A
		Proposed Amphitheatre Residences, Hancock Pavilion & surrounding area	1:100	05 - P/P - 06	B
		Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans Amphitheatre Residences Block 1	1:100	05 - P/AR - 07	
		Proposed Second & Roof Plans Amphitheatre Residences Block 1	1:100	05 - P/AR - 08	A
		Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans Amphitheatre Residences Block 2	1:100	05 - P/AR - 09	
		Proposed Second & Roof Plans Amphitheatre Residences Block 2	1:100	05 - P/AR - 10	A
		Proposed Sectional Elevations K-K & L-L	1:100	05 - P/AR - 11	B
		Proposed Sectional Elevations M-M & N-N	1:100	05 - P/AR - 12	A
		Proposed Elevations (Front & Rear)	1:100	05 - P/AR - 13	A

06	CARMEL TERRACES	Proposed Ground Floor Plan with surrounding area	1:100	06 - F - 01	D
		Proposed First Floor Plan	1:100	06 - FE - 02	E
		Proposed Elevations	1:100	06 - FE - 03	C
		Proposed Elevations & Section	1:100	06 - FE - 04	B
07	LAKE VIEWS	Proposed Floor Plans	1:100	07 - F - 01	B
		Proposed Elevations	1:100	07 - E - 02	C
		Proposed Sectional Elevation R-R	1:100	07 - E - 03	C
08	BARRINGTON COURT	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	1:100	08 - E - 01	G
		Proposed Upper Level Plans	1:100	08 - E - 02	H
		Proposed Front & Rear Elevations	1:100	08 - E - 03	G
		Proposed Side Elevations	1:100	08 - E - 04	G
		Proposed Sections	1:100	08 - E - 05	G
09	STABLES & VILLAS	Existing Ground Floor Plan with surrounding area	1:100	09 - E/G- 01	A
		Existing Elevations	1:100	09 - E/E- 02	A
		Existing Section S-S and Proposed Sectional Elevations S-S & T-T	1:100	09 - EP/SE- 03	A
		Proposed Sectional Elevations U-U & V-V	1:100	09 - EP/SE - 04	A
		Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Stables & Villas) with surrounding area	1:100	09 - P/G - 05	B
		Proposed First & Second Floor Plans	1:100	09 - P/1-2 - 06	B
		Proposed Roof Plan	1:100	09 - P/R - 07	B
		Proposed Elevations North & South	1:100	09 - P/E - 08	B
		Proposed Elevations East & West	1:100	09 - P/E - 09	B
10	REFUSE STORES / ENERGY CENTRE				
		Proposed Plan and Elevations of Refuse Stores	1:100	10 - P/RS -01	
		Proposed Plan and Elevations of Energy Centre & Pump House	1:100	10 - P/EC -02	
11	EXISTING AMPHITHEATRE / RETAINED DOVECOTE AND PAVILION				
		Existing Synagogue & Amphitheatre Layout Plan	1:100	11 - E/L/AS - 01	A
		Existing / Retained Dovecote	1:100	11 - E/D - 02	
		Retained Park Pavilion	1:100	11 - E/D - 03	

Appendix 4

14 June 2014
Cov lett addit info 14 June 2014

savills

Ms. S. Crawford
Planning Service
Development Management West
South Oxfordshire District Council
Benson Lane
Crowmarsh Gifford
Wallingford, Oxon
OX10 8ED

Catherine Mason
E: cmason@savills.com
DL: +44 (0) 207 4098130
F: +44 (0) 207 4953773

33 Margaret Street
London W1G 0JD
T: +44 (0) 20 7499 8644
savills.com

Dear Sharon,

Redevelopment of Mongewell Park, OX10 8BU – References P11/W2357 and P11/W2358/LB

Further to ongoing discussions in relation to the above and the meeting on 5th June 2014, please find enclosed additional and revised information to address the outstanding matters.

I enclose:

- Revised Drawings:
  - 00-P/MP-02 Rev T1 – Proposed Masterplan (Sheet 1 of 3)
  - 00-E/F-04 Rev D – Proposed Dry Boat House
- Revised Landscaping Drawings:
  - 480/01 P7 – Tree Planting Strategy
  - 480/02 P5 – Landscape Masterplan
  - 480/100 P2 – Entrance Court Tree Planting
- Drawing PDL/01 Rev G - Preliminary Drainage / Service Corridor Layout
- Response by WSP to OCC Highways Comments dated 23 April 2014
- Response by WSP Natural England Comments dated 9 May 2014
- Schedule of latest drawings

I have summarised the additional information and changes below under the relevant topics.

Forestry Comments

In order to address the Forestry Officer's most recent comments dated 1 May 2014, the following documents have been updated:

00-P/MP-02 Rev T1 – Proposed Masterplan (Sheet 1 of 3)
00-E/F-04 Rev D – Proposed Dry Boat House
480/01 P7 – Tree Planting Strategy
480/02 P5 – Landscape Masterplan
480/100 P2 – Entrance Court Tree Planting
Drawing PDL/01 Rev G - Preliminary Drainage / Service Corridor Layout

These have been updated to address the officer's comments and ensure consistency between the documents.

The changes which have been made and our response are provided below. These correspond to the numbering used in the officer's comments: below as itemised in the attached forestry comments form:

savills

1) Planting of the six Pin Oak in front of Mongewell House

- The masterplan Rev T1 now reflects the proposed six oak trees in Mongewell House forecourt
- The Planting Strategy plan and Landscape Masterplan have been updated and the additional access that was shown to pump house removed
- Dimensions have been added to Entrance Court Tree Planting Plan and the scale clarified
- The Preliminary Drainage / Service Corridor Layout Plan has been updated to reflect the changes
- The updated masterplan Rev T1 shows the additional service footpath right next to the building. This is necessary to provide a separate access to the kitchen/storage
- The new master plan (Rev T1) now matches the new proposed dry boat house 04-E/F-04 Rev D layout

2) Spence Pavilion (Dry Boat House)

- The width of semi-circular footpath has been reduced to 1200mm – this can not be completely removed as it is the only level access to the restaurant
- The double doors have been reduced to 1 unit; the semi-circular footpath will be gravel finish (or similar) to minimise landscape impact
- The piled foundations are required along the western side of the foundation as there is a minor overlap with the RPA of the adjacent Cedar tree

It is our view that any remaining points (points 3,4 and 5) can be secured through the imposition of appropriate Conditions, as these relate to matters of detail and the principles (following these revisions) are now agreed. I under that this approach has been discussed and agreed between Bernie Harverson and the Forestry Officer.

Natural England Response

Natural England's letter states:

'The Bat Mitigation Strategy by WSP dated 4 December 2012 uses ecological information from surveys carried out in 2007 and 2011, this is more than 2-3 years old and therefore is not an up to date survey. Consequently, we advise that further survey effort is required in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust and the Bat Mitigation Guidelines, with this additional survey information to be provided by the applicant before determination of the application. Without this information the potential impacts on bats cannot be fully understood and an assessment cannot be made on the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation.'

WSP have provided a response (see attached) which concludes:

'Further surveys carried out at this point will add little to the understanding of how bats use the site or the measures that are required to mitigate for them. The 2012 Bat Mitigation Strategy is still considered to be valid and it is very unlikely that it would change as a result of further surveys being undertaken. While the survey data does not meet the age criteria set out in NE's standing advice, given the volume of data collected over many years, in our view the LPA has sufficient information upon which to base their decision. It is considered that the completion of additional survey effort would be better served by undertaking further surveys prior to application for a European Protected Species licenses (such licenses can only be applied for after planning permission has been granted). Whilst these surveys would anyway be required to obtain a license, the Council could impose a planning condition requiring the surveys to be carried out before works potentially affecting bats could be commenced.'

It is therefore our view that an additional surveys can be secured through the imposition of a Condition attached to the planning permission.

savills

Highways Response

We are pleased to note that Oxford County Council (Highways) has confirmed in its response dated 23 April 2014 that it has no objection to the application. WSP have reviewed the response and prepared the attached letter to address the queries raised within the comments.

Latest Drawings

As discussed, please find enclosed a list of the latest version of the architect's drawings. In addition I confirm that the following drawings should also be referred to.

- Landscaping Drawings:
  - 480/01 P7 – Tree Planting Strategy
  - 480/02 P5 – Landscape Masterplan
  - 480/100 P2 – Entrance Court Tree Planting

- Highways Drawings:
  - 0823-SK-04 Rev A
  - 0823-SK-05 Rev B
  - 0823-ATR-07 Rev A
  - 0823-ATR-08 Rev A

I trust that this addresses the outstanding queries and enables the application to be considered at Planning Committee on 23rd July. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries or would like to discuss.

Yours sincerely

CMason

Catherine Mason
Associate