



Planning Application Consultation 21/02851/AOP - A comparison of the updated site block plan published on the Planning Portal on 9th February 2022 and the initial version published on 9th July 2021

1. Summary

There are a number of differences between the original site block plan (published on the Planning Portal on 9th July 2021), a subsequent minor update (published on 14th January 2022) and the most recent update (published on 9th February 2022). This objection is focussed on the main differences between the original version and the most recent one.

Some of these differences between the two versions of the block plan are clear but others are very difficult to identify, especially due to the format and colour of the designations within the plan. There are also some discrepancies both between the two versions and within the latest version as some aspects noted in the legend appear not to be included in the plan. In addition some aspects included in the initial version are no longer included in the revised plan. This includes some of the acoustic fencing and areas of planting (these were both still included in the update published on 14th January 2022). One area presumably designed to offer the inmates some form of purpose and training, i.e. the polytunnels and horticultural area has all but disappeared on the new version (this area was still included in the update published on 14th January 2022). Why have such changes been introduced at this stage with no notification or reasoning? It is only by detailed and diligent analysis of the two versions of the plans that such changes can be identified. Even then it is not possible to be confident that all the changes have been identified. This is a very poor practice and such apparent attempts to 'disguise' changes should surely be noted and taken into account of in the case officer's report and in the planning balance.

It is clear that a list of updates in the latest version of the block plan would have been helpful to anyone who had to or wished to review the new plan. This lack of an obvious step in the process does make one ask the question whether this was a deliberate act on behalf of the applicant or was it down to errors.

2. Introduction

A comparison has been carried out between the updated site block plan published on the Planning Portal on 9th February 2022 and the one originally published on the Planning Portal on 9th July 2021. A number of differences between the two versions were identified. However, this was made particularly difficult due to the lack of any form of update between the two versions. One would normally expect a list of changes to a plan of this nature to be included, especially as it is very complex and detailed and in addition a lot of the content of the plan is designated in a similar form and or colour.

3. Result of the Comparison

Below is a list of the differences observed between the two versions of the plans identified as well as any anomalies or unknowns noted due to misleading information.

- No details have been provided on the revised plan to indicate what the updates to the latest version are which make it difficult to review, especially as the plan is very crowded with markings. Was it a deliberate policy not to indicate the changes to make the plans more difficult to review?
- It is good that at least the full details of the building dimensions, including the heights, have at last been made available. However, it is not clear if the building heights do or do not include the height

GRENDON UNDERWOOD & EDGCOTT PARISH COUNCILS

21/02851/AOP - A comparison of the updated site block plan

of the services that will inevitably be fitted on top of the buildings, especially the accommodation blocks. This factor has to be taken into account when considering the overall impact on the landscape from such tall buildings and the proposed mitigation through planting. In fact this further strengthens the case that the mitigation will be somewhat futile in screening the buildings on the site.

- There are a number of differences in the legend content in the latest version of the plan vs the one posted in July 2021 and the following additional items were observed:
 - *Proposed 5.2m fence*
 - *Proposed 3.6m fence*
 - *Electric vehicle parking*
 - *'Shared car' parking*
 - *Cycle path*
 - *Footpath*
 - *Road*
 - *HV cabling*
- In some cases it would appear that the details were already included on the earlier plan but not listed in the legend of that plan, e.g. road to the site, footpath. However, it is very difficult to be certain as some of the designations are in colours very similar to each other.
- Some of the new details mentioned in the legend do not appear to be shown in the latest version of the plan. These include Electric vehicle parking, Shared car parking and HV cabling.
- The legend for planned fencing in the original plan has changed to two different heights in the latest plan which are 3.6 and 5.2m (no height mentioned in the earlier version). It would appear that the 5.2m fencing has replaced the earlier proposed fencing which had a different line marking. However, the plan is so crowded, especially with so many designations so close to each other and of similar colours, that it has proved too difficult to work out where the 3.6m fencing is proposed to be located.
- The 2m acoustic fencing is no longer shown adjacent to the land between the new road and Lawn House. In addition the length of the run of acoustic fencing close to the football pitch is much shorter than on the original plan. Have some changes been made to the plans or is this yet another mistake by the applicant? This possible change represents a major difference between the two plans.
- The designation for the acoustic fencing on the updated plan is also different on the plan to what is indicated in the legend.
- All the planting (shrubs or flower beds – details not specified?) shown on the earlier block plan adjacent to the accommodation blocks has completely disappeared in the latest version. Why? Was this planting part of the new areas designed to add to the net biodiversity gain?
- In addition to the above planting changes, the polytunnels and horticultural area adjacent to the most northern accommodation block has all but disappeared. Is this another change or an additional error? As above was this planting part of the new areas designed to add to the net biodiversity gain?
- What appears to be some possible planting next to the Entrance Resource Hub in the earlier version has totally disappeared in the latest version. Was this planting (not indicated on the earlier plan) or something else? Why has this change been made?
- The proposed running track is not listed in the legend for the new version of the plan (was not present in the original version as only recently considered).

Compiled by Grendon Underwood and Edgcott Parish Council's Joint Working Party