
APPLICATION NO.	P11/V2103
APPLICATION TYPE	Major
REGISTERED	26.09.11
PARISH	East Hanney
WARD MEMBER(S)	Cllr Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Linden Homes Ltd
SITE	Land South of Alfreds Place, East Hanney
PROPOSAL	Erection of 15 dwellings with associated access roads, garages and open space.
AMENDMENTS	Yes
GRID REFERENCE	442200 193296
OFFICER	Laura Hudson

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application site is located between the existing housing at Alfreds Place and offices/industrial buildings towards the north eastern edge of East Hanney. The site is bounded to the north and south by existing development and the A 338 forms the western site boundary. Open fields lie beyond the eastern site boundary.
- 1.2 The site is currently flat agricultural land located in the Lowland Vale as defined on the local plan proposals map and within Flood Zone 2.
- 1.3 The application comes to Committee as the Parish Council objects and 11 letters of objection have been received.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of 15 dwellings with access from Alfreds Place
- 2.2 The proposal includes a terrace of 6 affordable units at the front of the site (40%), with a pair of semi-detached units and a detached unit all creating the site frontage along the A 338 but with a landscape buffer adjacent to the road. To the rear of the site there are 6 detached units with garaging and a line of car ports to serve the frontage properties.
- 2.3 The layout includes an area of informal open space adjacent to the site access. Car parking for each unit is provided within the site amounting to 2 spaces for the two and three bedroom units and 4 spaces for the larger detached units to the rear of the site. Some visitor parking is also included within the site layout.
- 2.4 The layout has been amended slightly to address comments from the County Engineer and in relation to drainage.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents including a Flood Risk Assessment and Ecological report.
- 2.6 Extracts from the application drawings are **attached** at Appendix 1.

3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 East Hanney Parish Council – Objects. Their full letter is **attached** at Appendix 2. In addition to their original comments further submissions were made requesting that any affordable housing should be made available for local villagers first and also that before construction the Hanney History Group should be given the opportunity to carry out an archaeological review of the site.
- 3.2 County Engineer - No objections subject to conditions and S106 contributions.
- 3.3 Architects Panel – “ A useful infill development between Alfreds Place and the village proper resolving the present incongruity. A generally pleasing layout sensitive positioning of blocks which will settle well to its context. Specific comment on front block (1-3) – front elevation would benefit by removal of 3 dormer gables.... Approved with conditions”.
- 3.4 Thames Water – No objections.
- 3.5 Planning Policy Team – Recognise current 5 year supply which justifies some discretion in considering on applications which are not otherwise in accordance with policy. This site warrants this given the fact that East Hanney is one of the larger and more sustainable villages, the site is surrounded by development on two sides and the main road, the proposal does not seeks to extend the village further eastwards than existing development and it has been confirmed that the site is readily developable and could be progressed quickly and could then address the short term supply issue.
- 3.6 Housing – Concern that the mix of affordable housing proposed does not meet the specific need in the area and the tenure should be at least 75% rented. Currently only 67% are rented.
- 3.7 Sovereign Vale – Fully support the scheme and the proposed mix which will meet a local need.
- 3.8 Arboriculturalist – No objections.
- 3.9 Environment Agency – No objections.
- 3.10 Council Drainage Engineer – Initial concern over some of the groundwater level measurements however further work has been carried out and a revised Flood Risk Assessment submitted. No objection to the revised information subject to conditions.
- 3.11 Landscape Officer – No objections in principle in terms of landscape impact given the context and the proposal would form a link between Alfreds Place and the village. Concern over the lack of detail in the layout in relation to boundary treatments and landscaping but can be conditioned.
- 3.12 Council Ecologist – Satisfied with the surveys which have been carried out. No objections subject to a condition which requires the recommendations of the surveys to be carried out.
- 3.13 County Developer Funding Officer – Contributions to local infrastructure including education, library and waste of £169,739 via S106 agreement.

3.14 Neighbour Representations – 11 Letters of objections have been received raising the following concerns:

- The land is susceptible to flooding and concern that the proposal will add to flooding problems in the area.
- The proposal will result in an increase in impermeable area.
- The proposal will result in highway safety issues and there is no formal pedestrian crossing in the area.
- The site is a Greenfield site and should not be built on.
- The houses at the front of the site are too close to the road and will be a highway safety hazard.
- There are few green spaces in the village and these should be retained.
- Concern over construction vehicles and noise.
- Wildlife frequently visits the field.
- East Hanney is a small village and not designed for “housing estates”.
- The proposal will put increased pressure on parking in the area.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 The houses at Alfreds Place were allowed on appeal in October 2001 and replaced a former garage.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 Vale of White Horse Local Plan

Policy H11 lists East Hanney are one of the larger villages in the district suitable for new residential development on sites capable of accommodating up to 15 dwellings within the built up area of the village.

Policy GS2 indicates that outside the built up areas of settlements new building will not be permitted unless it is on land identified for development or is in accordance with other specific policies.

Policy DC1 of the adopted local plan requires new development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings.

Policy DC5 requires safe and convenient access and parking and suitable access from the public highway.

Policy DC6 requires hard and soft landscaping to protect and enhance the visual amenities of the site and surroundings and to maximise nature conservation and wildlife habitat creation.

Policy DC9 seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.

Policies DC13 and DC14 relate to the water environment and require flood risk identification, assessment, and appropriate mitigation; and to limit surface run-off of water into the surrounding water system.

Policy H17 requires 40% provision of affordable housing for schemes of more than 5 units in villages.

Policy NE9 refers to development in the Lowland Vale stating that it will not be permitted if it would have an adverse impact on the landscape particularly the long open views across the area.

- 5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaces the previous PPS and PPG's in a single document but covers largely the same advice in terms of this application.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Policy

- 6.1 Policy H11 of the adopted Local Plan enables additional residential development on sites within the built up area of the village. Outside the built up area of settlements Policy GS2 applies making it clear that no development will be permitted unless on land designated in the local plan and in accordance with its policies. Although the application site is contained to the north and south by existing development and by the A338 to the west, the land to the east of the main road is considered by officers to constitute more peripheral development outside the built up area. This is confirmed by the fact that the site is currently green field land. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to these policies which relate to the principle of the development.
- 6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Such material considerations could include issues of housing supply.
- 6.3 The applicants have submitted the application on the basis that the council are unable to demonstrate an up to date five year supply of deliverable housing sites which was formerly a requirement of PPS3 and has been carried forward in section 6 of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In these circumstances PPS3 made clear that where councils cannot demonstrate a five year supply or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, that applications' should be considered favourably. The NPPF retains this requirement in paragraph 49.
- 6.4 A recent appeal decision at Broadwater, Manor Road, Wantage, considered this issue of housing supply in the district and in allowing a development of 18 houses outside the Wantage development boundary, the Inspector stated that *"the shortfall in housing supply within the district and the necessity of responding positively to the proposed housing development in this context are both material considerations supporting the appeal proposals meriting considerable weight.... this site being in a sustainable location, capable of being brought forward quickly and with a mix of housing types assured by the commitment in the unilateral undertaking to delivering 40% affordable housing...[is] a further consideration in favour of development meriting considerable weight. (para 13)*. A copy of the appeal decision is **attached** at Appendix 3. Full costs were awarded against the council in this case.
- 6.5 The current application can be delivered quickly, provides 40% affordable housing, and is on a site which forms a logical extension to one of the larger villages in the district, being contained by development on two sides.
- 6.6 In trying to address the housing shortfall the Council have prepared a Draft Interim Housing Supply Policy (IHSP) which although not adopted was afforded some limited weight by the Inspector given the contribution the appeal scheme made to the guide

line growth figure for Wantage. Since the appeal the draft policy has progressed further through Council Cabinet. The policy favours sites which can be delivered in a quick time frame in order to meet the shortfall. The guideline growth figure for East Hanney is 31 dwellings, therefore the current proposal would go some way in meeting this within the time frame of the policy.

- 6.7 The above factors are significant material considerations which weigh in favour of the development. However these must be considered against other factors including the design and landscape impact of the proposal, flooding issues and traffic considerations.

Design and Landscape Impact

- 6.8 The site is currently an open field to the east of the A338. Despite this the site is contained to the north by the two and a half storey housing of Alfreds Place and to the south by industrial and office buildings. These provide a built up context to the site which, when driving through the village, give the impression of being within the built up area. The proposal includes an area of open space to the north western corner of the site and the housing along the site frontage is set back providing a landscaped setting which would soften the impact from the road.
- 6.9 The Council's landscape officer has raised no objections to the application despite being located in the Lowland Vale, acknowledging that long open views of the site are limited given its context. It is considered that the proposal would help integrate Alfred's Place with the village rather than being visually isolated from the main built up area of the settlement as it currently stands. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy NE9 of the local plan.
- 6.10 The design and layout of the proposal are considered acceptable in its context. The front terrace is only two-storey, rather than the more prominent two and a half storey frontage of Alfred's Place, to take account of the current open character of the site. The design includes features found locally including tile hanging and orange brick with steeply pitched roofs to pick up on local vernacular. The Architects Panel largely supportive of the scheme.

Drainage and Flooding Issues

- 6.11 The site is located in Flood Zone 2 and recent flooding events in the area have caused concern locally in relation to the proposed development. The application was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Utilities Assessment. The Council's drainage engineer had initial concerns over the original groundwater level measurements, therefore further investigations were carried out and a revised flood risk assessment submitted. Both the Environment Agency and the Council's Drainage Engineer are now satisfied with the submitted information subject to conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the report. Hard surfacing within the site will be permeable and a landscaping condition is recommended to ensure this.

Highway Safety Considerations

- 6.12 The site would be accessed via the existing access to Alfreds Place from the A338 where the main road is straight and visibility good within a 30mph speed limit. The proposal would not require any alterations to this junction with the main road. A new entrance would be provided from Alfreds Place into the development. There is a parking area to the rear of plots 1-6 which provides parking for these units in addition

to plots 7-9. These units all have at least 2 spaces each. Plots 10-15 all have on plot parking of 4 spaces (including garaging). The County Engineer has raised no objections to the scheme in principle subject to details and a S106 contribution towards the Science Vale UK Transport Strategy.

Other Issues

- 6.13 The layout of the proposed development is such that it would not have any harmful impact on the residential amenity of adjacent houses in Alfreds Place, in terms of overshadowing, over-dominating or loss of privacy. Concern has been expressed over the loss of views across the field and disruption from construction traffic however these are not a material planning considerations.
- 6.14 The application is accompanied by an ecological survey which has identified some lizards using the site margins. Mitigation proposals are set out in the report and a condition is recommended to ensure that these are implemented. The council's ecologist has raised no objections on this basis.
- 6.15 The application proposes 40% affordable housing in the form of 6 units. The council's housing officer has raised some issues over the mix and an update on this will be provided at the meeting.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposal needs to be considered in the light of the current shortfall in the Council's five year housing land supply which should afford significant weight particularly given the outcome of the recent appeal decision at Broadwater, Wantage. Although a greenfield site, it is visually contained by existing development restricting long open views, the design is appropriate for the area, recommendations in the flood risk assessment will ensure that the proposal will not be at risk from flooding nor lead to flooding elsewhere, the county engineer is satisfied with the proposed access and parking provision, and the proposal will not have any harmful impact on neighbour amenity or wildlife.
- 7.2 It is considered that the site is suitable for residential development as an exception to planning policy given the current housing shortfall and the site can be delivered quickly to address this.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman subject to a S106 agreement with both the County Council and District Council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure the affordable housing, and also subject to the following conditions:

- 1. TL1 – Time Limit***
- 2. MC2 – Material Samples – (panels on site)***
- 3. MC9 – Building details – windows, doors, rainwater goods, etc***
- 4. Restriction on PD (plots 1-9 only)***
- 5. MC24 – Drainage details***

- 6. MC29 – Sustainable drainage**
- 7. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment ref: R/C11212/001.07 prepared by Hydrock Consultants Ltd dated January 2012.**
- 8. LS1 – Landscaping scheme (Submission)**
- 9. LS2 – Landscaping scheme (Implementation)**
- 10. RE6 – Submission of boundary details**
- 11. RE17 – Slab Levels**
- 12. The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of the Extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment dated September 2011 and the Phase 2 Reptile Survey dated October 2011 in all respects. Any variation shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before such change is made. This condition will be discharged on receipt of a letter from the project ecologist stating that the mitigation has been completed according to the approved reports.**
- 13. HY1 – Access details (submission including visibility splays)**
- 14. HY7 – Car parking in accordance with approved plan.**
- 15. HY11 – Turning space in accordance with approve plan.**
- 16. HY12 – New Estate Roads (works in accordance with County Specification)**
- 17. Submission of construction traffic management plan.**

Author: Laura Hudson
Contact number: 01235 540508
Email: laura.hudson@southandvale.gov.uk