

APPLICATION NO.	P13/V2562/RM
APPLICATION TYPE	RESERVED MATTERS
REGISTERED	16.12.2013
PARISH	KINGSTON BAGPUIZE
WARD MEMBER	Melinda Tilley
APPLICANT	David Wilson Homes Southern
SITE	Land West of Witney Road and South of A420, Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor
PROPOSAL	Erection of 63 dwellings and 45 unit extra care facility including public open space, landscape and associated works from outline permission P12/V1836/O (As clarified by Drawing No: 354-400 Revision B accompanying agent's email of 13 January 2014 and as amended by Materials Layout Drawing No: H6501/ML/01 Revision B, Affordable Tenure Drawing No: H6501/ATP/01, Landscape Design plan GL0162-01 Revision C and GL0162-02 Revision C, Extra Care Facility Drawing No: H6501_ECF_01 Revision D, Parking Layout H6501/CPL/01 and as clarified by Acoustic Report all dated 28 February 2014 and further amended by Site Plan Drawing No: H6568/PL/01 Revision F and Acoustic Bund Drawing No: H6501/ABD/10 accompanying agents email of 30 April 2014)
AMENDMENTS	As above
GRID REFERENCE	440592/198488
OFFICER	Mr Peter Brampton

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application site is a field of slightly over five hectares in size, on the northeastern edge of the village. Witney Road runs along its western boundary, whilst the A420 runs to the north. The field is enclosed by hedgerows and some trees to the open boundaries at the north, east and west, and by the rear of neighbouring dwellings and community buildings to the south. Access to the site is from Witney Road.
- 1.2 This application comes to planning committee as Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council recommends refusal, and because twenty three neighbours have objected to the scheme.
- 1.3 A location plan is **attached** as appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 In April 2013, the applicants received outline planning permission for the erection of up to 63 dwellings on the site, up to a 45-bed extra care facility with associated public open space, land for the village scout group and a new site access. This application seeks approval of reserved matters pursuant to that outline planning permission (P12/V2429/O). The matters for consideration with this application are layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.
- 2.2 The proposed development is closely related to the indicative layout approved as part of the outline consent. The site is accessed from Witney Road, with the extra care facility (ECF) located in the southeastern corner, immediately adjacent to the entrance to the site. The southwestern corner of the site contains the public open space and an

area for the local scout group, which was agreed at outline stage.

- 2.3 In total, there are 63 houses on the site, all of two-storey construction, with some benefiting from additional roof accommodation. The proposed mix of houses is:

No. of bedrooms	Affordable	Market
1 bed apartment	2	0
2 bed house	6	0
3 bed house	5	5
4 bed house	3	15
5 bed house	0	27
TOTAL	16	47

- 2.4 The 45 bed unit Extra Care Facility is split as follows:

No. of bedrooms	Affordable	Market
1 bed apartment	10	5
2 bed apartment	13	17
TOTAL	23	22

- 2.5 During the determination of the application, the applicants have amended the scheme in light of a number of objections to the proposal. These were largely focussed on the size of the ECF, which has been reduced in scale (not in number of units). Other amendments relate to the parking layout, the spread of affordable housing, comments from the landscape officer regarding boundary treatments and planting and comments from the council's noise specialist.
- 2.6 Extracts from the applications plans, including the site layout, are **attached** as appendix 2. All plans, associated supporting documentation and a detailed explanation of the amendment can be viewed on the council's website.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 **Kingston Bagpuize With Southmoor Parish Council** – Recommends refusal on amended scheme – *“The Parish Council recognises and welcomes changes from the original proposal but considers the size and design of the Care Home is out of keeping with a rural village and will be intrusive on a main approach to the village and on surrounding properties. The proposal from a resident to re-position the dropped kerbs to School Lane is supported.”*

- 3.2 **Neighbour Representations** – Letters of objection from 23 neighbours have been received to this application. The main objections can be summarised thus:

- Inappropriate scale and design of the extra care facility
- Extra care facility will visually dominate surrounding properties and approach to village
- Extra care facility breaches condition on ridge height limitation of no more than 9.75 metres attached to outline consent
- Design of extra care facility is out of keeping with area, in particular use of roof space for accommodation and areas of flat roof
- Extra care facility will overshadow and overlook neighbouring residents
- Extra care facility has inappropriate garden size
- Extra care facility has inadequate parking
- Outline application indicative plans proposed 1-1 ½ storey extra care facility
- Height of screening bund to extra care facility is insufficient
- Increased noise disturbance to local residents from development
- Inappropriate spread of affordable housing

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 21 May 2014

- Design of new houses fails to pay attention to local context
 - Material distribution is inadequate, with brick houses fronting onto Witney Road
 - Excessive removal of hedgerow, including before consent for this scheme granted
 - Concern over boundary treatments with Faringdon Road and School Lane
 - Bollard and street lights on Witney Road will cause light pollution
 - Visibility splays on eastern side of Witney Road reduced by street lights
- 3.3 The following issues have also been raised by local residents, but were either dealt with at the outline stage, are covered by conditions attached to the outline consent or are not material to the determination of this reserved matters application
- Development will cause unacceptable increase in traffic on local roads
 - Unsafe access onto A415
 - Traffic survey has not been updated since outline application
 - Insufficient facilities given amount of development approved in village
 - Impact on water pressure
 - Impact on sewer and drainage network
 - Increased burden on local facilities and public transport
 - Need to improve local footpath network around village
- 3.4 **Oxfordshire County Council Highways** – Concerned over amount of unallocated parking and parking for the extra care facility. Awaiting comments on latest site plan – verbal update to be given to planning committee.
- 3.5 **Oxfordshire County Council Minerals and Waste** – No objections
- 3.6 **Landscape Architect** – No objections following submission of amended plans and details of the acoustic bund on the northern part of the development.
- 3.7 **Drainage Engineer** – Confirms details submitted with application are not sufficient to discharge drainage conditions on outline consent and would welcome more details being provided in due course to clarify the agreed drainage strategy from the outline permission.
- 3.8 **Thames Water** – *“A foul drainage impact study has been carried out which confirms that reinforcements are required to the sewerage network to ensure there is no detriment to the existing system. The developer is requested to progress these requirements as soon as possible to avoid delays in the discharging of conditions.”*
- 3.9 **Environment Agency** – No objections
- 3.10 **Natural England** - No objections
- 3.11 **Conservation Officer** - No comments
- 3.12 **Urban Design Officer** – Raised concerns on original plans regarding inactive frontages, the scale of the extra care facility, solar orientation of housing layout and a suburban layout where neither built form or landscape dominates
- 3.13 **Forestry Officer** - Confirms the loss of vegetation to facilitate the access is acceptable, subject to replacement planting being agreed, whilst the trees to be removed have a poor life expectancy. Endorses landscape architect comments on planting scheme and species choice. Confirms proposed tree protection measures are acceptable.

- 3.14 **Waste Management Officer** - No comments
- 3.15 **Countryside Officer** - No comments
- 3.16 **Environmental Health - Air Quality** - No comments
- 3.17 **Environmental Health – Contaminated Land** – No comments
- 3.18 **Environmental Health – Pollution and noise** – No objections subject to condition requiring mitigation measures in submitted noise report to be implemented
- 3.19 **Leisure Department** - No comments
- 3.20 **Housing Team** – No objections

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P13/V2165/FUL](#) - Approved (29/11/2013)

Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission P12/V1836/O to state "The development to which this permission relates shall begin within 18 months from the date of the approval of the outline permission. Within a period of 9 months from the date of this permission details of the layout, the scale, the appearance and the landscape of the site (the Reserved Matters) shall be submitted to the local authority."

[P13/V1568/FUL](#) - Approved (03/10/2013)

Variation of condition 1 of Outline permission P12/V1836/O to read "The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within 12 months from the date of the approval of the outline permission. Within a period of 9 months from the date of this permission, details of the layout, the scale, the appearance and the landscape of the site (the reserved matters) shall be submitted to the local authority."

[P12/V1836/O](#) - Approved (11/04/2013)

Outline application for a residential development comprising of up to 63 Dwellings, up to 45 extra care units (use Class C3), public open space, land for scout group and new site access.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;**

- GS1 - Developments in Existing Settlements
- GS2 - Development in the Countryside
- DC1 - Design
- DC5 - Access
- DC6 - Landscaping
- DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
- H11 - Development in the Larger Villages
- H23 - Open Space in New Facility Development
- NE7 - The North Vale Corallian Ridge

5.2 **Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)**

- Residential Design Guide – December 2009
- Open space, Sport and Recreation Future Provision – July 2008
- Affordable Housing – July 2006

5.3 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** – March 2012

5.4 **Planning Practise Guidance** - March 2014

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

Scale, layout and appearance – Extra Care Facility

- 6.1 A large amount of local objection to this application, including that of the parish council, has focussed on the size of the extra care facility (ECF). The starting point for assessing the extra care facility is the outline application. The indicative plan submitted in support of the outline application proposes an extra care facility of approximately 4,000 square metres. This building was shown in two distinct “L” shape wings. The Design and Access Statement supporting that outline application states, *“This illustrative masterplan designs a building where the eastern wing is 1 to 1.5 storey to help preserve the privacy of existing neighbouring properties. The western wing is 2 to 2.5 storeys where it can overlook the open space and act as a key building in views along the main access road and adjacent to the open space. Parking is positioned to the front of the building to enable good access for residents, visitors and staff. Landscaping will help soften the appearance of parked cars from the main road, and a strong building line of residential properties will improve definition... of the street.”*
- 6.2 The committee report presented to this committee in respect of the outline application has the following to say on the ECF. *“The extra care dwellings are illustrated as a large single structure within its own grounds and surrounding a parking courtyard. This element of the illustrative layout is not considered appropriate in the context of the village and should not be taken as being endorsed as part of the consideration of the outline application... The extra care dwellings would infer a larger scale building, both in vertical appearance as well as horizontal dimension. Development over two-storey would not be acceptable in this location and would lead to issues of character and potential overlooking and loss of privacy to existing surrounding properties. The scale of any structure outside the accepted two-storey scale would not be agreeable as part of the development of the site.”*
- 6.3 The ECF proposed is markedly different to that shown on the indicative outline application. It is a single building arranged in a “U” shape with the majority of the building being 2 ½ storeys in height. The amended plans reduce the height of the building and introduce two 2-storey/1 ½ storey wings on the southern elevation, facing towards the existing neighbours to the south. The design runs counter to officer comments on the indicative plan which indicated anything more than two storeys would be unacceptable. However, the building now proposed has a significantly smaller footprint than the one shown at outline stage. The footprint indicated at outline stage was 4,000 square metres, whereas the footprint now proposed is less than half that, 1,750 square metres. The increased height of the building has to be assessed in terms of this substantially reduced footprint, and in terms of other relevant factors which are considered below.
- 6.4 It is important to consider the reasons why, at outline stage, an ECF of more than two storeys was considered to be inappropriate. These related to character and the impact on neighbouring amenity. A condition was placed on the outline consent restricting the ridge height of any dwelling to 9.75 metres, but does not specifically apply to the ECF. As proposed, the ECF reaches a maximum ridge height of around 10.3 metres, around 0.55 metres higher than the condition allows. This additional height alone is not considered significant, particularly as the slab level of the ECF will be set well below the slab levels of adjoining neighbours. Thus, from the adjacent land, the ECF will meet the 9.75 metres restriction applied to the whole site. This somewhat artificial solution must be assessed alongside the bulk and footprint of the building and the associated impact on the character of the area and neighbouring amenity.
- 6.5 The more compact footprint relative to that shown on the indicative outline scheme has some advantages in these regards. Firstly, the indicative plan shows the ECF

projecting to within around 11 metres of Witney Road. The ECF now proposed is set further into the site, around 31 metres back from Witney Road. This additional setback allows the introduction of further landscaping and, following discussions with Kingston Bagpuize Parish Council and local residents, a bund between the road and the building. This additional landscaping will help assimilate the building into its surroundings and provide a softer edge to Witney Road, more suited to its edge-of-village character.

- 6.6 The more compact “U” shape plan form allows for more secure amenity space immediately behind the building. This area has a good deal of natural surveillance and is less open to the elements, which will be attractive to the residents of the ECF. Overall, the amount of amenity space available to residents is acceptable, and has been agreed between the applicant and the registered provider who is taking on the facility.
- 6.7 A final clear advantage of the more compact plan form is that the distances to neighbouring properties is greater than shown on the indicative layout. This indicative plan showed a minimum distance of around 19 metres to the southern boundary of the site, with a back to back distance to Woodruff of 43 metres. The same distances with the submitted scheme are around 28 and 50 metres respectively. Woodruff is one of the closest neighbours to the ECF due to being set back from Faringdon Road. However, the back to back distances between the ECF and properties along Faringdon Road are so great that it is not considered the building, despite its height, would have a materially harmful impact on the privacy or outlook of these neighbours.
- 6.8 In assessing the impact of the ECF, it is important to note that the building submitted as part of the outline application was not designed in great detail, nor had it benefited from the input of a registered provider. South Oxfordshire Housing Association (SOHA) have agreed to take on the ECF now proposed, and so have had direct input into the design submitted. They have particular requirements that any ECF need to meet. These include the provision of communal facilities of a size appropriate to the predicted number of residents, such as the lounge, dining room, staff offices and bin storage areas. The applicant has had to accommodate those, whilst providing 45 flats to SOHA size requirements and DDA guidelines. It is inevitable these requirements have impacted on the detailed design of the ECF, which has deviated significantly from the indicative outline submission. Nonetheless, the building has proposed provides 45 extra care units, a type of accommodation for which there is a district-wide shortfall.
- 6.9 In terms of the appearance of the ECF, it is considered there has been compromise between easing the relationship with the surroundings and neighbours and the overall appearance of the final building. Large areas of flat roof are needed to achieve the low ridge height within the compacted footprint. The use of dummy pitches allows the flat roof to be somewhat hidden from view, particularly from the principal front elevation and the eastern side elevation, which will be seen from Witney Road. The southern rear wings of the building are particularly squat in appearance, but this elevation will not be easily seen from outside the site, so the wider planning harm is limited.
- 6.10 The design does include features to break up the bulk of the building, such as two-storey gables with traditionally pitched roofs, and glazed single storey structures at the main entrance and opening onto the rear amenity space. These provide a degree of articulation that assists in reducing the perceived bulk of the building.
- 6.11 The quality of materials will be important to securing a high quality building and conditions are recommended that require the prior agreement to sample materials, and the provision of a sample wall panel on site.

6.12 There can be no doubt that, within the context of the village, the proposed ECF is a large building. If built, it would be one of the largest in the village. However, such facilities do possess an inherent size and this has to be balanced against the growing need for such facilities and the desire to disperse them more locally in villages as well as towns to provide local residents with accommodation for their later years. The ECF proposed will sit within an overall site of five hectares, and has been designed in conjunction with SOHA, a registered provider, who have confirmed in discussions with our housing team that the proposed design is acceptable to them, so they would be willing to manage the entire facility. Thus, whilst the ECF now proposed deviates from what was considered acceptable at outline stage, the conclusion is that the impact on the character of the area and on neighbours' amenities are insufficient to outweigh the benefits it will bring in terms of delivering this particular type of accommodation. As such, there are considered to be no grounds for refusal of this scheme based on the appearance, scale and layout of the ECF.

Scale, appearance and layout – housing

- 6.13 Unlike the ECF, the layout of the housing does not deviate significantly from the indicative plans submitted at outline stage. The layout primarily consists of an outer and inner road that allows access to the majority of the housing. The use of different surfaces on these two roads will distinguish the more residential areas of the site and reduce vehicle speeds. Generally, active frontages onto roads and public areas are achieved to ensure a good degree of natural surveillance within the site.
- 6.14 The urban design officer highlights that Plots 46-49 back onto School Lane, which lies along the southwestern boundary of the site, and so is one point where active frontages are not achieved. However, School Lane is a private and quiet road and it would change the character of the lane if these plots opened onto it, particularly in terms of car movements.
- 6.15 The urban design officer has criticised the suburban approach to the layout with neither built form nor the landscape dominating. Officers acknowledge this point and accept that on certain corners, particularly around the public open space, the development lacks a focal point or building. There is also no hierarchy of streets. This harms the permeability and legibility of the scheme and fails to create a sense of place. This is to the detriment of the overall quality of the scheme. However, there are a number of positive aspects to the proposal in urban design terms. As well as the active frontages outlined above, the public open space is well integrated into the scheme, incorporates scout land and connects well to the surroundings, ensuring it is likely to be well used. The scheme has a density appropriate to the edge of village location and the layout does provide for a good number of trees along most streets. The majority of the market housing is 4 or 5 bed detached houses, and the layout reflects the need to provide these properties with plenty of parking and good sized gardens. The result is a spacious character that is reasonably consistent with the existing housing within the built up limits of the village.
- 6.16 The appearance of the houses themselves is largely simple and traditional, appropriate for the village setting. The conditions relating to materials will cover all the buildings on the site to ensure a consistent approach. One neighbour has highlighted that existing buildings fronting onto Witney Road are stone, where the houses in this development facing Witney Road are brick, despite stone being used elsewhere on the site. This is true, but these houses will be well set back from Witney Road, behind the proposed landscaping and so will have a different relationship with this road than the housing on its eastern side, which sits closer with limited screening. Thus, the use of stone for these houses would not significantly alter the overall impression of the scheme viewed from Witney Road.

Landscaping and boundary treatments

- 6.17 The entire site is covered by a detailed landscaping scheme that has been fully assessed by the council's landscape officer and forestry officer, who have confirmed no objections following the submission of amended plans.
- 6.18 During the determination of this application, the hedgerow along Witney Road has been cut back. This work is consented as part of the Section 278 agreement between the applicant and Oxfordshire County Council as the Highways Authority. This hedge needed to be cut back to ensure adequate visibility splays. This removal is shown on submitted Drawing No: 354-400 Revision B and the council's landscape officer has visited the site and confirmed the hedge removal that has taken place was in line with the consented scheme. In addition, the landscape officer has confirmed the replacement planting proposed to mitigate the loss of the existing hedge is acceptable and will offer good screening of the development from Witney Road.
- 6.19 The northern boundary planting is important as it will screen a two metre high acoustic fence between the dwellings and the A420. This fence is an integral part of the noise mitigation measures and sits atop a 4.5 metre high bund. Screening this fence is an integral part of the landscaping scheme and the council's landscape officer has approved the planting along this boundary. The bund design has been amended to ensure this planting can be established and that the existing hedge along the A420 will be retained. This hedge offers almost complete screening of the site from the A420 and its retention is essential. The amended bund design has been agreed by the landscape officer.
- 6.20 The amended proposals include a 1.5 metre high bund between Witney Road and the ECF. This is acceptable, particularly as it helps to screen the main parking area of the ECF from the public realm. It is understood initial discussions between the applicant and residents proposed a two metre high bund. However, it is important to note that an artificial bund can appear out of place and draw the eye in the street scene. Thus, a 1.5 metre bund is considered a reasonable compromise on this point.
- 6.21 Within the site, a mixture of fencing, railings and stone walls are proposed. Close-boarded fencing is only proposed on private to private boundaries, with walls and railings used to define boundaries between public and private areas. This is appropriate. Generally, the hard landscaping proposals are appropriate for this edge of village location.

Impact on residential amenity

- 6.22 As discussed above, the distances between the ECF and the housing to the south ensures no material loss of light, privacy or outlook will occur.
- 6.23 Plot 49 has an unusual relationship with Martins, a large detached property accessed from School Lane. It is possible some of the first floor windows in this property will allow undue overlooking of the garden of this neighbour. However, these windows either serve bathrooms, or are secondary windows to a bedroom. Therefore, it is reasonable to obscure glaze these windows by condition. The properties to the north of Plot 49 are set further away from School Lane and the increased distance will ensure no material loss of privacy to Martins.
- 6.24 Within the site, adequate back to back distances are incorporated into the layout to ensure appropriate levels of amenity for future occupiers.

Access and Highway Safety

- 6.25 Full consent was secured at outline stage for the access. At the time of writing,

discussions with the County Council Highways Authority are ongoing as to whether the amended layout incorporates enough off-street and visitor parking. The applicants believe the off-street parking is in excess of required levels, thereby reducing the need for the usual visitor parking. A verbal update on this point will be provided to the planning committee.

- 6.26 Similarly, there are some minor points about the width of the carriageways within the site and the provision of footpaths within the layout that need clarifying. Again, a verbal update on this point will be provided to the committee.
- 6.27 One neighbour has raised concerns about the proposed street lighting and bollard proposed as part of the Section 278 agreement for works to Witney Road. This is in terms of light pollution and the street lighting blocking visibility splays for existing properties. The detailed highway works to Witney Road will have been agreed with the County Council and will need to meet the relevant safety standards to be acceptable to the Highways Authority. Any proposal to move the dropped kerbs on the roads approaching the site would need to be agreed separately with the Highways Authority.

Other issues

- 6.28 The mix for the housing has deviated from the indicative mix shown at outline stage, with more 3-, 4- and 5-bedroom dwellings proposed. Only six two-bed dwellings are proposed, all of which are affordable. However, it is important to take into account the ECF, which provides 45 one and two bed units. With the six, two-bed houses, there are 53 one- and two-bed units on this scheme, representing 49% of the total. This is only marginally short of the 50% target in Policy H16 of the Local Plan.
- 6.29 In terms of the spread of affordable housing, 27 of the 43 units are incorporated into the ECF. It is unusual that the ECF incorporates market and affordable flats and the council's housing team are supportive of this approach. Previous ECF's have tended to be single tenure, so this scheme offers a new way forward for this council to deliver this type of accommodation. The remaining 16 affordable units are arranged close together along the eastern boundary of the development. However, they are not separated from the market housing in terms of access, being spread across two different spine roads. It would not be desirable to split these 16 units into two groups of eight from a registered provider management point of view, as it is likely to increase the costs that have to be absorbed by the rents for the units, and the council's housing team has no objections on this point.
- 6.30 The council's drainage engineer has confirmed the information provided with this application is not sufficient in itself to discharge conditions relating to foul and surface water drainage. However, these matters will be picked up at the discharge of conditions stage. Works to the public sewer have been identified by Thames Water and will be necessary prior to occupation of any new dwelling. There is no aspect of this reserved matters application that conflicts with the indicative strategies for foul and surface water provided in support of the outline application.
- 6.31 The council's forestry officer has confirmed no objections to the scheme subject to the proposed tree protection measures being implemented as per the arboricultural report accompanying the application.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 This reserved matters application proposes an appropriate layout, appearance, scale and landscaping solution to the site. The amended plans have overcome concerns about the bulk of the extra care facility, the planting scheme within the site, including on the bunds at site boundaries and the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties.

Subject to the receipt of outstanding comments on technical issues, the proposal is considered to comply with local and national policies and should be approved, subject to the recommended conditions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

That, subject to the receipt of outstanding technical comments, and to those comments proving to be acceptable, Reserved Matters Approval is granted subject to:

- 1 : Commencement within 18 mths of outline consent 11/04/2013**
- 2 : Approved plans**
- 3 : Samples of all external materials to be agreed**
- 4 : Panel of walling materials to be provided on site and agreed**
- 5 : Parking & Turning as approved**
- 6 : New Estate Roads to County Council specification**
- 7 : Garage Accommodation to be retained on Plots 7, 8, 20, 23, 31, 32, 33, 43, 49, 51, 52, 56, 57 and 63**
- 8 : No Drainage to Highway**
- 9 : Tree Protection as approved**
- 10 : Noise mitigation as approved**
- 11 : First floor southwestern windows of Plot 49 to be obscure glazed**
- 12 : Commencement after all outline consent conditions agreed**

Author: Peter Brampton
Contact Number: 01491 823751
Email: peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk