

APPLICATION NO.	P15/V0343/O
APPLICATION TYPE	OUTLINE APPLICATION
REGISTERED	23.02.2015
PARISH	EAST HANNEY
WARD MEMBER(S)	Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Gladman Developments Limited
SITE	Land north of Summertown, East Hanney
PROPOSAL	A residential development for up to 55 dwellings, including site access, public open space and landscaping
GRID REFERENCE	441607/192584
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

SUMMARY

The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 55 dwellings. Only the principle of housing on this site and means of access are to be considered as part of this application with all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) being reserved matters for future consideration should outline permission be granted.

The main issues are:

- Whether the principle of development is acceptable
- Whether the site is a suitable location for new housing that can contribute to the five-year housing supply shortfall.
- The suitability of the access and whether the proposal will impact on highway safety or traffic flows.
- Implications for flood risk, foul and surface water drainage.
- Implications for ecology
- Implications for the historic environment including the setting of the East Hanney conservation area

This report seeks to assess the planning application details against the development plan, national and local planning policy framework where relevant and all other material planning considerations.

This is a greenfield site on the edge of East Hanney.

The principle of housing on this site is considered reasonable particularly in light of the lack of a 5-year land supply and Government advice in the NPPF which is considered more up to date and relevant in comparison to the housing policies in the adopted local plan and as the emerging local plan policies can only be given limited weight at this stage.

Access to the site from Summertown is acceptable. Consideration has been given to cumulative impacts of traffic on to the A338 which is particularly busy at peak hours with queuing but the highway authority is satisfied the additional traffic flows can be accommodated.

Officers are aware of drainage issues in the village and flooding that has occurred. Drainage issues can be addressed by planning conditions, as confirmed by the drainage consultees.

The applicant has commissioned recent surveys of the land for its habitat, botanical roosting bats, Great Crested Newt (GCN), water vole and for barn owl. These surveys found the site is used by barn owl which may be displaced by activity associated with construction. The applicant suggests mitigation can be provided and the Council's countryside officer agrees that this is reasonable and can be secured by planning condition.

Impacts for the setting of the conservation area are not considered substantial in NPPF terms and the benefits of the proposal can outweigh this limited harm. Buried archaeology has been investigated following a geophysical survey and can be addressed by condition.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 East Hanney is defined as a large village by policy H11 of the adopted Local Plan. The village provides a range of services including a shop, community facilities, a primary school, some limited employment opportunities and access to a regular public transport service serving larger towns.

1.2 This application relates to a greenfield site adjoining the south eastern edge of the village. The land is open in appearance with the pattern of ridge and furrow noticeable and given over to pasture. There are no other features within the site. Immediately north of the site is a footpath linking the A338 to Main Street. Beyond the footpath is a former farmhouse and its outbuildings. To the east is a dwelling with a farm shop alongside and its associated livestock buildings, a parking area and the A338. A post and rail fence separates the dwelling and farm shop from the site and a hedge defines the boundary with the A338. Summertown Road is to the south of the site with the site boundary defined by a hedge and occasional, individual trees. South of Summertown Road is an open field that is allocated for housing as part of the draft Local Plan 2031. The western boundary is defined by trees and in part it is open. Beyond are dwellings which front Main Street. The western boundary also defines in part the edge of the East Hanney conservation area.

1.3 There is no current vehicular access to the site other than through the area accommodating livestock buildings to the north east of the site. The area containing the livestock buildings is shown as being within the applicant's control.

1.4 The site is outside the village conservation area which adjoins the western boundary of the site. The site lies within the wider Lowland Vale landscape (Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan).

1.5 The application is presented to committee as the Parish Council object and more than four letters of objection have been received from local residents.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This is an application for outline planning permission seeking approval for up to 55 dwellings and means of access from Summertown Road. All other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) are reserved matters for future consideration should outline permission be granted

2.2 Access is proposed from Summertown Road at a point some 48m from the western boundary of the site and forming a 'T' junction. To form the access a section of existing hedge approximately 6m wide will need to be removed. The new access road itself will be 5.5m wide with radii of 6m. Vision splays of 2.4m set back by 44m in either direction are proposed. The vision splays will be across the existing grass verge and there should be no requirement for further hedge removal although some trimming back

of overhanging branches may be required to maintain vision splays.

2.3 The application plans include a development framework plan. This does not show a housing layout but indicates the areas on which dwellings could be built, areas for open space and a play area (LEAP) along the north western boundary to the site, potential main streets and pedestrian access which include links to the adjacent footpath and farm shop. It is proposed to provide bus stops close to the point of the footpath (198/15/10) meeting the A338.

2.4 The application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents, which are as follows:-

- Design and Access Statement
- Planning statement
- Arboricultural assessment
- Built heritage report
- Utility and drainage report
- Ecology appraisal
- Phase 1 study & walkover survey
- Archaeological desk based assessment
- Geophysical survey report
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Foul drainage analysis
- Potable water capacity flow & pressure investigation
- Socio economic report
- Statement of community involvement
- Sustainability report
- Transport assessment
- Travel plan
- Landscape and visual impact assessment
- Ecology survey update letter

2.6 A site location plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Below is a summary of the responses received. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

<p>Parish Council</p>	<p>Object The Parish Council’s objections may be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 dwellings per hectare is overdevelopment for this rural village location adjacent to a conservation area • No detailed layout plan and there is concern that there is insufficient parking and footpaths • Confusion of the land to the north east which is shown for drainage purposes but outside the assessment boundary • The adjacent footpath is too narrow for mobility scooters,
-----------------------	--

	<p>double width push chairs and unsuited for cycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No concrete proposals to make it easier to use sustainable transport• Health care facilities at Grove and Wantage are not easy to access on foot or by cycling• Cow Lane is unsuitable for pedestrian or cycle access due to its heavily rutted nature and boggy areas• Other footpaths to Grove are unsuitable for regular use being over ploughed fields and crossing the busy A338• The walk isochrones included in the submission are wrong and misleading assuming the A338 and Steventon Road can be walked whereas they have no footways and they assume private land can be walked• There are no designated bus routes to centres of employment at Harwell, Didcot or Milton Park• The Summertown/A338 junction will become more difficult to negotiate and more so with new housing proposals at Grove and Wantage.• Increase traffic congestion on the A338• Dispute the applicants foul drainage claims• No evidence that the sewage system can cope with an extra 55 dwellings• No indication where foul water can be stored and the consequences of pump failure• Application makes no attempt to address how it meets local housing need• The application does not demonstrate how SUDS can be implemented or how they are a solution to high water tables• The primary school is over capacity and a statement by the pupils place service manager does not take account of other developments in East Hanney• There are no proposal to
--	---

	<p>encourage home working</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of ridge and furrow field • Loss of a locally historic site <p>Their full comments are <u>attached</u> at Appendix 2.</p>
<p>Neighbours</p>	<p>44 letters of objection have been received. The objections and concerns expressed may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an allocated site in the emerging local plan • Village cannot accommodate the scale of development especially considering the 200 dwelling proposed housing allocation in the emerging local plan, and housing permissions already granted • The village facilities cannot accommodate the housing growth proposed • Council has already met its housing targets • Flood risk. The site acts as a reservoir for excessive rain and excessive water runoff into the ditches leads to flooding of nearby dwellings. The village is impassable during periods of heavy rain and many home shave been flooded regularly • The flood risk assessment is flawed and inadequate. SUDS and swales are proposed but there are issues with high ground water levels which have not been addressed. The status of land to the north east is not clear and its roles in storm water attenuation vague. • Increased traffic congestion at the junctions with the A338, as most people will drive to work and drive their children to school • Increased traffic through the village and on narrow roads including the sharp bend at Summertown/Main Street and at the bridge • Increased safety risk with additional vehicles using the Summertown/A338 junction • Inadequate capacity at the village school • Inadequate capacity at the GP

	<p>surgery in Wantage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Put a greater strain on local facilities including the shop, post office• Access is onto a narrow road• Inadequate sewerage capacity as acknowledged by Thames Water• Displace wildlife using the site including bats, birds and water vole. The proposal does not increase biodiversity. Ecology surveys have been undertaken in winter which is inappropriate• Detrimental impact on the conservation area and listed buildings• Will not preserve the rural character of the village• Do not need more 4 bedroom dwellings; the need is for two and three bedroom dwellings, flats and bungalows• Green fields should not be used for housing• Loss of ridge and furrow• Too many dwellings proposed• Will there be street lighting; there is none in the village at present• Need more housing for first time buyers and retirement properties• Increased pollution from traffic• High density housing is out of keeping• Footpath is not suitable access to the village for some people e.g. cyclists, those with push-chairs, mobility scooters• Not a sustainable development with no direct public transport to Didcot, Harwell or Milton Park• A338 and Steventon Road re extremely dangerous for cycling• The site has historic interest which has not been properly assessed. It contains an old manor and the evidence from numerous archaeology yields in the fields immediately to the south• The play area should be in the centre of the site for better access and supervision• A pavement along Summertown ought to be provided• Traffic lights should be provided at the Summertown/A338 junction if
--	---

	<p>this is to be permitted</p>
<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Access to the footpath should not be denied during construction and any damage to it made good. Access from the site to the footpath is welcomed.</p> <p>Footpath (198/15) on the northern boundary of the proposed development crosses the A338. Where the FP meets the A338 on the western side there is very little verge and there are continuous streams of traffic. Irrespective of whether the proposed development proceeds it would desirable for the FP15/A338 junction to be improved i.e. space provided for pedestrians to wait in safety until the road is clear. It would also be helpful if a proper footway was created where FP15 continues on the eastern side of the A338.</p> <p>Echo the comments of the East Hanney Parish Clerk about the disgusting state of Cow Lane which links the Hanneys and Grove. This has the potential to be a PROW that would be easy for all to walk on, for cyclists to use and, indeed, for those using mobility scooters. It is asked that durable materials be used to rectify the appalling surface of Cow Lane to encourage the use of what should be a PROW of strategic importance between the three communities.</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council One Voice</p>	<p>No overall objection</p> <p><u>Transport</u> No objection subject to conditions relating to access, vision splays, drainage, footpath improvements and a travel plan. They would also seek financial contributions toward public transport infrastructure and a s.278 agreement for kerb realignment at the Summertown/A338 junction, a north and south bound bus stops with pull in, footway and pedestrian link to the site, footway around the north east side of Summertown/A338 junction</p> <p>Having regard to the additional traffic that would be generated by this proposed development, which would include large and heavy vehicles during the construction period as well as regular</p>

servicing vehicles following occupation, the highway authority would seek improvement of this junction, in the form of kerb re-alignments. The authority would also require commensurate visibility at the junction from Summertown northwards along A338 to be provided.

Welcome the proposal to improve Public Footpath No 198/15 (East Hanney) by clearance and removal of overgrowing vegetation and providing a sealed, metalled surfacing.

Welcome the proposal to add bus stops but these must be considered in conjunction with the proposed strategic housing site and bus stops would be better proposed close to the Summertown/A338 junction in order to serve both sites.

The developer should liaise with the Parish Council over relocation bus stops on Main Street which are at a narrow point and these should be agreed at full planning stage.

Contributions towards strategic transport infrastructure in the western science vale, procuring additional bus services serving East Hanney, costs of bus stop pole/flags/information and a bus shelter are sought

Archaeology

Initially objected but having reviewed the geophysical survey confirms it reveals no significant archaeological features and recommends conditions requiring a staged programme of investigation.

Education

No objection subject to contributions as follows:-

- £203,032 for necessary expansion of permanent, possibly new build primary school capacity in the area. St James CE Primary School is broadly full, evidencing a trend towards higher demand for school places in the area over recent years. Population growth as a result of local housing would require expansion of school capacity, either at the village

	<p>school, or in the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £442,626 for necessary expansion of permanent secondary school capacity in the area - King Alfred's Academy. - £11,991 as a proportionate contribution to expansion of Special Educational Needs provision in the area. <p><u>Property</u> No objection. Financial contributions as follows are sought;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grove library £14,494.20 - Central Library £2,924.42 - Waste Management £10,913.28 - Museum Resource Centre £852.60 - Adult Day Care £10,593 <p>Suggested an informative relating to sprinkler systems in new dwellings.</p>
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>Waste Comments: Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application, therefore recommended a Grampian condition for a drainage strategy to be submitted and approved prior to commencement.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.</p> <p>Water Comments The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. Thames Water therefore recommend the following</p>

	<p>condition be imposed: Development should not be commenced until: Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water).</p> <p>Waste: Thames Water do not consider the "foul drainage analysis" a drainage strategy. No assessment has been made to review the impact the additional flows will have on the existing network. It is worth noting there are reported flooding events in East Hanney and a drainage strategy is required.</p>
<p>Conservation officer</p>	<p>The north west boundary of the proposal site abuts the East Hanney conservation area. There are a number of listed buildings including Jasmine Cottage, The Mulberries and Robey House and associated railings within the conservation area. The key site constraints from a Conservation/Design point of view are the setting of the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings. It would be important for any new housing to respect and address the established grain of the nearby built development and locally distinctive vernacular architecture in terms of siting, heights, scale, massing and materials.</p>
<p>Equalities officer</p>	<p>The design and access statement refers to affordable housing but does not appear to include the provision of lifetime homes although the planning statement implies they will comply with the policy. Please can we ensure these are included in both the affordable and market housing. It would be good to include accessible play equipment in the LEAP, but if it is a naturalistic design, using timber play equipment and natural play features providing accessible elements may be harder to achieve. Good to see a footpath through the green space. Consider the abilities and limitations of people with visual impairments when designing shared surface area</p>
<p>Stagecoach</p>	<p>Stagecoach notes and welcomes the fact that additional stops have been identified by the applicant as being appropriate to allow residents of the site, and indeed the bulk of East Hanney, to much more</p>

	<p>easily gain access to use the X30. This service operates every 30 minutes and the TA makes clear that the journey time into Oxford is very competitive indeed with driving: about 25 minutes off-peak to Oxford Station and a little more to the City Centre. We recognise that the final design and location of these stops is likely to need some more detailed investigation. The proposed location near the crossing of the public right of way with the A338 looks logical, subject to full safety audit. Such a location also makes it likely that a second pair of stops could in due course be provided, a distance south of the Summertown junction, should further development proposals being considered by the emerging Local Plan eventually come forward in that location. We wish to make it clear that as a fast service from Wantage and Grove to Oxford, we would not want to divert X30 through the village Main Street. The extra time delay, not least to enter and exit the village, would tend to unduly delay the bulk of existing and potential future users of the service. Therefore, to make best use of the opportunities for sustainable transport, these stops are very important. Stagecoach can confirm that it is actively looking to make its own further investments into the X30 and 31 route, particularly as new developments come forward. We would advise that pressure on capacity is growing on morning peak time journeys. We are looking at ways to provide extra capacity to relieve this. A considerable amount of new patronage however, will be needed to support the considerable additional costs of a frequency upgrade on either service throughout the day. The ongoing review of the business case for this continues to be high on the company's priority list. Stagecoach is also aware that proportionate contributions to help pump-prime such upgrades have been sought from developments of a range of scales along the corridor concerned.</p>
<p>Waste Team</p>	<p>Seek a contribution of £170 per dwelling towards waste collection services for this development</p>

<p>Countryside Officer</p>	<p>No objection subject to conditions and an informative.</p> <p>Further to my comments submitted on 10/4/15 we have now received further ecological information from the applicant detailing the results of additional surveys conducted recently for barn owls bats and botanical surveys.</p> <p>In summary, the detailed botanical surveys of the grassland confirmed the findings of the initial winter surveys that the grassland habitats would not qualify as a priority habitat as it is comprised of species with a wide distribution in the county.</p> <p>The bat emergence and re-entry surveys have confirmed that Tree 5 does not currently support a bat roost however, as bats are transient and the tree does provide suitable roosting conditions recommendations have been made for a further survey prior to felling and the use of soft felling techniques. I have recommended a condition below to cover this issue.</p> <p>Barn owl surveys confirmed that the existing box is in regular use for roosting but did not find evidence of current nesting activity. However, as the barn owl nesting season is quite long this does not preclude the possibility that the box could be used for nesting during the season. It will therefore be necessary to update the surveys and design a suitable mitigation strategy once the detailed layout is produced at reserved matters stage. The mitigation proposals which have been put forward include the erection of two new barn owl boxes on land to the north which is within the applicants control however, these boxes would be relatively distant from the existing box site and there is no guarantee that they would be used given barn owls known habit of fidelity to nesting sites. I would therefore recommend that a condition is used to ensure that the existing nesting site is maintained in a suitable green buffer on the southern boundary and that the layout is designed to allow for suitable buffer habitats.</p> <p>The presence of great crested newts is now not thought to be a reasonable</p>
----------------------------	---

	<p>likelihood given the absence of the species form a number of other suitable ponds locally which have been surveyed recently and the presence of fish within the pond on the western site boundary. Recommended conditions: Condition 1: mitigation strategy for barn owls Condition 2: reptile mitigation. Condition 3: method statement for biodiversity enhancements Condition 4: Prior to the removal of any trees on site an update survey for bats. Informative: Nesting birds.</p>
Environment Agency	No objection
Drainage Engineer	<p>The submitted Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates an acceptable sustainable surface water drainage strategy, in principle, subject to it being integrated into the site layout and landscape proposals. Thus, the detailed surface water drainage strategy will need to be consider as part of Reserved Matters should planning permission be granted. CONDITION Prior to the commencement of the development, a fully detailed sustainable drainage scheme for foul and surface water of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the District Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of any dwelling to which the scheme relates. Reason: To ensure the effective drainage of the site and to avoid flooding. ADVISORY: The submitted foul drainage assessment report states that a foul water impact study has been commissioned with Thames Water. The final study report is required to be submitted to show the recommended solution to cater for waste water disposal from the development.</p>

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P15/V0067/SCR - screening opinion sought - not EIA development

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2011**

The development plan for this area comprises the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan 2011. The following local plan policies relevant to this application were ‘saved’ by direction on 1 July 2009.

Policy No.	Policy Title
GS1	Developments in Existing Settlements
GS2	Development in the Countryside
DC1	Design
DC3	Design against crime
DC5	Access
DC6	Landscaping
DC7	Waste Collection and Recycling
DC8	The Provision of Infrastructure and Services
DC9	The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
DC12	Water quality and resources
DC13	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
DC14	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
H11	Development in the Larger Villages
H15	Housing Densities
H16	Size of Dwelling and Lifetime Homes
H17	Affordable Housing
H23	Open Space in New Housing Development
HE1	Conservation areas
HE10	Archaeology
NE9	The Lowland vale

Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1

- 5.2 The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. It has not been subject to Examination and policies remain subject to objections. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF. At present it is officers' opinion that the emerging Local Plan housing policies carry limited weight for decision making. The relevant policies are as follows:-

Policy No.	Policy Title
Core Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Core Policy 2	Co-operation on unmet housing need for Oxfordshire
Core Policy 3	Settlement hierarchy
Core Policy 4	Meeting our housing needs
Core Policy 5	Housing supply ring-fence
Core Policy 7	Providing supporting infrastructure and services
Core Policy 20	Spatial strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area
Core Policy 22	Housing mix
Core Policy 23	Housing density
Core Policy 24	Affordable housing
Core Policy 33	Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
Core Policy 35	Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
Core Policy 36	Electronic communications
Core Policy 37	Design and local distinctiveness
Core Policy 38	Design strategies for strategic and major development sites
Core Policy 39	The historic environment
Core Policy 42	Flood risk

Core Policy 43	Natural resources
Core Policy 44	Landscape
Core Policy 45	Green infrastructure
Core Policy 46	Conservation and improvement of biodiversity

5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Design Guide – March 2015
The following sections of the Design Guide are particularly relevant to this application:-
Responding to Site and Setting
 - *Character Study (DG6) and Site appraisal (DG9)**Establishing the Framework*
 - *Existing natural resources, sustainability and heritage(DG10-13, 15, 19)*
 - *Landscape and SUDS (DG14, 16-18, 20)*
 - *Movement Framework and street hierarchy (DG21-24)*
 - *Density (DG26)*
 - *Urban Structure (blocks, frontages, nodes etc) DG27-30**Layout*
 - *Streets and Spaces (DG31-43)*
 - *Parking (DG44-50)**Built Form*
 - *Scale, form, massing and position (DG51-54)*
 - *Boundary treatments (DG55)*
 - *Building Design (DG56-62)*
 - *Amenity, privacy and overlooking (DG63-64)*
 - *Refuse and services (DG67-68)*
- Open space, sport and recreation future provision – July 2008
- Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009
- Affordable Housing – July 2006
- Flood Maps and Flood Risk – July 2006
- Planning and Public Art – July 2006

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012

5.5 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)

5.6 Other Relevant Legislation

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation Human Rights Act 1998
- Equality Act 2010
- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)

5.7 Human Rights Act

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

5.8 Equalities

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. Principle of the development
2. Use of Land
3. Locational Credentials
4. Landscape and Visual Impact
5. Open Space and Landscaping
6. Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage
7. Traffic and Highway Safety
8. Protected Species and Biodiversity
9. Viability and Developer Contributions

The Principle of Development

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan currently comprises the saved policies of Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 6.2 Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and NPPG and the emerging Vale of White Horse Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Sites and Policies and its supporting evidence base.
- 6.3 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to *"use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area"*... The authority has undertaken this assessment through the April 2014 SHMA which is the most up to date objectively assessed need for housing. In agreeing to submit the emerging Local Plan for examination, the Council has agreed a housing target of at least 20,560 dwellings for the plan period to 2031. Set against this target the Council does not have a five year housing land supply.
- 6.4 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites"*. This means that the relevant housing policies in the adopted Local Plan are not considered up to date and the adverse impacts of a development would need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal is refused. In order to judge whether a development is sustainable it must be assessed against the economic, social and environmental roles.
- 6.5 Policy GS1 of the adopted Local Plan provides a strategy for locating development concentrated at the five major towns but with small scale development within the built up areas of villages provided that important areas of open land and their rural character are protected. In terms of a hierarchy for allocating development this strategy is consistent with the NPPF, as is the intention to protect the character of villages.

- 6.6 The relevant housing policies of the adopted and emerging local plan hold very limited material planning weight in light of the lack of a 5 year housing supply. Consequently the proposal should be assessed under the NPPF where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through the decision making process. Having a deliverable 5 year housing supply is considered sustainable under the 3 strands. Therefore, with the lack of a 5 year housing supply, the proposal is acceptable in principle unless any adverse impacts can be identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of meeting this objective.

Cumulative Impact

- 6.7 East Hanney has been subject to a number of planning applications for housing development that have been permitted including application no's: P13/V2266/O (35 dwellings allowed on appeal), P13/V0381/FUL (25 dwellings), P13/V2608/FUL (16 dwellings), P11/V2103 (15 dwellings). The draft local plan also seeks to allocate some 200 dwellings on land south of Summertown Road.

The NPPF does not suggest that populations of settlements should be limited in some way or not be expanded by any particular figure. It expects housing to be boosted significantly.

The highway authority is not raising any concerns in response to increased traffic movements including those along the A338 or at the Summertown/A338 junction. Likewise no objections are being raised by technical consultees in regard to drainage, flood risk, foul and waste water disposal or infrastructure.

Use of Land

- 6.8 The NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value (paragraph 17). This is not a brownfield site; it is greenfield. The site is agricultural land given over to pasture. According to Natural England's agricultural land classification map it is grade 3 and the loss of this relatively small area land to housing will not adversely affect agricultural operations including food production.

Locational Credentials

- 6.9 The NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34).
- 6.11 The site adjoins the edge of East Hanney and is beside the A338 being a short walk from bus services to Grove and Wantage and to Oxford with their wider choice of services, shopping and employment opportunities. It is acknowledged that employment opportunities at Milton Park are not accessible by bus and whilst some people may choose to cycle Steventon Road most people may drive should they need to access Milton Park. Likewise with the state of Cow Lane it is unlikely that many people would choose to walk to Grove or cycle that route. Some people will choose public transport others will choose to drive.
- 6.12 There are a range of services reasonably close to the site. The primary school is approximately 700m away; the village shop, village hall and recreation ground are approximately 560m away. A public house is some 350m walk. The walking distances to key facilities in the village are largely greater than 400m which is a desirable distance according to the Institution of Highway Transportation guidelines for providing for journeys on foot (2000) but which does also advise distances up to 800m are acceptable and up to 1200m are a preferred maximum. (The distances provided are from the proposed site access and by road to the facilities).

- 6.13 It is concluded that this is a reasonably accessible site for a housing development and in reaching this conclusion I am mindful that the Council is seeking to allocate housing on land south of Summertown Road and other housing schemes have been permitted at the edge of the village which indicate East Hanney is considered a reasonably accessible location.

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 6.14 The applicant is offering 40 % affordable housing which accords with Policy H17 of the adopted Local Plan. As this is an outline application it is not for this application to agree the mix and location of affordable housing; this would be agreed at detailed application stage. Officers will expect a detailed submission to accord with the SHMA guidance in respect of affordable housing mix and tenure based on 25% shared ownership and 75% being rented. Likewise the mix of market house sizes will be expected to accord with the SHMA. The mix explained in the applicant's socio economic assessment is biased towards 4+ bedroom dwellings and this would not be acceptable.

Design and Layout

- 6.15 The NPPF provides that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment (paragraph 60). It gives considerable weight to good design and acknowledges it is a key component of sustainable development.
- 6.16 A number of local plan policies seek to ensure high quality developments and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties (Policies DC1, DC6, DC9). In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.
- 6.17 This is an outline application with only access to be considered. The details concerning layout and external appearance of the dwellings are reserved matters and would be considered should a detailed application be submitted; they are not part of the consideration of this outline application. It is not therefore, intended to address design and layout in any detail in this report.
- 6.18 Principle DG26 of the design guide states that density should be appropriate to the location, and it requires a range of densities for larger development proposals. Policy H15 of the adopted local plan requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. The application proposes a density of some 28 dwellings per hectare. Housing immediately adjacent to the site is of a lower density but 28 dwellings per hectare would be a reasonable density and not inconsistent with the range of densities that comprise the character of East Hanney.
- 6.19 A detailed submission would need to convince the Council that up to 55 dwellings could be accommodated on this site and the appropriate stage to consider this would be at detailed application stage or reserved matter submission.

Residential Amenity

- 6.20 Adopted local plan policy DC9 seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment. Protecting amenity is a core principle of the NPPF. Design principles DG63-64 of the Design Guide pertain to amenity, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.21 As no details of housing layout or house types accompany this outline application it is not possible to consider the impact on residential amenity. The most appropriate stage

to do this would be at detailed application stage or submission of reserved matters. The adopted Design Guide provides guidance on protecting residential amenity and a detailed submission would be expected to comply with the Design Guide

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 6.22 The NPPF seeks to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (paragraph 109). This is not a valued landscape in NPPF terms. The site is part of the wider Lowland Vale landscape (policy NE9 of the adopted local plan applies).
- 6.23 The site is contained by the existing village to its north and west. The A338 passes the eastern boundary. Views of the site from public vantage points are limited and this site is not prominent in any distant views across this relatively flat landscape and if it is visible, it is against the built up area of the village.
- 6.24 In local views from the A338 that passes the site and the footpath crossing the northern boundary receptors will experience a significant change with the loss of this open site to housing. This local and limited extent of this significant impact needs to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal. In this context of an edge of village location and the limited wider public views of the site in the landscape, it is concluded that the overall visual harm will not be adverse and the proposal is not contrary to policy NE9 of the adopted local plan.

Open Space, Landscaping and Trees

- 6.25 Adopted Local Plan Policy H23 of the adopted Local Plan requires a minimum of 15% of the residential area to be laid out as open space. The proposal indicates an area of open space including a play area on the north western parts of the site against the footpath and adjoining the rear gardens of some adjacent dwellings. The area being proposed by the applicant is some 0.57ha which equates to over 15% of this 2.56ha site.
- 6.26 There are no trees within the site; there are occasional trees on the southern, western and northern boundaries of the site and field hedges on the southern, northern and eastern boundaries. Three trees are assessed by the applicant's arboriculturalist as being unsuited to retention and are proposed for removal. There is no evidence that contradicts this and their loss will not be harmful to the character of the area. A small 6m section of hedge is to be removed to facilitate access. All other trees can be retained as can the hedges and opportunity is available to provide new tree planting and hedge planting on the site boundaries which in turn will assist in screening the site. A condition can secure this.

Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

- 6.27 The NPPF provides that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be appropriately flood resilient and resistant (paragraph 103). It states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution (Paragraph 109).
- 6.28 Adopted local plan policy DC9 provides that new development will not be permitted if it would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties or the wider environment in terms of, amongst other things, pollution and contamination. Policy DC12 provides that development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the quality of water resources as a result of, amongst other things, waste water discharge. Policies DC13 and 14 are not considered to be consistent with the NPPF, because they

do not comply with paragraphs 100 to 104 which require a sequential approach to locating development and provide that flood risk should not be increased elsewhere.

- 6.29 A phase 1 contamination survey has been undertaken which confirms the risk is low but recommends a phase 2 survey targeting two small bunds, two bonfire sites and a small area of previous excavation. This can be secured by condition, as can any requirement for mitigation. Risks for groundwater contamination are considered by the applicant's consultant to be low. There is no evidence that disputes this conclusion.
- 6.30 I am aware that water does pool on the site in the furrows that cross it and that the site is in flood zone 1 which are the areas at least risk to fluvial flooding and preferred by the NPPF for housing developments. I am also aware that parts of East Hanney have flooded in the wetter months of the year and also after periods of heavy rainfall e.g. in July 2007. The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment as expected by the NPPF and which considers the use of SUDS in draining the development including a restricted drainage outfall into an existing ditch system with attenuation in swales and stone 'blankets' under areas of permeable block paving to roads and other areas of hardstanding. The Council's drainage engineer has reviewed the FRA and has no objection. It is also noted that the Environment Agency has no objection. A sustainable drainage scheme can be agreed and secured by planning condition thereby minimising the risks of flooding from this development.
- 6.31 The applicant has commissioned a potable water capacity flow and pressure investigation from Thames Water. This Thames Water report concludes the network has sufficient spare capacity in the distribution mains network to supply the domestic peak demand profile for the proposed development of 55 domestic dwellings.
- 6.32 The applicant's foul water analysis is unconvincing in arguing that there is no need to impose a planning condition requiring a foul drainage scheme and this approach was not supported at appeal in the Highworth Road, Faringdon case. A foul and waste water drainage and disposal scheme is required and as indicated by Thames Water and as was the case in the Highworth Road, Faringdon case this should be secured by a Grampian type condition. The applicant has since submitted a Thames Water sewer impact study that confirms the lack of capacity within the foul network. The impact study goes on to explore foul flows predicted from the development and suggests two options could be provided to address the capacity issue. These involve pipe upsizing or pipe upsizing and sewage pumping station upsizing. Either of these options are considered by Thames Water to have potential to resolve the potential for increase in flooding and surcharge on the sewer network. As mentioned above a scheme can be secured and implemented by Grampian type condition.

Traffic and Highway Safety

- 6.33 Adopted local plan policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely. The NPPF (Paragraph 32) requires plans and decisions to take account of whether:-
- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
 - safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
 - improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
- 6.34 Paragraph 32 goes on to state: *"Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."*

- 6.35 The highway authority has not raised any concerns in respect of the access arrangements to Summertown or as a result of increased traffic movements to and along the A338 including at the Summertown/A338 junction or the Steventon Road/A338 junction. They do seek kerb realignment at the Summertown/A338 junction which can be secured through a s.278 agreement between the County Council and the applicant.
- 6.36 Adequate vision splays are available at the proposed access point and can be secured by planning condition. An existing gas station exists on the verge immediately west of the proposed access. The gas station is by simple definition a green coloured box. It is set back from the Summertown metalled road surface by approximately 1.5m and would not interfere with the vision splays.
- 6.37 The proposed bus stops are welcomed. In the absence of a scheme for the housing development south of Summertown and no timescale for that development coming forward or any guarantee that a scheme will be approved, it is considered bus stops on the A338 at the junction with footpath 198/15/10 is appropriate. These can be secured by condition and a financial contribution secured by s.106. The County Council has not justified the need for this development to relocate bus stops on Main Street and a requirement for this is not considered necessary as part of this proposal.
- 6.38 The footpath improvements proposed are welcomed providing a shorter route for pedestrians into the village. These can be secured by condition. Cow Lane is not in the control of the applicant and a condition could not require its upgrade.
- 6.39 As this is an outline planning application on site parking for the dwellings is a matter for a detailed submission and that would be the appropriate time to consider this issue.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.40 Paragraph 117 of the NPPF refers to the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, whilst Paragraph 118 sets out the basis for determination of planning applications. Paragraph 118 states that “...*if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused...*”
- 6.41 The applicant's ecologist indicated that the site may be used by barn owl and that further surveys for barn owl should be undertaken. At the request of officers the applicant has commissioned the barn owl survey, a further phase 1 habitat survey and a roosting bat survey of a tree which is proposed to be removed.
- 6.42 The applicant's survey findings have now been received. The phase 1 and botanical survey found that the site has limited botanical interest and it is of limited ecological value. At the same time the applicant surveyed for water vole in the ditches on the site boundary and found no evidence of their use by water vole and little habitat that might attract them. A search of the ditch on the western boundary found no suitable GCN habitat. Access to a pond on adjacent land was refused by the land owner. However, the applicant's ecologist suggests fish inhabit the pond which would make it unsuitable for GCN. The bat roost survey found no evidence of bats roosting in the tree proposed for removal.
- 6.43 The barn owl survey found that an owl box located in a tree on the southern boundary is in use by barn owl and suitable for nesting although barn owl was not nesting in it at present. The applicant's ecologist states “*It is highly likely that prior to any mitigation, barn owls would be lost from the application site, and displaced into the surrounding*

habitats. Since barn owls are highly sedentary and faithful to their main roost and nest sites, it is proposed that the existing box is maintained and two additional boxes are erected facing north within the proposed green infrastructure and in adjacent land to the north (under the same ownership) to ensure alternative roosting and nesting habitat is available. Once successful uptake of the new boxes is identified, the existing box should be removed to prevent potential traffic accidents during the construction and operational phases”.

- 6.44 Barn owl would be displaced from using this field in the event of housing being built with displacement into areas to the north east where there is existing foraging opportunity. The applicant’s ecologist recommends the hedge of the southern boundary be allowed to grow to a height of at least 3m to push owl flights above traffic using Summertown. In addition, construction works should not be in the owl nesting season and a further survey takes place prior to construction and mitigation and enhancement recommendations implemented.
- 6.45 Your countryside officer has reviewed the applicant’s ecology survey findings and has no objection subject to conditions seeking mitigation and enhancements schemes as summarised in his response above

Historic Environment and Archaeology

- 6.46 The site adjoins the East Hanney conservation area. Policy HE1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that developments preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, including the setting. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Officers have given significant importance and weight to this requirement.
- 6.47 The site makes a contribution to the rural setting of the edge of the conservation area and this will undoubtedly be eroded by housing development on the site. The indicative framework plan allocates the open space against the conservation boundary in an attempt to maintain a degree although far lesser extent of openness to the boundary. The extent of visibility of the conservation area across this site is limited due to the few public vantage points from which the relationship is visible and views from the A338 and Summertown are partially obscured by existing vegetation around the site edges. Consequently it is not considered that this site is a major contributor towards the setting of the conservation area. Nonetheless, the rural setting to this edge of the conservation area will be eroded with the harm identified being less than substantial in NPPF terms. This harm needs to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal.
- 6.48 Policy HE10 of the adopted Local Plan states that development will not be permitted if it would cause damage to the site or setting of nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not.
- 6.49 Some local residents and the Parish Council have made reference to the previous existence of a manor house on site and archaeological finds south of the site. The site also clearly features ridge and furrow. The applicant conducted a geophysical survey of the site at the request of officers and this has been reviewed by the County Council archaeologist who advises it reveals no significant archaeological features. The County Council archaeologist has no objection and recommends conditions requiring a staged programme of investigation.
- 6.50 Some concerns have been expressed with regard to the impact on the settings of listed buildings. The nearest listed buildings are on the western side of Main Street such as

Jasmine Cottage, The Mulberries and Robey House and its gates and railings; all grade II listed. They are separated from the site physically and visually by existing dwellings on the eastern side of Main Street and their settings are not experienced from the site. It is considered there would be no harm to the settings of listed buildings.

Viability, affordable housing and Section 106 contributions

- 6.51 The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests (paragraph 204):
- i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - ii) Directly related to the development; and
 - iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- Policy DC8 of the Adopted Local Plan provides that development will only be permitted where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured.
- 6.52 As discussed above, the application provides for 40% of the dwellings as affordable housing.
- 6.53 On 6 April 2015 a change in legislation was introduced by the Government which now prevents the pooling of more than five financial contributions to any one infrastructure project. Consequently this rules out requests for contributions towards King Alfred's Academy, Special Educational Needs, Grove library, the central library, waste management, museum resources and adult day care in Wantage and transport improvements in the western science vale.
- 6.54 With the above in mind the following developer contributions are considered fair and proportionate and should be subject to a legal agreement to secure them should planning permission be granted:-

Vale of White Horse District Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
Sports and Recreation	To be confirmed
On Site public open space maintenance	To be confirmed
Waste Collection	£9,350 (£170/dwelling)
Street Naming and numbering	To be confirmed
Police	£11,102
Total	£20,452 (with potential for further increase)
Oxfordshire County Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
St James CE Primary School	£203,032
Public transport service improvements in East Hanney	£46,612.50 (£847.50/dwelling)
Bus stops	£3,000
Total	£260,644.50
Overall Total	£281,096.50 (with potential for further increase)

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 In view of the council's housing land supply shortfall, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and permission should be granted unless "any

adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole" (NPPF paragraph 14). Paragraph 7 of NPPF identifies three mutually dependant dimensions to sustainable development; it should fulfil an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.

- 7.2 The proposed development would perform an economic role, at least in the short term, in that it would provide employment during the construction phase. It would also create investment in the local and wider economy through the construction stage and new residents and their spending. This could help secure local facilities or make them more robust. Through increasing the housing stock, it would contribute to an expansion of the local housing market and could potentially improve the affordability of open market housing. In the Highworth Road, Faringdon appeal case (proposed up to 94 dwellings) it is noted that the Secretary of State considered that the *"benefits of the scheme would include the provision of much needed market and affordable housing to contribute towards acknowledged substantial shortfalls, and would generate considerable economic benefits of the type arising from housing development"* and that he gave these benefits significant weight (application no. P13/V1366/O, appeal reference APP/V3120/A/13/2210891).
- 7.3 The scheme would have a social role as it will provide in general additional housing that the District needs together with much needed affordable housing units. Whilst the housing mix does not strictly meet the SHMA this is a matter to be addressed fully at detailed application/reserved matters stage.
- 7.4 The proposal will have some very limited environmental implications resulting from localised landscape harm and ecology impacts but mitigation can be put in place to address these. This limited harm is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.
- 7.5 Addition harm has been identified in terms of less than substantial harm to the setting of the conservation area in the limited public views of the site and its relationship to this edge of the East Hanney conservation area. Considerable importance and weight is given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. In this case the harm is limited and not substantial. The proposal has economic, social and environmental benefits as explained above and below. It would also make an important contribution to the need for housing in the District. It is considered these significant benefits outweigh the limited harm identified. It will nonetheless be important to provide open ground against the boundary to the conservation area and the Council will expect a high standard of design in any detailed scheme to ensure the limited harm remains.
- 7.6 This is an accessible site and the new bus stops will assist in providing access to the bus service along the A338.
- 7.7 Overall, and in view of the emphasis in the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing, the development is considered to amount to sustainable development, and whilst there will be some adverse effects, these do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure affordable housing and developer contributions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the head of planning, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the committee, subject to:

1: A S106 agreement being entered into with both the county council and district council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and

2: Conditions as follows:

- 1. Commencement – 18 months or 6 months after reserved matters approval.**
- 2. Reserved matters submitted within 9 months of outline consent.**
- 3. Approved plans.**
- 4. Landscaping scheme required.**
- 5. Implementation of landscaping.**
- 6. Tree protection to be agreed.**
- 7. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed.**
- 8. Foul water drainage strategy to be agreed before development commences.**
- 9. Mitigation for barn owl.**
- 10. Mitigation for reptiles.**
- 11. Biodiversity enhancement.**
- 12. Bat survey.**
- 13. Archaeological watching brief.**
- 14. Implementation of programme or archaeological work.**
- 15. Contamination investigation to be agreed.**
- 16. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.**
- 17. Green travel plans to be agreed.**
- 18. Access construction as approved.**
- 19. Vision splays.**
- 20. Footpath surfacing.**
- 21. Bus stop provision.**
- 22. No drainage to highway.**
- 23. Finished slab levels to be agreed.**
- 24. Wheel washing facilities on site during construction.**
- 25. Fire hydrants.**

Informatives:

- 1. Bird nesting.**
- 2. Works within the highway.**

Author: Adrian Butler
Contact No: 01235 540546
Email: Adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk