

---

APPLICATION NO.	<a href="#">P15/V0898/O</a>
APPLICATION TYPE	Major Outline Application
REGISTERED	21.4.2015
PARISH	STEVENTON AND THE HANNEYS
WARD MEMBER(S)	Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Greenland Henley Ltd
SITE	Steventon Road Nurseries, Steventon Road, East Hanney, OX12 0HS
PROPOSAL	Outline application for the development of up to 40 dwellings, with all matters reserved except access.
GRID REFERENCE	442413/193150
OFFICER	Simon Dunn-Lwin MRTPI

---

## SUMMARY

This application is referred to the planning committee because East Hanney Parish Council objects, together with 30 objections from local residents, at the time of writing this report. The proposal is in outline form for the development of up to 40 houses on the site of the existing nursery for plants, following demolition of all existing structures on site. This application is for the principle of residential development. All matters, except access, are reserved for further consideration at a future date.

The main issues are:-

- Whether the principal of development is acceptable.
- Whether the site is a suitable location for new housing that can contribute to the five-year housing supply shortfall.
- Impact of the proposal on Lowland Vale and openness of the countryside
- Suitability of the access and impact of the proposal on highway safety.
- Cumulative impact on East Hanney.
- Implications for foul and surface water drainage
- Impact on archaeology and ecology

This report assesses the planning merits of the outline proposal in the context of national and local planning policy, and other material planning considerations.

The outline application proposal will help to address housing needs in the district in the absence of a five year housing land supply in accordance with the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF). The indicative layout is acceptable in the context of location, character and access.

The proposal presents a satisfactory development subject to detailed scrutiny at full application stage. The supporting information addresses issues of drainage, ecology, trees, landscape and visual impact similar to the issues considered in the recent appeal decision to allow a similar development on the adjacent site. There are no unreasonable undue impacts on the village, the countryside or traffic safety. The technical issues relating to impacts on the highway, pedestrian links, open space, drainage, sewage, domestic waste and trees are considered acceptable subject to conditions. 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 report concludes that the proposal is considered to amount to ‘sustainable development’ and compliant with policy and guidance. Whilst limited adverse impacts during the construction phase would be experienced by neighbours, on balance, the proposal is acceptable in planning terms. The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement; securing contributions to mitigate the impact on local infrastructure.

## **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.2 The application site is approximately 1.84 hectares in total area. It is located on the north side of Steventon Road backing on to farm land to the rear and Tinkerbush Farm to the east. Beacon. The site contains a variety of large raised planting beds, poly tunnels, glass houses and hard standings. The nursery occupies approximately 60% of the site area with the remainder in a natural overgrown state. A site plan is **attached** at appendix one.
- 1.3 The existing plant nursery is stated to have started about 25 years ago. The applicant say the business has declined rapidly because of recent economic conditions rendering continuation non-viable. The quality of the soil, where the heavy clay does not support healthy planting except on raised beds of imported soil, has also contributed to running costs and demise of the business.
- 1.4 The site has a street frontage of approximately 130m on Steventon Road, widening out to approximately 137m, with a depth of approximately 140m. The ground is relatively level but overgrown and uneven in parts, gently sloping away from south to north by approximately half a metre across the site. It is bordered by mature hedging on all sides rising up to 3.5m with a generous spread of mature trees, particularly on its boundaries. The tree line is prolific along its northern and southern boundaries, offering a pleasant view to its edges on approach. Along its eastern border lies a buried high voltage power cable connected to the overhead power lines by supporting column cables that are rooted within the site to the south east and north-east borders
- 1.5 Generally, this part of the village edge is naturally rural. Predominantly of fields and tree lined hedges, epitomizing rurality in character and appearance, notwithstanding the plant nursery use, which is relatively concealed on Steventon Road.

## **2.0 PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The application proposes to demolish all structures described above and redevelop the site for 40 houses retaining the green edges and majority of trees within the site, as well as additional planting shown within the indicative layout. Outline permission is sought for up to 40 dwellings in an unspecified mix with 60% market and 40% affordable housing with the existing access point retained on Steventon Road. Public open space is included within the layout amounting to 15% of the overall site area or 2760 sq.m (0.7 acres). The applicant indicates within the supporting statement that ‘50% of the proposed dwellings will be 1 and 2 bedroom’.
- 2.2 The application is in outline form and only the access arrangements are considered in detail. The proposal retains the existing vehicular access point on Steventon

Road, which is considered below. The application plans are **attached** at appendix two.

**3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Consultation letters were sent on 27th April 2015. A site notice was posted outside the site and a press advert placed in the local paper.

3.2 Consultations

<p>Neighbours:</p>	<p>30 objections received. The objections can be summarized as follows: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative impact of housing developments unsustainable:-</li> <li>• Insufficient facilities and amenities in village to support additional population.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity at local school, amenities, services and community facilities in village.</li> <li>• Impact on and loss of character of village and surrounding countryside</li> <li>• Impact on natural wildlife – particularly Bees from RosyBee Nurseries and surrounding natural wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Traffic congestion, particularly during peak hours, on A338</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity of sewerage system</li> <li>• Drainage and flood risk.</li> <li>• No linkages to existing public rights of way and no connections/access to village</li> <li>• Safety issue for children and pedestrians on isolated site on main road</li> <li>• Housing developments exceed provision in local plan, particularly policy H11.</li> <li>• Growth of village unprecedented and will turn into town and join Grove.</li> <li>• Visual impact.</li> <li>• Design inferior to Gladman homes</li> <li>• Increase in traffic generation and congestion</li> <li>• Footpath encroaches on neighbouring property.</li> <li>• Site should provide public transport facilities</li> </ul>
<p>East Hanney Parish Council:</p>	<p>The Parish Council response is <b>attached</b> at appendix three. In summary the Parish objects strongly to the application on the following summarised grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speculative development.</li> <li>• Contrary to Local Plan policy H11 limiting developments to a maximum of 15 dwellings in village.</li> <li>• Cumulative adverse impact of housing to village character and environment - in last 3 years amounting to 152 dwellings representing an increase of 50%.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeological impact on Iron Age remains.</li> <li>• Pedestrian and cycle connections poor and unsustainable.</li> <li>• Increase traffic congestion and associated accident risk</li> <li>• Bus data out of date</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Impact on mains and waste water capacity</li> <li>• Impact on services</li> </ul>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council One Voice</p>	<p><u>Transport</u>  Holding objection subject to clarification sight lines and visibility splays and updated traffic analysis.  Recommends conditions and informatives as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S106 agreement to secure financial contributions towards enhancement of the Wantage bus service of £33,900 and Bus Stop of £2000.</li> <li>• S278 requirements for footway, bus stop infrastructure and relocation of speed limit sign and appropriate 'gateway' features.</li> <li>• Standard drainage condition.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer comment: Further information has been submitted by the applicant for clarification and an update response will be provided in the committee Addendum Note.</i></p> <p><u>Archaeology</u>  No objection. Archaeology investigations to the west and north west have not revealed any archaeological monuments or features. Two small enclosures identified to the east but no indication they formed part of larger settlement. There are no archaeological constraints to this application.</p> <p><u>Education</u>  No objection subject to S106 mitigation contributions on the following:-  £123,117 for St.James Primary School  £189,447 for Grove Airfield Secondary School</p> <p><u>Property</u>  No Objection. Recommend condition regarding fire hydrants.</p> <p><i>Officer comment: This is a matter for Building Regulations.</i></p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u>  No objections. The proposed development would affect deposits of sand and gravel but would not sterilise a potentially workable mineral resource and therefore would not be contrary to policy on the safeguarding of mineral resources. There is no significant waste planning issues relating to this</p>

	proposal.
Forestry Team (Trees)	No objection subject to conditions on tree protection/method statement, and details of planting to eastern boundary.
Drainage Engineer	No objection subject to conditions.
Environmental Protection Team – Contaminated Land	No objection raised subject to condition on contamination investigation and remediation.
Countryside Officer (Ecology)	The proposed development would not impact on any nationally important habitats either directly or indirectly. There are no known populations of protected species which would be significantly impacted by the proposals and surveys of adjacent sites have not found any evidence of protected species. The main habitats of value are the trees on the site boundaries, which are proposed to be retained within this scheme. Recommends standard condition on biodiversity enhancement.
Landscape Architect	<p>Comments summarized as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern expressed relating to tree line on the northern and eastern boundaries and effect on long open views of the site.</li> <li>• Concern expressed about internal layout and relationship of garden boundaries with public open space and orientation on Steventon Road.</li> </ul> <p>Following consideration of amendments to the layout, recommend standard landscaping/boundary condition and consideration of layout at full planning stage.</p>
Housing	Request 40% affordable housing with a tenure split of 75% rent and 25% shared ownership. Detailed comment on unit sizes to be addressed at full planning stage.
Thames Water	Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application recommends a 'Grampian' style condition to address this issues and an informative relating to water pressure.
Environment Agency	<p>EA defer to Oxfordshire County Council for comments as the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p><i>Officer comment: County did not raise an objection to flood issues as the LLFA. Drainage issues are addressed by condition.</i></p>
Waste Management	No objection subject to S106 contribution of £6800. Comments provided on technical requirements for bin storage provision and maintenance.
Leisure	No objection subject to contributions for leisure facilities set out in the report under S106 contributions.

#### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 A plethora of minor applications for small buildings (poly tunnels, glass houses, storage tanks) relating to the use of the site as a plant nursery dating back to the early 1990s is on record, which does not require full reproduction here. Earlier history relates to use of the site for kennels during the 1970s is also shown. Permission was refused in 1968 for residential development as part of larger 10 acres site.
- 4.2 An appeal for non-determination into P13/V2266/O for residential development of 35 houses on the adjacent site, shown on the submitted indicative layout plan no.020 Rev B is **attached** at appendix two. This appeal, which is relevant to the consideration of this application, allowed residential development on 13 January 2015. Costs were also awarded to the appellant against the Council. The appeal and costs decision are **attached** at appendix four and discussed further below.

#### **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 local plan policies relevant to this application as listed below were 'saved' by direction on 1 July 2009.
- GS1: Developments in Existing Settlements
  - GS2: Development in the Countryside
  - DC1: Design
  - DC3: Design against crime
  - DC4: Public Art
  - 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
  - DC14: Flood Risk and Water Run-Off
  - H11: Development in Larger Villages
  - H15: Housing densities
  - H16: Size of dwelling and lifetime homes
  - H17: Affordable Housing
  - H23: Open Space in New Housing Development
  - NE9: Lowland Vale
  - HE10: Archaeology
  - TR2: Integrated Transport and Land Use
  - TR5: Cycle Network
- 5.2 Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1  
The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. The relevant policies are as follows:-
- 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 8: Spatial strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe 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  
Cope Policy 38: Design strategies for strategic and major development sites  
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

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.

### 5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

Design Guide – March 2015 –

The following sections of the design guide are particularly relevant to this application, however it should be noted the proposal is outline and the layout is indicative only:-

*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)*

Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009

Flood maps and flood risk – July 2006

### 5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012

Paragraphs 6 – 10 – Achieving sustainable development

Paragraphs 11- 14 and 29 – presumption in favour of sustainable development

Paragraph 17 – Core Principles

Paragraphs 34 & 37 – encourage minimised journey length to work, shopping, leisure and education

Paragraph 47 - 50 – housing

Paragraph 50 – create sustainable inclusive and mixed communities  
Paragraph 99 – Flood risk assessment  
Paragraph 103 – Ensure flood risk is not increased  
Paragraph 156 – Local Plans to set strategic priorities for infrastructure, including waste  
Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Paragraphs 203, 204, 205 – Planning obligations and conditions  
Paragraph 216 – prematurity of neighbourhood plans

#### 5.5 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)

In particular guidance on:

‘Determining a planning application’

‘Design’

‘Air Quality’

‘Noise’

‘Transport assessments in decision taking’

‘Planning obligations’

‘Water supply, waste water and water quality’

‘Use of planning conditions’

#### 5.6 Other Relevant Legislation

- 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.
- 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**

6.1 This is an unallocated site within the adopted local plan, therefore this application is contrary to Policies GS2 and H11 of the local plan, which restrict development on unallocated sites and limits the scale of housing provision within villages to no more than 15 or 0.5 ha in site area. However, the adopted local plan is based on the now revoked structure plan housing numbers, which means that the adopted local plan is not addressing the most recent and robust objectively assessed need for growth, which is a requirement of the NPPF. As such, these policies do not plan for the current or future housing needs of the district and therefore are out of date in the context of the NPPF, in so far as they restrict housing development. Furthermore, these policies are also out of date in that the council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Given the current policy context the Council must assess this application on its own planning merits in the context of the most up to date policy and guidance.

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

- The principle of development
- Land use



- Accessibility and sustainability
- Cumulative Impact
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Layout, design and residential amenity
- Affordable housing and housing mix.
- Highway Safety
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Ecology and Archaeology
- Contamination.
- S106 developer contributions

### **The Principle of Development**

- 6.3 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to 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 the 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).
- 6.4 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.
- 6.5 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 that 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.
- 6.6 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.
- 6.7 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 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. The site is not allocated for housing and is clearly a greenfield site beyond the built up edge of East Hanney.

- 6.8 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. In conclusion, the principle of development and in particular residential development on this site is considered acceptable.

### **Land Use**

- 6.9 Paragraph 17 of 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. The site is a redundant plant nursery, which is to be demolished to make way for the proposed housing. The Parish and local residents have objected that it would erode the open countryside and negatively impact on the character of the village. However, the Council's Tree Officer and Landscape Architect have not objected to the proposal. It should also be noted that the principle of development of housing on the adjacent site, with similar characteristics has been approved at appeal under the same policy parameters, in January 2015, as referred above and **attached** at appendix four. Officers therefore do not consider the site to be of such high environmental value to prevent housing development, given the current policy circumstances.

### **Accessibility Credentials**

- 6.10 The NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34). In terms of facilities, East Hanney is limited in services and facilities with a single convenience store, pub and St. James primary school within the village. Site is located about 500 metres from the St James View bus stops, for the Wantage-Abingdon-Oxford bus route, and about 800 metres from the Ashfields Lane bus stop for the Wantage-Besselsleigh-Oxford bus route.
- 6.11 However, Grove to the south is approximately 2 miles away on the A338 and served by buses X30 and route 31 that run every half hour (15 minutes during peak hours) between Wantage and Oxford. Wantage is approximately 9 miles from East Hanney beyond Grove to the south. This allows reasonably easy and sustainable access to larger service centres that provide health care, sport and recreation, retail and employment opportunities. Therefore, the emerging Local Plan identifies East Hanney as a larger village with a sustainable location for further, but limited, development under policy H11.
- 6.12 There is currently no bus service on Steventon Road. However, it is envisaged that the Science Vale Bus Strategy will introduce a service between Wantage and Didcot via East Hanney on Steventon Road to facilitate links for new residents at the Grove Airfield and Crab Hill development sites for journeys to work. This is set out in the Transport Officer's assessment. With developments taking place in Grove and Wantage, it is expected that improved public transport services will increase accessibility and sustainability to accommodate developments en-route. Via the current bus strategy.
- 6.13 The location cannot be regarded as so isolated to be considered unsustainable. The committee's attention is drawn to the recent appeal decision on the adjacent site

where the Planning Inspector considered that development to be compliant with NPPF paragraph 14's emphasis on 'the presumption in favour of sustainable development'. In that instant, the Inspector considered "The appeal site is not in a location where specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted".

- 6.14 In terms of the site's location and its relationship to the existing settlement pattern the proposal, is considered a sustainable form of development under the terms of the NPPF, and emerging Core Policy 1.

#### **Cumulative Impact**

- 6.15 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 nationwide.
- 6.16 Core Policy 8 of the emerging local plan 2031 provides the spatial strategy for the Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area. In terms of housing delivery, the Plan proposes that at least 5,438 new homes will be delivered between 2011 and 2031: 1990 homes to be delivered through strategic allocations, with the remaining 722 homes will be allocated through the local plan part 2, neighbourhood development plans or through the development management process. 563 homes are expected through windfall sites. The plan makes it clear that east Hanney is part of this strategic growth area where 200 homes are allocated to Land South of East Hanney within Appendix A (page18) of the emerging of the Local Plan 2031, Part 1.
- 6.17 The Council has permitted or resolved to grant permission for a number of major housing developments within the last 5 years of 131 dwellings. Based on the 2011 census figures for East Hanney, if all the developments are implemented, it would increase the village population by 42% (314 people). This overall population rise and the resulting impacts, particularly on the local highway network and foul drainage, is a key concern of local residents and the Parish Council.
- 6.18 This development would increase the population by a further 96 people. This represents an increase of approximately 13% on the 2011 Census. Cumulatively with the approved development schemes, the population increase would amount to 410 people or 55% of the 2011 baseline. A significant increase to the village.
- 6.19 Currently the Council is considering a further outline application for 200 dwellings at Land to the South of Summertown (P15/V1616/O). This application relates to the strategic sites allocated in the emerging plan referred above under paragraph 6.16.
- 6.20 The considerable increase in population will lead to additional pressure on existing services and contributions are therefore sought to mitigate the impact discussed below. The proposal must be considered on its planning merits given the village is a sustainable location. The NPPF does not seek to restrict development in any settlement in terms of numbers; it expects housing to be boosted significantly.

#### **Landscape and Visual Impact**

- 6.21 The NPPF seeks to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (paragraph 109).
- 6.22 The site is identified in the adopted local plan as Lowland Vale (policy NE9), with its fields, farms and villages, which forms the landscape quality of the district. Policy NE9 seeks to prevent development that would harm the landscape, particularly on the long open views within or across the area. A number of objectors have raised

concern regarding the landscape impact.

- 6.23 It is relevant to note that the adjacent site, which forms the eastern edge of the village has been approved on appeal together with recent permissions in close proximity to the north-west. This proposal would extend the village edge along Steventon Road on a site previously used as a plant nursery.
- 6.24 The Council's Landscape Architect and Tree Officer initially expressed concern about the landscape treatment and tree retention to the site, particularly along the northern and eastern edge, which screens the site with mature trees on approach from the north along the A338 and from the east along Steventon Road. These issues have been largely resolved given the outline nature of the proposal. The trees and hedges on all sides are largely retained, including the frontage on the Steventon Road around the main access point.
- 6.25 It accepted that there would be local views of the development particularly from Steventon Road access road to the site, however the development would be seen in the context of an extension to the village edge, which would be screened by planting to the open countryside beyond. Subject to further detailed consideration of landscaping layout, officers do not consider the outline proposal would harm the landscape character or long views of Lowland Vale.

**Layout, design and amenity**

- 6.26 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. 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.
- 6.27 The application is at outline stage and layout is a reserved matter, it is important the indicative plan shows a layout that demonstrates this quantum of development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site.
- 6.28 Principle DG26 of the design guide states that density should be appropriate to the location. Policy H15 of the adopted local plan requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. The application proposes a density of 22 dwellings per hectare. This is reasonably low compared with the expectation of local plan policy H15. However when compared to the pattern of existing development in village and approved developments in the immediate locality, and due to the fact the site is adjacent to open land to the north, south and east (with the exception of farm buildings, the provision of 40 dwellings is considered to be the right design response for this site.
- 6.29 The indicative layout provides a pattern of development within the site, which respects the extensive green edges to minimize the visual impact on the open countryside and retain its green character. Whilst it is acknowledge that a new housing estate will impact on the local character the self-containment of the proposal layout with landscaped edges would respect the village edge and provide housing which would meet the necessary criteria with respect to amenity with neighbours, amenity impacts within the development, car parking and amenity space requirements, including provision for public open space of 15% of total site area.

- 6.30 The built form, building design, and boundary treatments will be assessed in detail as part of any future reserved matters full application. However, officers are satisfied from the illustrative layout plan that 40 dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated on site in a manner that can comply with the relevant design guide design principles (DG51-54, DG55, and DG56-62).

**Affordable Housing and Housing Mix**

- 6.31 The applicant has indicated the proposal comprise 40% affordable housing in accordance with adopted policy H17. This provision will be secured through a legal agreement. Whilst the housing mix has not been specified in the application, the Council’s Housing Officer requests that this equates 12 rented houses and 4 shared ownership houses for a typical village such as East Hanney to the following mix:-

**Rent – 12 units:**

- 2 x 1 bed /2 person house
- 6 x 2 bed /4 person house
- 3 x 3 bed / 5 person house (at least 1 should be a 6 person house)
- 1 x 4 bed / 6 person house

**S/O – 4 units:**

- 4 x 2 bed / 4 person house

- 6.32 This Policy H16 of the adopted local plan requires that 50% of dwellings have 2 beds or less. However, as stipulated at paragraph 47 of the NPPF this policy is out of date as it is not based on recent assessments of housing need. The Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) is the most recent assessment and estimates the following open market dwelling requirement by number of bedrooms (2011 to 2031) for the District:

1 bedroom	2 bedrooms	3 bedrooms	4+ bedrooms
5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%

- 6.33 This represents an under-provision of smaller one bedroom units and larger 4+ bedroom units. The application would be expected at reserved matters stage to comply with the SHMA housing mix. A planning condition is recommended to ensure the mix provided at reserved matters stage meets SHMA requirements.

**Highway Safety**

- 6.34 The 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 limits the significant impacts of the development.

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 NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34). Local residents have raised concerns that the transport infrastructure will not cope, that parking and congestion is already a problem along the A338.
- 6.36 The application proposes the provision of a footway from the site along the north side of Steventon Road to the adjacent site with a bus stop to be provided along this frontage. The pedestrian link is shown to continue through the adjacent approved development. The connectivity plan 003 shows the pedestrian link through the approved development site of 25 houses to the east side of Crown Meadow (A338) into the village. The adjacent development sites through which the pedestrian link is proposed, are also owned by the applicant.
- 6.37 At the time of writing County Transport has a holding objection to the application, as originally proposed, subject to clarification on adequate visibility splays, updated information in the TIA, service vehicle turning and pedestrian footway links to the village. This information has been provided by the applicant and a further response will be provided to the committee via the Addendum Note.
- 6.38 They are satisfied with the retention and use of the existing access for the proposed development and layout for the car parking is considered to be adequate. They have recommended conditions relating to sustainable drainage, travel information packs and that a Travel Information Pack is provided to each occupier, and a condition is recommended to ensure the County is satisfied with the Travel Plan.

#### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 6.39 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).
- 6.40 In. 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.
- 6.41 The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a drainage strategy within the Technical Notes in support of the application. They have been considered by the County, as Lead Local Flood Authority, and by the Council's Drainage officer. No objections are raised on drainage issues subject to conditions.
- 6.42 Thames water has also considered the proposal, as set out in the consultation section above. It is acknowledged that there is a local capacity issue relating to foul water discharge, but Thames water have recommended that this issue be dealt with by way of a 'Grampian' style development to prohibit any occupation of the

development until such time that the infrastructure is in place to accommodate the foul water discharge from the development.

### **Ecology and Archaeology**

- 6.43 The application is supported by a preliminary ecological appraisal which has been considered by the Council's Countryside officer (ecology), who has confirmed that there are no important species or habitats on the site and surveys of adjacent sites have not found any, which would harm local wildlife. In line with NPPF Section 11 and emerging Core Policy 46 to conserve and enhance biodiversity a condition is recommended.
- 6.44 The County's Archaeological advisors comments are summarized above. Whilst the Parish Council has expressed concern about Iron Age remains, there is no evidence of any archaeological constraints affecting this application.

### **Contamination**

- 6.45 The Contamination officer considers there may be contamination present as a result of the former use as a plant nursery, and the proposed residential development is regarded as a particularly sensitive use to any land contamination. For this reason, it is recommended that the developer conduct adequate contaminated land investigations to ensure that the land is safe and suitable for the intended residential use. As a minimum, the developer should complete a contaminated land desk study and site reconnaissance to ensure that the development is not put to an unacceptable risk from land contamination. This is treated by condition.

### **Viability and Developer Contributions**

- 6.46 The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests (paragraph 204):-
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - Directly related to the development; and
  - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development
- 6.47 Recent legislative changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, introduced in April 2015, places pooling restrictions on S106 contributions. As a result the original developer contributions agreed at the public inquiry into the previous refusal have been reviewed together with the requests made by the County. The following table sets out the contributions agreed, which is compliant with meet the NPPF and CIL Regulations.

<b>Proposed project/type of infrastructure</b>	<b>Requested by</b>	<b>Amount £</b>
Recreation - Outdoor tennis	VOWH Leisure	8,676.00
Recreation - MUGA	VOWH Leisure	8,719.00
Recreation - Football pitches	VOWH Leisure	6,803.00
Recreation - Cricket pitches	VOWH Leisure	2,495.00
Recreation - Clubhouse/pavilion	VOWH Leisure	17,580.00
Waste Management	VOWH/Waste	6,800.00
Affordable Housing 40%	VOWH/Housing	
Public Art	VOWH	12,000.00

Admin/Monitoring	VOWH	2,926.00
Bus Service East Hanney	OCC Transport	33,900.00
Bus Stop Flag Pole/ Info Units	OCC Transport	2,000.00
Secondary School - Grove Airfield	OCC Education	189,447.00
St James Primary School	OCC Education	123,117.00
E Hanney Library	OCC Property	1,850.40
Admin/Monitoring Costs	OCC Property	3,750.00
Total		420,063.40

**7.1 CONCLUSION**

7.2 This application has been assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), relevant saved policies in the local plan and all other material planning considerations. The NPPF states that sustainable development should be permitted unless the adverse effects significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The NPPF also states that there are social, economic and environmental dimensions to sustainability and that conclusions must be reached taking into account the NPPF as a whole.

7.3 Overall, the proposal is considered to amount to sustainable development, and whilst there will be some minor and temporary adverse effects, these do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

**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 – 2 years or 6 months after reserved matters approval.**
- 2. Reserved matters on appearance, layout, landscaping and scale submitted within 9 months of outline consent.**
- 3. Approved plans.**
- 4. Landscaping and boundary treatment scheme to be agreed.**
- 5. Hedgerow management to be agreed.**
- 6. Tree protection to be agreed.**
- 7. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed.**
- 8. Foul and surface water drainage strategy to be agreed.**
- 9. Biodiversity enhancement.**
- 10. Contamination investigation and mitigation to be agreed.**
- 11. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed**
- 12. Green travel plans to be agreed.**
- 13. Access construction as approved.**
- 14. Vision splays.**
- 15. Footpath surfacing.**
- 16. No drainage to highway.**
- 17. Parking, servicing and turning areas completed prior to occupation.**
- 18. Wheel washing facilities on site during construction.**



**19. Thames Water requirement on sewerage capacity upgrade prior to occupation.**

**Author:** Simon Dunn-Lwin  
**Contact no.** 07717 271916  
**Email:** [simon.dunn-lwin@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:simon.dunn-lwin@southandvale.gov.uk)