

APPLICATION NO.	P15/V1846/O
APPLICATION TYPE	4.8.2015
REGISTERED	EAST HANNEY
PARISH	
WARD MEMBER(S)	Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Rockspring Barwood East Hanney Ltd & W Cumber & Son Ltd
SITE	Land South of Steventon Road East Hanney
PROPOSAL	Outline application for the development of up to 200 homes including associated infrastructure works and demolition of existing structures, provision of vehicular access to the site with realignment of the A338 and Steventon Road, and including landscaping and provision of new public open spaces.(as amplified by additional development access layout plan)
GRID REFERENCE	442117/192835
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

SUMMARY

The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 200 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
- Landscape and visual impacts
- The suitability of the access and whether the proposal will impact unreasonably 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
- Infrastructure improvements through s.106 contributions and compliance with CIL regulations

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 beyond the eastern edge of East Hanney being east of the A338 and south of Steventon Road

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. Moreover, the application site plus additional land to the east was considered as a potential strategic housing site as part of the draft local plan process. The evidence base for the draft local plan advised that whilst not pursued ultimately as a strategic housing site, part of the site could accommodate housing as potentially part of a Part 2 draft local plan 2031 housing site allocation. Recommendations were also made in a landscape and visual impact report for connecting the site to the village and providing planting buffers. The proposal follows these suggestions.

The re-alignment of the A338 and Steventon Road through the site and respective new junction has been considered by the highway authority and following clarification of issues and a revised Transport Assessment the access changes and traffic flows including cumulative traffic flows are considered acceptable.

Officers are aware of drainage issues in the village and flooding that has occurred. A small part of the north western corner of the site is flood zone 2 with the remainder of the site on which housing development is proposed being flood zone 1. The application is supported by a flood risk assessment and proposals to include a sustainable drainage scheme (SUDS). Thames Water advise that the Wantage STW presently has capacity. In addition, a Thames Water sewer impact study identifies improvements to the local sewer pipes that can be secured by condition. The drainage bodies have no objections. Planning conditions can require an agreed foul drainage strategy to be implemented prior to occupation of the dwellings, and a sustainable urban drainage scheme.

The applicant has commissioned recent surveys for protected species as well as a habitat survey. Some limited impacts are identified. The proposed scheme includes new tree and hedgerow planting, grassland planting, barn owl box, swales, ditch improvements through de-culverting in excess of the new culverting needed. This mitigation and enhancement is considered satisfactory.

Impacts for the setting of the conservation area which adjoins the north west corner of the site and the settings for listed buildings are less than substantial in NPPF terms and the benefits of the proposal outweigh this limited harm. Buried archaeology has been investigated following a geophysical survey and intrusive investigation and can be addressed by condition. The present line of the A338 which some interested parties suggest is the line of a Roman road is retained.

St James primary school even after planned expansion is not considered by the County Council as having sufficient capacity to accommodate this development as well as the 200 dwellings proposed on land south of Summertown Road, East Hanney (application no. P15/V1616/FUL) and other permitted developments in the catchment area. The County Council has not objected but it has expressed severe concern should the two applications be permitted. Overall the County Council advises that should both this application and P15/V1616/FUL be approved then a larger expansion to the primary school would be required and the cost to the developers in this area increased.

If the planning authority is minded to approve “both this application and P15/V1616/FUL then planning permission will need to be dependent on a satisfactory agreement to secure the resources required for the necessary expansion of education provision. This is in order for Oxfordshire County Council to meet its statutory duty to ensure sufficient pupil places for all children of statutory school age”. A financial contribution in accordance with the County Council’s recommendation can be secured by a legal agreement.

Overall the proposal is considered sustainable development meeting the three roles (economic, social and environmental) referenced in the NPPF. The limited harm this

proposal would cause is not considered so adverse as to significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

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 A site location plan is attached at **Appendix 1**. This application relates to a greenfield site at the eastern edge of the village. The application site includes part of the present route of the A338, part of Steventon Road and an island of land between the Steventon Road/A338 junction and the former line of the Steventon Road immediately south of La Fontana restaurant. The main body of the site is a field being agricultural land used for growing miscanthus. This crop obtains a height in excess of 1.8m at which stage it tends to screen views over the site, as is the present situation (late October 2015). The site is generally level.
- 1.3 With the exception of an agricultural building towards the north west corner of the field, there are no other features within the site. Immediately north of the site is Steventon Road and beyond that La Fontana restaurant, an existing house and sites on which planning permission has been granted for housing or there is a resolution to grant planning permission for housing. The Steventon Road frontage is defined by a gappy hedge with an element of hedge, trees and scrub in the north west corner of the field.
- 1.4 The eastern boundary is continuous with agricultural land beyond. The southern boundary is open with the exception of agricultural buildings (outside the site) against part of the boundary. A public footpath adjoins part of the southern boundary to the site. The boundary is open in appearance.
- 1.5 To the west is the A338 and beyond dwellings and small fields at the eastern edge of East Hanney. The western boundary of the field consists of a gappy hedge and more continuous line of trees. A small copse of trees exist in the south west corner of the site.
- 1.6 The site is outside the village conservation area which adjoins the north western corner of the site. The site lies within the wider Lowland Vale landscape (Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan).
- 1.7 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 outline application for up to 200 dwellings. Access is to be considered at this stage with appearance, landscaping layout and scale reserved for future consideration.
- 2.2 The proposal includes access from the A338 and Steventon Road. Both these roads are proposed to be diverted through the site. The A338 at its Main Street junction will sweep eastwards before re-joining the existing line of the A338 east of Blenheim Orchard. Steventon Road would turn south westwards from a point just west of The Nurseries site, sweeping west to form a new junction with the re-aligned A338. This is illustrated in the drawing at **Appendix 2**.

- 2.3 The proposed A338/Steventon Road junction would be signalised with left hand and right hand turn lanes provided. Pedestrian crossing points are proposed with their final detail and position to be agreed. Bus stops on the re-aligned A338 and Steventon Road are illustrated on the submitted plans. Again their actual positions are to be agreed.
- 2.4 The existing stretches of the A338 and Steventon Road within the site will be downgraded and form in part footways and cycleways, and vehicular connections to parts of the proposed development. The plan at **Appendix 2** illustrates this.
- 2.5 In response to the County Council’s education comments the applicant has written to confirm that they and the landowner are willing to enter into a legal agreement to safeguard land adjacent to the site boundary for the potential future provision of a school should it be required. Whilst not necessary in planning terms, the applicant believes this will resolve the County’s concerns about providing sufficient primary school capacity for the local population. This offer has been formally forwarded to County Council. Their response is contained in the representations section below.
- 2.6 The illustrative masterplan indicates areas for dwellings, open spaces, attenuation ponds, play areas and strategic planting. These details are illustrative at this stage and not fixed.
The application is supported by:

- A design and access statement
- Planning statement
- Noise assessment
- Landscape and visual appraisal
- Flood risk assessment
- Transport assessment
- Road safety audit
- Air quality assessment
- Travel plan
- A phase 1 environmental risk assessment
- Ecological appraisal
- Utilities report
- Sewer impact study
- Statement of community involvement
- Arboricultural baseline assessment and tree protection plan
- Archaeological and heritage assessment

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.

Parish Council	<p>Object.</p> <p>The Parish Council has submitted a detailed objection to this proposal in excess of 30 pages long. This comprehensive response provides in depth the Parish Council's concerns and assessment against the NPPF.</p> <p>The full document is contained on the District Council's web site. The Parish Council's objection includes an executive summary of the objections and this is provided in full below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "East Hanney was allocated for only 'up to 200 homes' for development under the Local Plan to 2031. This is still subject of
----------------	---

	<p>review by the inspector. In the last 12 months the majority of these 150 have already been approved by the Vales planners. That is nearly the entire 15 year allocation approved to be built/are currently in development, being forced onto the village in a period of a little over 12 months. To approve any further housing would be both in breach of core principles of the NPPF, and morally wrong.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site incorporates quality green field agricultural land which would be lost.• Ecology and biodiversity; the site has some protected ecology, including water vole, afforded protection under the NPPF and the Vales own policies. <u>The land is also known as hunting grounds for barn owls which nest nearby.</u>• Biodiversity –The surveys by EDP for Barwood Homes acknowledge that the ditches offers “site wide intrinsic environmental value.” The NPPF and the Vale’s own core policies state that there should, where possible, be a net increase in biodiversity. No plans are offered either to protect or increase the biodiversity of the area by their consultants• East Hanney is a small village rich in historical buildings, listed heritage assets, and conservation areas (there are 2 conservation areas). The size and scope of the development would adversely impact on the setting and environmental context of the heritage assets.• There is a significant, recognised and documented flood risk• The current Sewage system is beyond capacity, and there is no current solution for managing the wastewater from this site. Thames Water as statutory undertaker and public consultee has confirmed that there is no capacity.• There are known Saxon and Roman findings within the close vicinity, and it is thought that the site borders the route of a roman road. The developer has reported little from their initial report, accordingly, we believe that further investigation should be undertaken• There will be significant and irreversible changes to the character or the village – against Vale policy• It is unlikely that designs for 200 homes on a single site will be able to ‘blend in’ to the existing village. The magnitude is so large against the existing settlement that the character and design values of the existing village will be dwarfed and lost. Even though Barwood have made comments regarding matching the design to the existing village, this would not be achievable on a single site of this scale, simply because the imbalance of a gross development of this size in the context of the existing village, and because of the volume impact of the mass build. The design would not therefore be able to properly reflect the character, make up, and built form of the existing village.• The design promotes an area of high density buildings compared to the existing settlement. Which is out of keeping
--	---

	<p>with the village and the village setting, breaching the Vale's own policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There will be a major change in the landscape, and therefore the visual impact will be seriously detrimental.• There will a significant increase in light, and noise pollution and vehicle emissions. East Hanney is a no streetlight zone.• The proposal will extend the village physical form towards Grove and Steventon, increasing the spatial spread of the built envelope.• East Hanney does not have the services or infrastructure to support this.• East Hanney under the Vales own assessment criteria is now only a 'smaller village' and should therefore be protected from developments of this nature. The Vales own policies require a certain level of services as assessed under a points system in order to be classed as viable to support development, and we simply do not have those services, and therefore cannot support housing of this nature and quantity.• Barwood have sought to mitigate the impact of the development on the A338, and to integrate the development within the village by rerouting the existing road and providing new places for crossing. We would like to see appropriate transport advice from the OCC Highways confirming their acceptance of the proposal and its benefits to the village.• Transportation – the study provided by Barwood fails to fully identify the need for families to travel for schools, shopping, work and thus the increased traffic on the A338 travelling towards Milton, Harwell, Didcot and the A34• This proposed site contravenes the Vale's own policies in a number of areas. <p>We consider that to approve an application for development of this size and scope on a single site in East Hanney is morally wrong because; – it is not right to enforce a village on a village, to impose higher density housing, to degrade the existing quality of life, to impose risk of flooding, and enforce failure of public infrastructure services such as waste water, to destroy the environment, and to destroy the character of the village”.</p> <p>The prospect of a development of this size is already a cause of great consternation, and stress to members of the community, not only those who have lived here for the majority of their lives, but also those who have chosen to live here because of the rural qualities and village environment.</p> <p>Where there is no Local Plan in place, it is the responsibility of the Vale as the local planning authority to ensure that such significant public issues are taken into account. Where there are applications such as this, where the number of homes proposed threatens to materially destroy the existing character of the village and overwhelm its limited facilities, it must be for the local planning authority to step in and refuse permission.</p>
--	--

	<p>In the case of this application we have both significant adverse impact of this site on the character and community of the existing village, together with the prospect of an increase in flooding risk. Both these issues arise as a direct consequence of the sheer size of the development in a village which is already extremely prone to flood.</p> <p>The application breaches both NPPF and Vale policies in a number of areas. Thus there is ample substance for rejection, please reject this application".</p> <p>Without prejudice to its objections, the Parish Council has requested s.106 contributions should permission be granted. These are listed and addressed later in this report.</p>
<p>Neighbours</p>	<p>44 letters of objection have been received. Most of the concerns raised not only relate to the impact of this proposal but also cumulative impacts when considered against existing housing permissions granted in East Hanney and pending planning applications for housing including the 200 dwellings proposed south of Summertown Road. The objections expressed may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dangerous for children to have to cross the A338 to access the school • Proposed pedestrian crossing points are not in a safe location • The site to the south of East Hanney is a better site as there would be no need to cross the A338 • The site is cut off from the village by the A338 and is the worst site for a development • This site is not allocated for development • Contrary to adopted local plan policies H11 and H12 • Object to the potential market in the north east corner of the site adjacent to existing dwellings. This could result in increased litter. • Result in a disproportionate 60% increase in population for the village and over development. This will detrimentally alter the character of the village (some objectors suggest an increase in the village from 334 existing dwellings to 926 dwellings with existing permitted schemes plus this scheme and the proposed strategic housing site) • Introduce urbanisation completely at odds with the village • Needs to be considered in light of other housing applications in the village which together represent a vast overdevelopment • There is no employment in the village and therefore, residents will travel elsewhere to work. Housing should be provided close to employment • Inadequate capacity in the village school • Increased risk of flooding – the village has been subject to flooding in the past e.g. 2007 and 2008. This field presently absorbs rainfall • Inadequate sewerage system. This proposal would increase flooding from the sewers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Area is of archaeological importance being the site of a Roman road• This is valuable farm land• Will split the village and not help maintain community spirit• Moving the road could mean buses will not run through the village thereby isolating the young and old• Alternative better sites for housing are available• Inadequate local infrastructure and facilities to accommodate the proposal e.g. sewerage system, GP surgeries, shops, hospitals, schools• Roads cannot cope with the extra traffic• No consideration given to the housing developments at Grove and Wantage which will increase traffic on the A338• The village will be overwhelmed by this development• Housing density proposed is too high and much higher than neighbouring areas• Inadequate car parking• Low cost housing will still be unaffordable• No provision of housing for the elderly or those wishing to stay in the area• New road junctions & bus stops will considerably disrupt traffic flows & lead to increased traffic queues, delays, noise and pollution• Road Safety Audit undertaken on 25 July 2015 which is a holiday period and an inappropriate time for such a survey with fewer vehicles on the road compared to non-holiday periods. Does not take account of other housing proposals in the planning process• Proposal is not integrated with the existing village• Road Safety Audit identified the proposed right turn lane from A338 into Steventon Road to be too short and should be lengthened to accommodate anticipated turning flows at the junction. This could turn the whole diverted A338 section into a 3-lane highway• Street lighting adjacent to a Conservation Area is proposed along the diverted A338 as drivers may fail to appreciate the road layout leading to loss of control type accidents• A by-pass to the east of the site may be the only credible way of planning local traffic management and integrating the proposal.• Insufficient water supply available• No need to divert the A338• No local need for the housing• First step in a linear conurbation stretching from Wantage to East Hanney• Road analysis does not demonstrate it would be possible to turn right from main Street onto the A338• East Hanney can no longer be defined as a large village as the mobile library service has been withdrawn• Roman and Saxon remains have been found in the area around the site and there could still be significant heritage assets to be found• Impact on ecology including great crested newts, frogs,
--	--

	<p>toads, reptiles, bats, water vole and birds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport assessment submitted does not consider other potential development in the village or at Grove • Proposed housing developments should not be considered in isolation • East Hanney is inappropriately ‘allocated’ to the Abingdon on Thames and Oxford sub area in the draft local plan whereas it should be in the South East Vale sub area <p>One local resident requests that should the scheme be permitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street lighting should be minimised as is the case with the existing village • The applicants design commitments should not be allowed to degrade <p>One local resident objects but suggests that should permission be granted development should be restricted to 100 dwellings</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council One Voice</p>	<p><u>Highways</u> No objection subject to conditions and financial contributions towards bus services in East Hanney, provision of bus shelters, maintenance costs towards the signalised junction and for travel plan monitoring.</p> <p><u>Access</u> Internal junction and pedestrian crossing arrangements can be agreed at detailed stage. Submitted plans demonstrate the realigned A338 and Steventon Road can cater for large opposing HGV traffic. The submission now provides confidence in the operation of the signalised junction with phasing addressed at the detailed design stage. The inclusion of committed developments within the analysis and the sensitivity testing of junctions, together with a non-committed site are acceptable. The realigned A338/Steventon Road junction arrangement is a suitable alternative to the extant priority T junction arrangement and can provide potential calming measures in the vicinity. With regard to the major Grove development, planning application No. P12/V0299/O, which has a resolution to grant permission, if for any reason this development does not come forward then this development would need to provide the signalisation at the existing A338/Main Street junction. In promoting sustainable modes of travel, the 4 No. proposed bus stops are welcomed and the various foot/cycleway provisions on Steventon Road and the A338 linking the development site with the wider services available in the Village are seen as a positive.</p> <p><u>Trip Generation</u> The trip generation for the site has been estimated from acceptable sites within the TRICS database. The anticipated vehicle trips within the peak hours are 110 and 115 two-way during the AM and PM peak hours respectively. This is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the capacity of local junctions. Junction analysis within the submitted Transport Assessment, including the main signalised A338/Steventon Road junction indicates adequate</p>

capacity. The results of the junction assessments indicate that they operate within capacity when taking into account committed development in the vicinity. Furthermore, a requested sensitivity assessment for the local highway network was undertaken which includes traffic generation from the yet to be determined residential development for 200 dwellings on land to the west of the A338, south of Summertown, planning application No. P15/V1616/FUL. Again, this was found to be acceptable.

Public Transport

The developer should engage with the Parish Council regarding the proposed location of new bus stops on the A338.

Furthermore, provision for bus stops to the north side of the Steventon Road are required for future service 36 from Wantage and Grove to Steventon, Milton Park and Didcot. There is currently no bus service along the Steventon Road, but the strategy envisages the introduction of a service between Wantage and Didcot via East Hanney and Steventon in due course. There are also deficiencies in the East Hanney to Oxford (via Abingdon) bus service. These improved bus services are required to provide a credible level of service for residents making journeys to work and education in particular, to provide an alternative to the car.

Archaeology

No objection. Proposes two conditions to require and implement a written scheme of investigation.

The predetermination archaeological field evaluation revealed evidence of a Later Bronze Age settlement. This underlies two phases of medieval and post medieval ridge and furrow. The settlement includes a series of linear features and pits. The evidence suggests that this is very similar in character to other settlements of the same date that have been identified north of the Steventon Road and are laid out in a ladder pattern. The number of pits is higher in the southern part of the site and this may suggest that this is the focus of settlement with field systems radiating from it.

Recommend that, should planning permission be granted, the applicant should be responsible for ensuring the implementation of a staged programme of archaeological investigation to be undertaken in advance of development.

Education

No objection. However, they do advise severe concern over the potential cumulative effect of the current applications on primary school provision serving this area. In this respect the County Council states:

“In isolation, each 200-dwelling site has been estimated to generate 54-58 primary pupils, 42-46 secondary pupils and 1.1-1.2 pupils requiring education at an SEN school, subject to confirmed housing mixes. In addition, there are also a number of recent approvals or resolutions to approve housing development in the area feeding to St James CE Primary School, the local primary school. These include P15/0343/O (55 dwellings), P15/V0898/O (40 dwellings) and

P13/V2266/O (35 dwellings) allowed on appeal 13 January 2015. As detailed below, expansion of St James CE Primary School is planned, but this would only be sufficient to meet the need arising from the extant permissions and one of the 200-dwelling applications, in line with the submitted Local Plan. The provisional cost of this expansion is £1.48m, equivalent to £14,095 per pupil place. In these circumstances, developer contributions would be sought at this level – this is higher than the contribution rate previously notified, but has been revised based on the Option Appraisal now completed. For the 54 pupils estimated to be generated by this application, this would require £761,130 index linked Section 106 developer contributions towards the expansion of St James CE Primary School. (These figures have since been revised to 3rd quarter 2015 figures of £21,888 per pupil and a sum of £1,181,952.

The county supports the local plan site and the ability for it to deliver the expansion of the primary school. However if the Planning Authority is minded to approve both the strategic allocation (P15/V1616/FUL) and this application the school would need to expand further than currently planned. For the combined total of existing pressures and housing growth, an admission number of at least 40 would be required. The county council does not consider that this scale of growth is sustainable in terms of primary school infrastructure provision, for reasons set out in the detailed comments.

Should permission for both 200-dwelling applications be granted regardless of these concerns, developer contributions would be needed at a significantly higher rate, to cover the expected additional costs of further new classrooms and the hall extension, as well as any costs incurred in securing land for additional necessary school outdoor space. This rate for expansion works and the cost of land cannot yet be confirmed, but work has been commissioned to estimate the relevant costs”.

“If this application is approved in addition to the 200 dwelling strategic site (P15/V1616/FUL):

A higher contribution will be required to reflect the greater level of expense in expanding the school beyond 1 form entry. This cost is still to be advised.

If this application but not the 200 dwelling strategic site (P15/V1616/FUL) application is approved:

£761,130 Section 106 developer contributions towards the expansion of St James CE Primary School, by a total of 54 pupil places. This is based on an Option Appraisal carried out by the county council’s property consultants Capita Carillion, using data provided by Turner & Townsend cost consultants. This is index linked from 4th Quarter 2012 using PUBSEC Tender Price Index”

In response to the applicant’s offer to safeguard land for a new primary school, OCC are pleased to note applicant acknowledges that land will be required to secure additional school capacity but unfortunately the 2.2 ha offered does not provide a solution to the problem. The suggestion that the school could relocate to the new site, operate as a split site school or that there could be a second primary school for the Hanneys would all be unviable financially.

	<p>Therefore, while the applicant is free to protect 2.2 ha for potential school use this should not be given any weight to any decision to grant permission. I can however confirm that OCC has had an initial discussion with the parish councils, who are owners of land adjacent to the school, regarding joint use of playing fields and although a positive in principle response was received it should be stressed that that there is no guarantee that land will become available.</p> <p><u>Property</u> No objection. Seek contributions towards library stock and adult health care.</p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u> No objection</p> <p><u>County Council Ward Member</u> Objection. A totally inappropriate and exposed development, I believe, in flood plain. Visually intrusive. illogical by any reasonable standard of planning criteria</p>
<p>Ramblers Association</p>	<p>Pleased there will be linkage to the public footpath adjoining the southern boundary of the site. Hedging against this footpath should not be allowed to over grow it. Access to the footpath should not be unnecessarily denied during building works</p>
<p>Thames Valley Police</p>	<p>No objection Seek a financial contribution towards increased policing for the area</p>
<p>Conservation officer</p>	<p>Support Support is given subject to further details being provided by condition these being a Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment of the A338 road and details of mitigation of design of accesses onto A338 to minimise impacts and protect significance; details of materials; contextual details and analysis with details of house types and locations to ensure the materials, size, scale and layout is sympathetic to the established grain of the village conservation area and its setting; details of hard and soft landscaping to ensure the protection of the rural setting of the conservation area and listed buildings; details of the accesses to ensure the protection of the rural setting of the conservation area and listed buildings. The impact includes the effect of the diverted road, intrusion of housing into the rural landscape setting of the village conservation area and formalisation/urbanisation of the road network to control traffic movement. Impacts on the core of the conservation area and listed buildings would be limited due to the flatness of the landscape and hedge/tree screening of these heritage assets The A338 is considered an important north/south historic route of indeterminate age and significance but which links Wantage and Frilford as well as centres further afield. In order to assess the significance of the road and the impacts on it, a Heritage Statement should be produced clearly setting out the significance of the road. Following this an Impact Assessment should be produced, showing what the impacts would be on the identified significance of the road and its setting and giving any options for mitigation.</p>
<p>Landscape officer</p>	<p>No objection There would be an impact for the landscape character of the Lowland Vale with the change agricultural field becoming housing,</p>

	<p>however there would limited impact on existing landscape features. There would be some harm to the landscape character of the area however the proposed layout of the scheme with its proposed landscape buffer on its southern and western boundary would help integrate the proposed housing in to the surrounding landscape and reflect the existing treed character of East Hanney.</p> <p>The landscape in this area is generally flat. Views over this site tend to be restricted from the west and north by the existing village form and field pattern.</p> <p>From Steventon Road there are potential for views over the site to the wider surrounding landscape towards the AONB approximately 4km to the south. The proposal would result in the loss of views to the south from Steventon Road however it not considered unacceptably harmful to those using the road. The development will not significantly impinge in any views northwards towards the North Corallian ridge due to the existing village form to the north.</p> <p>The built form of the south eastern edge of East Hanney does not form a strong feature in the landscape. In the views when travelling northwards on the A338 and from the public right of way network to the south and east, the development would be seen against the backdrop of the vegetation located along the southern and eastern edge East Hanney, with existing vegetation on the edge of the A338, breaking up the extent of open views available. The proposed woodland areas to the south and east of the site would integrate the new area of housing and help establish a new village edge.</p> <p>This site being approximately 4km from the boundary with the AONB does not have a significant role in its setting. The proposed planted areas to the south and east of the site would assist in screening these limited distant views as it matures.</p> <p>In visual terms the development would be visible in public views from adjacent highways and sections of the public rights of way to the south and east of the site to the south, and would have a moderate to minor impact on the immediate local area but would impact would quick diminish with distance and the impact on views from the AONB would be minimum.</p> <p>The proposed development would initially have localised minor to moderate landscape and visual harm on the Lowland Vale. The impacts mainly relate to the extension of the village eastwards and the visual impact of this new village edge. However the proposed development site will not extend further than the existing and consented built form of the existing village.</p> <p>The extent of the proposed planting including the strategic boundary planting shown on the illustrated layout is appropriate in mitigating both the proposed landscape and visual impact and once established would reduce to the impact of the proposed development and help integrate it with the existing form of East Hanney.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Team</p>	<p>No objection on air quality or noise grounds.</p> <p>With regard to noise they expect at least part of each outdoor living area to meet the 50dBA objective and the site layout/orientation and mitigation will need to be altered to address this requirement.</p> <p>This level of detail is expected when the layout of the site has been refined and detailed as part of the reserved matters application.</p>
<p>Health &</p>	<p>No objection</p>

<p>Housing – air quality</p>	<p>Have reviewed the air quality assessment submitted in support of the application. This assessment indicates that predicted air quality impacts from traffic sources with the development in place, will be well within acceptable limits on the new development. The detail of the site layout will be dealt with as reserved matters. I would wish the developers to ensure that a sufficient stand-off will be provided between the principle roadways and residential properties in order to ensure that direct impacts of vehicle emissions will be minimised.</p>
<p>Vale Leisure Team</p>	<p>No objection. The significant increase in population as a result of consented developments and this application is putting pressure on the Memorial Ground, which provides for cricket and football as well as tennis and amenity greenspace. Contributions for football, AGP and youth sport/MUGA are focussed on providing a new full sized floodlit MUGA and/or small AGP that can act as a multi-purpose sports and training area. The current pavilion needs improved and extended changing facilities. Cricket is to provide additional new nets to increase capacity, whilst rugby is for enhancement at the local club at Grove RFC. Tennis is to replace old floodlights and to add an extra tennis court to what is a very busy club on courts that are at capacity. Other contributions are sought for the proposed new Leisure Centre at Grove/Wantage. Play and open space are sought as on site provision.</p>
<p>Stagecoach</p>	<p>No objections. Bus stop positions have been marked that accord with our suggestions. Evidently the proposals will be subject to formal technical and safety audit, and may require some adjustment; but subject to the broad principles being taken forward into the detail design, we are pleased to confirm that the arrangements would serve to significantly boost access to bus services for East Hanney residents as a whole, as well as provide excellent access to high-quality public transport from within the proposals and nearby committed development. In addition, given the material improvement the proposals offer to improve access to bus services for existing residents, we consider that the proposals significantly improve current conditions for public transport and allow residents a credible opportunity to take advantage of our X30 service running direct to Oxford in particular. It is credible to assume that a certain proportion of the additional local car journeys arising from this site will be offset by a higher level of bus use from the existing village.</p>
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>No objection. Identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the development. Propose a Grampian condition requiring a drainage strategy to be approved prior to development commencing and implemented. Surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. It is recommended that the applicant ensures 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 will be required.</p>

	<p>Running from the North to the South West of the proposed development there are easements and wayleaves. These are Thames Water Assets. The company will seek assurances that it will not be affected by the proposed development.</p>
Vale Urban Design Officer	<p>No objections.</p> <p>Well thought out master plan that should lead to a high quality development.</p> <p>Strategic planting on the southern and eastern boundaries of the site form a strong boundary to the development.</p> <p>While this is understandable given the need to reduce the impact of the development on its rural location, it severs any relationship between the development and the land to the south and the east. No consideration has been given to the potential for future development in this area, even where this future development may be a long way off. The scheme should relate to its surroundings in a way that would allow comprehensive development of adjacent sites if these ever come forward. The proposed scheme needs to be future proofed so that any future development can be well related and connected. Future connections could be established as a continuation of the south and east secondary routes that pass through the strategic planting. These connections should be designed into the scheme.</p> <p>Establishment of a design code is welcomed.</p> <p>There is the opportunity to use the LEAP as a stronger connection between the new development and the existing village. Locating it further west at the north east of the primary road or more centrally on this route would allow it to provide a stronger link between the entrance of the existing village, the proposed new community space, the central greenway and wider countryside. It would also add to the series of green spaces and verges running from The Green. A stronger relationship with the pedestrian and cycle route in the north of the scheme could also be explored.</p> <p>The proposed parking solution for the scheme is predominately on-plot to the side and rear of the properties with some rear parking courts. It would be beneficial to the scheme if a wider variety of parking options were considered.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>No objection.</p> <p>This application is deemed to either have a low environmental risk. The EA is no longer a statutory consultee for surface water for sites over one hectare. Responsibility for assessing surface water drainage proposals for major applications is passed to the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) which in this case is Oxfordshire County Council.</p>
Vale Waste Management	<p>No objection.</p> <p>Need to ensure a waste collection vehicle can access all relevant areas of the site. Request a contribution towards bin provision and waste collection services.</p>
Vale Countryside officer	<p>No objections.</p> <p>The proposed development will not result in any direct or indirect impacts on designated sites, or priority habitats. Ecological surveys have revealed that the site supports a population of water voles in the ditches in the northern part of the site and a low population of common lizards in the grassland margins along the northern and western site boundaries. In addition, a roosting site for barn owls is present within one of the existing buildings. The remainder of the</p>

	<p>site is relatively unconstrained in ecological terms. The proposed plans would involve impacts on the population of water vole and common lizard where the proposed road network is re-aligned, the loss of the existing buildings would also destroy the barn owl roost. The applicant has designed the scheme to avoid impacts on the ditch network as far as possible. The illustrative layout allows for an increased availability of habitats for water voles in new/enhanced ditches and new opportunities for the species within the proposed SUDS features.</p> <p>The population of common lizards is confined to the rough grassland margins around the site at present. The illustrative layout would significantly increase the amount of habitat available to reptiles in the long term. These habitats would also provide opportunities for foraging barn owls.</p> <p>The Ecological Appraisal outlines a mitigation strategy designed to ensure that the works illustrated in the master plan could be completed without harm to water voles, reptiles and barn owls. It is not possible to provide a detailed mitigation strategy at outline stage. However, I am confident that a successful mitigation strategy could be developed and the necessary licences obtained to ensure that the populations of protected species are protected during the development process.</p> <p>In the longer term the proposed layout would allow the site to deliver a net gain for biodiversity over the existing situations.</p>
<p>Vale Housing officer</p>	<p>No objection.</p> <p>40% affordable housing should be provided. Based on 80 affordable dwellings the following mix should be provided:</p> <p>Rented (75%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 x 1-bed 33 x 2-bed flats/houses 12 x 3-bed 2 x 4-bed <p>Shared Ownership (25%):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 x 2-bed 6 x 3-bed

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 This site and adjacent land was presented to the Council as part of the draft Local Plan 2031 consultation with it being put forward as a potential strategic housing site in the February 2014 consultation local plan 2031 Part 1. Ultimately as part of its November 2014 Topic Paper 3 on Strategic Sites Selection, the Council 'rejected' this site as a strategic housing site in favour of land to the south of East Hanney which it considers better connected to the village. However, it was suggested that the western part of the site might be considered as part of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 process.
- 4.2 Application no. P13/V1960/O – planning permission for 3 dwellings on land between the La Fontana restaurant and Steventon Road was refused on 31 October 2013 on grounds of the site being a prominent location and would result in a cramped, poor quality and visually harmful development out of character with the area.
- 4.3 Application no. P91/V1604/O – permission for a single dwelling on the land between the La Fontana restaurant and Steventon Road was refused and an appeal dismissed on 12 August 1991. In conclusion the Inspector held development on this 'island' site would be an inappropriate and unjustified intrusion into open countryside.

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
H13	Development Elsewhere
H15	Housing Densities
H16	Size of Dwelling and Lifetime Homes
H17	Affordable Housing
H23	Open Space in New Housing Development
HE9	Archaeology
NE9	Lowland Vale
HE1	Conservation Areas
HE4	Listed buildings

5.2 **Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1**

The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. 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 8	Spatial Strategy for Abingdon & 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
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
- 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 **Neighbourhood Plan**

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.

An application has been received for a neighbourhood planning designation area and accepted by this Council. To date a neighbourhood plan has not been submitted to the Council. Consequently no weight can be given to any policies that may be emerging in any draft neighbourhood plan.

5.7 **Environmental Impact**

This proposal is for more than 150 dwellings and the site area exceeds 5ha in size and is therefore, above the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015. As required by the above Regulations officers have undertaken a screening opinion. Taking into account government guidance in paragraph 58 of the NPPG on thresholds that may trigger the need for EIA and having considered the potential for significant effects of the proposal in accordance with Schedule 3 of the Regulations including cumulative impacts with other housing developments permitted and the strategic housing site allocation for East Hanney, it is the case that this proposal is not EIA development. A screening opinion has been provided demonstrating this.

5.8 **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)

5.9 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.

5.10 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. Cumulative Impact
3. Use of Land
4. Locational Credentials
5. Affordable Housing and Housing Mix
6. Design and Layout
7. Residential Amenity
8. Landscape and Visual Impact
9. Open Space and Landscaping
10. Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage
11. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety
12. Protected Species and Biodiversity
13. Historic environment
14. Viability and Developer Contributions

6.1 The Principle of Development

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. This site is not allocated for development and as mentioned at paragraph 4.1 above.
- 6.6 The site including a wider area to the east was presented as a potential strategic housing site as part of the draft local plan 2031 process. At stages 4 and 5 of that process it is stated that the *“Site is adjacent to the Larger Village of East Hanney which has a reasonable level of services and facilities. Western part of site (next to the A338) is considered suitable for development. Careful consideration should be given to minimising landscape impacts and ensuring development is well integrated with East Hanney. Wastewater capacity issues will need to be addressed”* (Topic Paper 3 Strategic Sites Selection (November 2014)). This Topic Paper goes on to add that the *“Allocation was revisited after Housing Delivery Update Consultation. Site was replaced by an alternative site ‘South of East Hanney’ which is considered to be better connected to the village. The site to the East of the A338 could be considered through the Local Plan 2031: Part 2 process”*.
- 6.7 Policy H11 of the adopted local plan and emerging policy 4 of the draft local plan 2031 allocate East Hanney as a large village. The parish Council and some local residents dispute this as the village has now lost its library service and therefore, the facilities and services in the village are now such that it should be re-classified as a smaller village. Policy H11 is out of date being based on south east plan housing figures and emerging policy 4 has yet to be Examined. I give both policies limited weight.
- 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.
- Cumulative Impact**
- 6.9 East Hanney has been subject to a number of planning applications for housing development that have been permitted including application no's: P15/V0343/O (resolution to permit up to 55 dwellings), P13/V2266/O (35 dwellings allowed on appeal – now subject to a detailed application for 37 dwellings), 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 and this is subject to application no. P15/V1616/FUL).
- 6.10 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.

- 6.11 Additional housing can help support and secure local services and it may be possible to address infrastructure deficiencies through planning conditions or through a legal agreement. Cumulative impacts are considered where relevant in the topics below.

Use of Land

- 6.12 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. The field is mainly used for growing miscanthus. The proposal will result in the loss of some 15.63 of grade 3 agricultural land. There will also be or potential for loss of other agricultural land with other housing proposals permitted and applications pending consideration. In an area such as this district where it has a limited supply of previously developed sites and a housing need, it is inevitable that some greenfield sites and agricultural land will be lost. There is some limited harm in taking this grade 3 land out of agricultural production. The site is at the edge of East Hanney and whilst there is lesser quality land at the western and north western edges of the village, that land is part of the flood plain and would not be sequentially preferable for housing development. The limited harm resulting from the loss of this agricultural land needs to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal.

Locational Credentials

- 6.13 The NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34).
- 6.14 The site adjoins the edge of East Hanney albeit separated by the A338. It is proposed that new bus stops will be provided on the proposed re-aligned A338 and Steventon Road with these positioned in locations discussed with the bus operator, and being a relatively short walk from the proposed housing whilst not making accessibility from existing housing unreasonably distant. The bus services provides a good service 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 directly accessible by bus via Steventon Road and whilst some people may choose to cycle Steventon Road most people may drive should they need to access Milton Park. The proposal includes bus stops on the realigned Steventon Road and the County Council is seeking to provide a bus service along Steventon Road towards Milton Park.
- 6.15 There are a range of services reasonably close to the site. Using distances measured by pavement and footpaths the primary school is approximately 1, 2km walk away; the village shop, village hall and recreation ground are approximately 940m away. A public house is some 600m walk with the social club/British legion hall about 1km away. La Fontana restaurant is immediate north of the site and Dews Meadow farm shop around 620m away but not easily accessible on foot as there is no footway connection beyond the site. The walking distances to key facilities in the village are largely greater than 400m which is a desirable distance according to the Institution of Highways 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.
- 6.16 The A338 is a busy road especially so at peak hours. Three pedestrian crossing points including a signalised crossing, are proposed on the re-aligned A338 which will assist pedestrian movements. It is concluded that this is a reasonably accessible site for a housing development.

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 6.17 The application makes provision for 40% affordable housing which accords with Policy H17 of the adopted local plan. 75% are proposed for rent and 25% for shared ownership which accords with this council's preference. This is an outline application and the actual number of dwellings that might be accommodated on site is not known at this stage and likewise the housing mix has not been provided; these are matters for any reserved matters or detailed application stage. Officers will expect the market housing mix to closely comply with the April 2014 SHMA (unless superseded by any more up to date objectively assessed need for housing in the district), and the affordable housing mix to complement the expectations of the housing team with the current preference being listed in their consultation response above.

Design and Layout

- 6.18 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.
- 6.19 A number of local plan policies seek to ensure high quality developments and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties (Policies DC1, DC6, and DC9). In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district. The assessment below is set out in logical sections similar to those in the design guide.
- 6.20 This is an outline application with only access to be considered. The details concerning layout, scale external appearance of the dwellings and landscaping are reserved matters and would be considered should a reserved matters or 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.
- 6.21 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 13 dwellings per hectare which is reasonably consistent with development in East Hanney. This is an edge of village location which justifies a lower density to ensure a residential development knits into the semi-rural character of the area. The proposal includes wide areas of open space at the site edges which can be planted to soften the development edges, further reduce public views of the development and help assimilate it with the open countryside beyond. The illustrative masterplan suggests a hierarchy of streets with the re-aligned A338 and Steventon Road being the primary routes also described in the design and access statement as forming a central greenway with these roads lined with trees and green edges. Secondary and tertiary streets link through the development and connect the development parcels. In addition it shows a focal area for community space on land immediately south of the La Fontana restaurant with a further open area immediately east of housing on the southern side of Main Street. These areas visually seek to connect with the small village green at the Main Street/A338 junction. Pedestrian connections to the existing village are proposed including the crossings of the re-aligned A338 and using the existing route of the A338; this being closed to traffic in part.
- 6.22 The design and access statement seeks to set out key design principles for the development. These include:

- Creating key spaces including seeking to establish a series of key spaces creating a strong sense of character and legibility throughout the development. The re-establishment of a green/community space at the junction of Main Street/The Green and the A338 is one of the principal design objectives
- Creating key frontages with dwellings generally facing the streets or public open space in order to provide a high quality, active and strong frontage to define/ frame key locations
- Provide key buildings that would be generally located at the end of the views and vistas, and at points marking key locations i.e. at the entrances to the development
- Provide security
- Street typology creating a strong, connected structure designed for ease of movement especially cycling and walking, establishing spatial coherence with well-defined streets and spaces, providing legibility and variety and a sense of place, and the integration of parking
- Character areas such as community spaces, the central greenway, highway corridors, single storey pockets, the rural edge
- Green Infrastructure such as strategic planting (some 42% of the site is to be given over to public open spaces), habitat areas, managed parkland, retention of ditches for wildlife interest, use of street trees and soft garden frontages such as hedges.

6.23 These principles are reasonable and can set design principles for taking forward a detailed scheme should outline permission be granted.

Residential Amenity

6.24 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.

6.25 As no firm details of housing layout or house types accompany this outline application, as they are reserved matters, it is not possible to consider the impact on existing residential amenity. The most appropriate stage to do this would be at detailed application stage or submission of reserved matters. The proposal does seek to re-align the A338 away from existing dwellings on the eastern edge of this part of East Hanney which could enhance living conditions for occupants of those existing dwellings by potentially reducing traffic noise and air pollution. There is a suggestion in the submission that space created beside these dwellings might be used as a market and it is noted that this has met with some opposition due to noise and disturbance and litter this might generate. This authority is not making any commitment to a market on this piece of land or anywhere else in the development. It may be appropriate that this area becomes part of the open space or is landscaped/planted to soften this edge of the conservation area and protect residential amenity for existing residents.

Landscape and Visual Impact

6.26 The NPPF seeks to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (paragraph 109). In NPPF terms this is not a valued landscape. Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan designates the site as part of the wider Lowland Vale which is a distinctive landscape and valued for its own quality. Paragraph 7.67 of the adopted local plan explains that *“the long views over the patchwork quilt of fields, farms and villages in the Vale are an essential part of the landscape quality of the District”*.

- 6.27 In considering the site as part of a possible strategic housing site this authority commissioned a landscape and visual impact appraisal. This was undertaken by Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd in February 2014 (the Kirkham report). The application site is much smaller than the area considered as a possible strategic site (15.63ha compared to 50.1ha) but the application site characteristics remain the same.
- 6.28 The Kirkham report notes the open nature of the land and its interconnectivity with the North Wessex Downs AONB which is located some 4km to the south. It also noted the disconnection with the village of East Hanney which faces inwards, by vegetation and the busy A338. It noted the site is strongly connected to the landscape to the south and east. Overall the Kirkham report concluded the landscape sensitivity of the 50.1ha site as medium/high, with landscape character sensitivity as medium/low and landscape capacity as medium.
- 6.29 The Kirkham report concluded and recommended:
- Any housing be restricted to the north east corner of the site which has the most potential to relate to East Hanney
 - Contain housing to a reduced area shown in figure 45.2 of the report (see **Appendix 3**)
 - Plant new woodland to the south and east
 - The density should be lower than 25dph to reflect the character of the village and that the site might accommodate 135 dwellings at a density of 25dph
- 6.30 The applicant has supported its application with a Landscape and Visual Appraisal which considers the local landscape character has a low overall sensitivity *“with few of the attributes of the positive attributes of the prevailing Alluvial Lowlands and Lowland Clay Vale:*
- a) The site is not enclosed by hedgerows and there are no hedgerow trees;*
 - b) The condition of landscape features that do exist is poor and not representative of the distinctive characteristics of the Lowland Vale;*
 - c) The A338 disturbs the rural tranquillity of the site and East Hanney; and*
 - d) High voltage cables and carriers to the east of the site and, together with dilapidated farm buildings at the site’s boundaries, are visual detractors”.*
- 6.31 The applicant’s Landscape and Visual Appraisal notes the application site area is substantially smaller than the site area appraised in the Kirkham report and therefore, is not directly comparable. The applicant considers the proposal will deliver considerable landscape enhancements including publicly accessible landscape buffers and a dispersed woodland edge to the wider agricultural landscape.
- 6.32 Many local residents and the Parish Council disagree and consider the proposal will have a major change on the landscape, adversely affect and change the character of the village extending it into open countryside and the proposal will be visually detrimental. This will be more so in the opinion of the Parish Council and local residents when combined with housing schemes permitted already and the proposed strategic housing allocation to the south of the village. It is also pointed out that the NPPF expects planning to *“take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”* (paragraph 17 of the NPPF).
- 6.33 The site is not part of a statutory protected landscape. It is a large open field with few defining features. The A338 and village of East Hanney are to the immediate west.

Existing houses, buildings and planning permission for housing exist on the northern side of Steventon Road. Open agricultural land exists to the south and east. The proposal would clearly extend East Hanney into open countryside at its edge. The proposal seeks to divert the A338 and Steventon Road through the site in order to better connect the proposal with the village.

- 6.34 The proposal could lead to the loss of some 9ha of land to development with the remaining 6ha used for landscaping and open spaces within the proposed development and around the edges of the development and particularly the eastern and southern edges that adjoin open countryside. Paragraph 6.67 of the adopted local plan advises it is the “*long views over the patchwork quilt of fields, farms and villages that are essential part of the landscape quality*” and adds at paragraph 7.68 that “*insensitively located or designed proposals could have an adverse impact on these open vistas and on the intrinsic qualities of the Lowland Vale*”. There would be an impact for the landscape character of the Lowland Vale limited to the loss of this site to housing and this would be most noticeable for people passing the site using the A338, Steventon Road and footpath on the southern boundary of the site. From further afield the site is not particularly noticeable. Housing could be seen from further afield although views are limited due to limited public accessibility and hedges and trees in the landscape. This is demonstrated in the photo viewpoint images in the applicant’s landscape and visual appraisal. I am also mindful of the Kirkham report conclusion that considered the north east part of the site has housing potential relating most strongly to East Hanney. The illustrative masterplan supporting the application suggests housing could be extended further east than suggested in the Kirkham report. There would be localised landscape harm which needs to be balanced against the environmental benefits in providing the landscaped buffers largely on the eastern and southern edges of the site and overall it is considered the landscape harm would be limited.
- 6.35 The landscape in this area is generally flat as is this site with views from public vantage points to the North Wessex Downs (part of the AONB) to the south and Corallian ridge to the north. Views south over this site tend to be screened by the height of the miscanthus, in part by the sporadic hedgerow beside Steventon Road and the agricultural building towards the north western corner of the site. Based on views available when the miscanthus is cut or at a lesser height, there are views from Steventon Road over the wider surrounding landscape towards the North Wessex Downs and AONB the boundary of which is some 4.1km south of the site. The proposal could result in the loss of views to the south as a person passes the site. There is potential for opening public views from the southern part of the site towards the AONB. Loss of this limited section of views is not considered unacceptably harmful to those using Steventon Road. The development will not impinge in any views north from Steventon Road towards the North Corallian ridge.
- 6.36 A footpath adjoins part of the southern boundary of the application site (it is outside the site), from which there are clear views into the site and the change to the site would be obvious. In these views the site is seen in the context of the A338 and the village to the west with these views of the village partially screened by the hedge and trees on the western boundary, views towards existing development on the northern side of Steventon Road and the areas of open countryside to the east. Views from the footpath to the AONB are unaffected, as it is to the south. There are no panoramic views across the site; views are north towards the tree belt along Steventon Road and housing sites beyond and towards the eastern edge of East Hanney. Views from this footpath across the site to the rising land in the distance which forms part of the North Corallian ridge are limited and in my opinion negligible due to tree cover at the edge and within East Hanney. The local harm visually for users of the footpath needs to be balanced against the benefits of the scheme.

- 6.37 The applicant's photo viewpoints demonstrate that housing would not be unduly prominent in views from public rights of way further to the south and east of the site including the A338 to the north and south of the village. In the views the development would be seen against the backdrop of the village and with foreground views broken by hedges. Strategic planting on the south and eastern edges of the site would also break up the appearance of housing
- 6.38 This site being approximately 4.1km from the boundary with the AONB does not have a significant role in its setting. In views from the Ridgeway the distance to the site e.g. 8.2km from the Lord Wantage monument, any housing on this site would be seen at distance against the backdrop of East Hanney and particularly housing permitted on the north side of Steventon Road. Planted areas to the south and east of the site would assist in screening these distant views and the impact would be negligible.
- 6.39 This development would extend the village to the east. In aerial views as pointed out by the Parish Council, it would represent a large addition to the village and more so in conjunction with the land south of Summertown Road (application no. P15/V1616/FUL). In landscape and visual terms the development would be striking in public views from adjacent highways and footpath against the southern site boundary. From the west and within the village the site and proposals would be unlikely to be visible. From the A338 to the north the proposals would be screened by existing buildings and trees limiting any noticeable landscape and visual change. From the east the site is seen against the backdrop of the village edge and vegetation with other vegetation filtering views and limiting the impact. From the A338 to the south the proposed strategic housing site would be visible whereas boundary vegetation beside the eastern carriageway would significantly screen views of this site. With the proposal to re-align the A338 and Steventon Road the scheme seeks to integrate the development with the village and strategic planting can be achieved on the southern and eastern boundaries of the site to form a strong boundary to the village. This responds to recommendations in the Kirkham report.
- 6.40 The village would grow by a further 400 dwellings on top of those already permitted should this proposal and that under application no. P15/V1616/FUL be permitted. However, the overall landscape and visual change whilst clear would mainly be a localised experience and only visually harmful to those passing the site over a relatively short distance. The localised impact needs to be considered against the scheme benefits as required by the NPPF. In addition, this impact has to be considered against the assessment of this site as part of a larger area extending further to the east which was presented as a potential strategic housing site as part of the draft local plan 2031 process. At stages 4 and 5 of that process it is stated that the *"Site is adjacent to the Larger Village of East Hanney which has a reasonable level of services and facilities. Western part of site (next to the A338) is considered suitable for development. Careful consideration should be given to minimising landscape impacts and ensuring development is well integrated with East Hanney. Wastewater capacity issues will need to be addressed"* (Topic Paper 3 Strategic Sites Selection (November 2014)). This Topic Paper goes on to add that the *"Allocation was revisited after Housing Delivery Update Consultation. Site was replaced by an alternative site 'South of East Hanney' which is considered to be better connected to the village. The site to the East of the A338 could be considered through the Local Plan 2031: Part 2 process"*. The site was not being ruled out as a possible housing development site for its landscape or visual impacts or cumulative impacts.
- 6.41 The applicant has sought to demonstrate that the proposal can be integrated into the village by re-aligning roads and with new planting creating a strong countryside edge.

These were points recommended in the Kirkham report.

- 6.42 Localised landscape and visual harm is identified and this has to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal including the lack of a five year land supply. I am also mindful that East Hanney has very little street lighting and many interested parties would prefer this to remain the case. The highway authority has confirmed it would not adopt the streets without lighting. Modern luminaires (LEDs) with sensitively designed cut-offs could be used and keep lighting pollution to a minimum. Furthermore, a reduced level of lighting, in terms of spacing/intensity, could also be considered within the development and could be acceptable. It is not considered that street lighting would result in adverse harm and a condition can require an appropriate lighting scheme.

Open Space, Landscaping and Trees

- 6.43 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. Over 6ha of public open space is proposed. This is more than 15%. This can be secured by planning condition with a developer expected to provide and maintain the open spaces.
- 6.44 There are no protected trees on site. There are hedgerows with trees on the A338 frontage including a small group of trees at the south west edge of the site and an area of scrub in the north east corner of the site. Some trees and sections of hedge will need to be removed to facilitate access including the re-aligned A338. Opportunity exists for new planting throughout the scheme including strategic planting to the east and south. Loss of the small sections of hedgerow and trees need to be balanced against the benefits of the proposal.

Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

- 6.45 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).
- 6.46 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.
- 6.47 The majority of the site is in flood zone 1 which are zones the least susceptible to flooding and preferred in flood risk terms for housing development. Part of the site in the north west corner is flood zone 2 with such areas being at risk to fluvial flooding. Housing is not illustrated in this area. Local residents and the Parish Council have expressed concern that this development could increase the risk of flooding in the village. Photographs showing flooding at the Main Street/A338 junction have been submitted by a local resident clearly showing flooding events and I am aware of other flooding events that have occurred elsewhere in the village. It is important that new development does not increase the risk of flooding.
- 6.48 The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment (FRA) as expected by the NPPF. It provides a list of flood risk management measures to be implemented. Amongst

these measures are the use of SUDS including swales to collect run-off from the main roads proposed, permeable roadways which will drain to attenuation ponds. In turn these would drain to an existing surface water drainage ditch running east (away from the village) on the northern boundary. A suitable flow control device is proposed downstream of the interconnected detention basins restricting flows to a maximum rate of 21.4 l/s. The western ditch-course will be opened along its route with 430m of new trapezoidal shaped channel with 1:3 banks and 1m depth and this will provide additional flood storage. The FRA advises that *“The ditch-course located within the northwest corner of the site (north of existing Steventon Road alignment) is to be modified and a new pond with approximately 300m³ of storage capacity will be provided. This pond is not linked to the onsite attenuation provision and will simply provide additional flood storage capacity to the existing ditch network”*.... The system will provide attenuation for flows up to a 1 in 100 year event (+30% allowance for climate change. The FRA finished floor levels to the dwellings are also recommended to be at least 150mm above ground level.

- 6.49 The Council's drainage engineer has reviewed the FRA and has no objection subject to a condition requiring a fully detailed scheme to be submitted and approved. It is also noted that the Environment Agency and Oxfordshire County Council has no objection. A sustainable drainage scheme can be agreed and secured by planning condition thereby minimising the risks of flooding from this development.
- 6.50 Thames Water has provided a sewer impact study which *“indicates that the foul network does not have available capacity downstream of the proposed connection manhole to accept the proposed development flows. On inclusion of the additional flows from the development site, an increase in the predicted volume of flooding on the downstream sewer network is predicted to occur”*.
- 6.51 Two indicative options have been developed to prevent this with both options needing the ability of the Wantage sewage treatment works (STW) to accept additional pumped flows to be determined. Since then Thames Water has advised the applicant that capacity exists at the Wantage STW to accommodate flows from the 200 dwellings. I have asked Thames Water to consider the situation bearing in mind the 200 dwellings proposed under application no. P15/V1616/FUL (land south of Summertown, East Hanney) and as should both this application and P15/V1616/FUL be approved, up to 400 dwellings may need to discharge to the Wantage STW.
- 6.52 In response Thames Water has advised either of the two schemes will need network upgrades to be undertaken. The sewage treatment works (STW) at Wantage accommodates flows from East Hanney and also serves Wantage and Grove. Upgrades have recently been undertaken providing capacity for approximately 1,000 – 1,500 homes. Capacity is not reserved and will diminish in due course. Nevertheless, presently capacity exists. Should both schemes come forward Thames Water consider a strategic approach to foul drainage would be beneficial and recommend a condition that development does not commence until a detailed drainage strategy for on and off site infrastructure identifying exactly what is required, where and when is submitted to and approved by the planning authority and that this is implemented before any discharge to the public system is accepted. This is a reasonable condition.
- 6.53 Paragraph 004 Reference ID: 34-004-20140306 of the NPPG refers to funding wastewater infrastructure. It advises that companies such as Thames Water *“are subject to a statutory duty to ‘effectually drain’ their area. This requires them to invest in infrastructure suitable to meet the demands of projected population growth. There is also statutory provision for developers to fund additional sewerage infrastructure required to accommodate flows from a proposed development”*. Funding is a matter for

Thames Water and the developer.

- 6.54 Thames Water, have a legal obligation under Section 94 of the Water Industries Act 1991 (WIA 1991) to provide developers with the right to connect to a public sewer regardless of capacity issues. This, when read in conjunction with Section 91(1) of the Act in effect makes it impossible for Thames Water to object or for the Council to refuse to grant planning permission for development on the grounds that no improvement works are planned for a particular area. Paragraph 20 Reference ID: 34-020-20140306 of the NPPG states:

“If there are concerns arising from a planning application about the capacity of wastewater infrastructure, applicants will be asked to provide information about how the proposed development will be drained and wastewater dealt with... The timescales for works to be carried out by the sewerage company do not always fit with development needs. In such cases, local planning authorities will want to consider how new development can be phased, for example so it is not occupied until any necessary improvements to public sewage treatment works have been carried out.”

The applicant has provided this detail through the Thames Water sewer impact study mentioned above and which outlines two options. Thames Water has confirmed current capacity at the Wantage STW. To conclude therefore this authority can reasonably impose a planning condition restricting occupation until a scheme of for foul water disposal is agreed and implemented.

Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

- 6.55 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 decision 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.
- 6.56 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.”*
- 6.57 Objectors are concerned that this proposal will increase traffic flows onto the A338 and its junctions in East Hanney. The A338 is a very busy road especially at peak hours and local residents point out that traffic can queue at the road junctions and back from the Frilford traffic lights and from Grove. There are concerns expressed that this proposal together with other planned development in East Hanney and at Grove will exacerbate these issues.
- 6.58 The proposals include re-aligning the A338 and Steventon Road through the site, creating a new A338/Steventon Road junction and pedestrian crossings on the realigned A338. A transport assessment accompanies the application and this has been updated in response to an original holding objection from the County Council as highway authority. The transport assessment takes in to account additional committed flows including those predicted from the proposed Grove airfield development and in East Hanney.
- 6.59 The scope of undertaking the transport assessment (TA) has been agreed with the

County Council as highway authority who in turn confirm that trip generation has been estimated from acceptable sites within the TRICS database. Traffic counts were undertaken in June and early July 2015 and are therefore reasonably up to date. The TA anticipates 110 two-way movements in the AM peak development and 115 two-way movements in the PM peak. The highway authority has reviewed the application and has no objection. The highway authority advises that this development is not expected to have a detrimental impact on capacity at local junctions including when taking into account committed development in the vicinity. In addition, should the 200 dwellings south of Summertown subject to application P15/V1616/FUL be approved, the impact would remain acceptable. There is no expert evidence contradicting these findings.

- 6.60 In considering the access arrangements the highway authority has some concerns regarding the indicative crossroads arrangements in the 'centre' of the site illustrated on the masterplan accompanying the application. This can be addressed as part of a detailed scheme. There are no objections to the principle of pedestrian crossings on the re-aligned A338 these being necessary to allow safe pedestrian access to and from the development. The actual location of the pedestrian crossings can be agreed at reserved matters application stage.
- 6.61 The proposed connections with the existing A338 are considered suitably designed to allow HGV movements including HGV's passing one another.
- 6.62 A signalised A338/Steventon Road junction is proposed which reflects that required as part of the Grove airfield development. The highway authority prefers a roundabout at this new junction but only on the grounds of maintenance and ultimately it is not objecting to the signalised junction. This development will need to provide the signalised junction at the A338/Main Street junction should it proceed before the Grove airfield development or that development does not proceed.
- 6.63 Concerns expressed about traffic generation from this development and others and their impact on traffic flows along the A338 and at its junctions have not been taken lightly. The evidence presented and which the high authority is satisfied with, indicates the A338 can accommodate this development and there is capacity at junctions. In access and traffic generation terms the proposal is acceptable.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.64 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...*"
- 6.65 The site is not designated for its ecology or biodiversity interest and there are no designated sites likely to be affected by the proposal. The applicant has undertaken ecology surveys including a phase 1 habitat survey, bat, reptile and water vole surveys which have been subject to scrutiny by the council's countryside officer. The surveys identified some populations of breeding birds, water vole in ditches to the north of the site and a small population of common lizard within grassland margins. Overall the applicant concludes that the site is of negligible ecological habitat value due to intensive farming and the proposal has a minimal impact for protected species. The applicant's ecology appraisal includes proposed mitigation and enhancements to minimise impacts for protected species.
- 6.66 The mitigation and enhancement includes retaining ditches or diverting them to ensure

minimal losses and buffers provided to protect them. Trees will be retained and protected where possible (some trees and sections of hedge need to be removed to provide access), with significant new planting proposed to mitigate losses and provide enhancement. Ecological protection zones should be established during construction. Species rich grassland can be provided, with new native species of hedgerows and trees. These can provide habitat for reptiles, bats, birds and invertebrates. New ponds and ditches can provide suitable aquatic habitat and habitat for water vole. A barn owl box can be provided towards the east of the site and the proposed grasslands can providing foraging opportunities for barn owl.

- 6.67 The bat survey identified no roosting potential within the site and no evidence of bat activity. New hedgerows, trees, aquatic habitat and grasslands can all provide enhanced habitat for bats.
- 6.68 A small population of water vole was recorded in the ditches beside Steventon Road. Parts of the ditches will require culverting to provide the re-aligned roads and consequently some disturbance to water vole is possible. There is an opportunity to open up existing parts of the Steventon Road ditches and provide ponds to create new water vole habitat thereby providing mitigation and enhancement for displaced water vole.
- 6.69 The loss of rough grassland field margins would affect reptile habitat and there is a risk of reptiles being damaged by the development. To minimise this risk, prior to development a hand search for reptiles by a suitable ecologist is proposed to remove any discrete refugia habitats during an appropriate time of year (April to mid-October inclusive) and then progressively mown through phased vegetation clearance to encourage reptiles to disperse into adjacent and retained habitat under the supervision of a suitably experienced ecologist. Temporary reptile fencing would be installed around the areas retained as open spaces during construction work. Proposed species rich grassland will provide replacement and enhanced reptile habitat.
- 6.70 Mitigation and enhancement can be required by planning condition and this will prevent significant harm to wildlife and the limited biodiversity interest in the site.

Historic Environment and Archaeology

- 6.71 The site is not within a conservation area. It does in part adjoin the East Hanney conservation area (the easterly of the two conservation areas). There are no listed buildings or any other designated heritage assets on the site or adjacent. No listed building or scheduled ancient monument will be directly affected by this development.
- 6.72 The applicant has provided heritage statements assessing the impact for designated heritage assets including listed buildings, the East Hanney conservation area and the A338. Local residents and the Parish Council have expressed concerns for the setting of the conservation area.
- 6.73 Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Considerable importance and weight should be given to this requirement.
- 6.74 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF confirms that *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be”*. The NPPF adds at paragraph 133 that proposals causing substantial harm to or

total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset should be refused unless the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF explains that less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

- 6.75 Policy HE4 of the adopted local plan seeks to protect the setting of listed buildings. In this case it is important to consider the impact on the settings of listed buildings which the NPPF defines 'setting' as *"The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral"*.
- 6.76 The closest listed buildings are the grade II Pound Croft House beside the A338 some 90m north of the site and grade II listed Tudor Cottage, The Green some 50m north west of the A338 junction with Main Street. Consideration has to be given to the impact for the settings of these listed buildings which is the surroundings in which they are experienced.
- 6.77 Pound Croft House is north of the La Fontana restaurant but has vehicular access from Steventon Road. There are no direct views from public vantage points in which this grade II listed building is experienced in the context of the site with tree coverage and fencing restricting views from Steventon Road of the listed building and its garden. Its setting is defined by the adjacent restaurant and developments to the east. This proposal illustrates the retention of the present open space to the south of the La Fontana restaurant with green spaces on the northern boundary of the site. The change to the A338 alignment would have no impact on the setting of this listed building. The impact on the setting of Pound Croft Cottage is negligible and certainly less than substantial.
- 6.78 Tudor Cottage is on The Green within the village and separated from the A338 and its junction with Main Street by existing dwellings. This listed building is experienced from The Green and not from the application site, there being no present intervisibility from the field to this site and vice versa. The route of the A338 is to be realigned and from the new route there would be some limited intervisibility with Tudor Cottage between existing dwellings and screened by the tree on The Green at the junction of Main Street and the A338. Retaining the open spaces and creation of new open space and provision of planting would further protect the setting of this listed building and without this new space and without planting the effect on the setting of Tudor Cottage is considered negligible and less than substantial.
- 6.79 There are a number of other listed buildings within East Hanney. Their settings are not experienced from the site or any view across the site.
- 6.80 Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this case considerable importance and weight is given to the desirability of protecting or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.81 Policy HE1 of the adopted local plan seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The north western corner of the application site adjoins the south eastern edge of the East Hanney conservation area with the boundaries being contiguous for approximately 150m in front of the La Fontana

restaurant to the A338/Main Street junction and south beside Yew Tree House and St James Barn which border the A338.

- 6.82 The immediate setting of the eastern edge of the conservation area is eroded by the proximity of the A338 and its attendant traffic and noise. The setting is also affected by the A338/Steventon Road junction. Realigning the A338 will be an enhancement. The addition of an open space illustrated on the master plan submitted, compliments and enhances the area around the A338/Main Street junction which forms the appearance of a village green.
- 6.83 The rural setting of the eastern edge of the conservation area is not considered to have a significant or defining role in the designation of the conservation area. In this sense I agree with the applicant's historic consultant in that the significance of the conservation area is primarily derived from the collective sum of the architectural and historic qualities of the buildings and spaces within the designated area which contribute to its special character and appearance. With limited views into and of the eastern edges of the conservation area from east of the A338, this site does not have a significant role in defining the setting of the conservation area. Any perception of impact of this proposal on the setting of the conservation area is limited to the footpath at the southern edge of the site and in those views the edge of the conservation area is masked by existing vegetation beside the A338. There is a benefit in creating open space against its boundary and realignment of the A338 off the boundary. The less than substantial harm needs to be considered against the public benefits of the proposal as expected by paragraph 134 of the NPPF.
- 6.84 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. At the request of the County Council archaeologist the applicant has undertaken a geophysical survey of the site and intrusive investigation to establish the significance and likelihood of archaeological interest. Following this investigation I note that the County Council archaeologist has no objection subject to conditions requiring implementation of a staged programme of archaeological investigation and any mitigation to be undertaken in advance of development. It seems there was evidence of ridge and furrow but this has been ploughed out.
- 6.85 Objections have been received relating to the A338 being the line of a Roman Road and ham caused by the loss of its present line. No evidence has been produced that confirms the present line of the A338 is the line of the Roman Road; historical mapping is inconclusive and your conservation officer suggest it is conjectural. The A338 is not a heritage asset as defined by the NPPF
- 6.86 The line of the present A338 is illustrated as being retained but the road becomes in part a footway/cycleway with the remainder potentially forming an access road to a pocket of proposed housing and a smaller section becoming open space. The present route of the A338 can remain and marked clearly. The A338 is not a heritage asset as defined by the NPPF and I give less weight to this possible impact and any harm is to be balanced against the benefits of the scheme.

Viability, affordable housing and Section 106 contributions

- 6.87 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.

6.88 The NPPG provides further guidance on how to apply the tests mentioned above and notes the following:

1. Planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of development which benefits local communities and supports the provision of local infrastructure.
2. Planning obligations should not be sought where they are clearly not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
3. Planning obligations must be fully justified and evidenced. Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, planning obligations should not prevent development from going forward.

Recreation/sports Provision

6.89 Additional population will increase pressure on existing facilities in the village and at Wantage/Grove. It is reasonable to request contributions towards their improvement as no provision is being made as part of this proposal. The sums requested are set against planned schemes. The amounts sought are proportionate to this development based on 200 dwellings. The amounts would fall if fewer dwellings are ultimately permitted.

Parish Council Requests

6.90 The Parish Council has requested contributions as follows:

1. Ownership and future management of land sufficient for 2 full-sized sports pitches and a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), parking and pavilion/council building contained within or to the edge of the site.
2. Section 106 allocation totalling £350,000, comprising:
 - a. Approximately £100,000 to improve and extend the Hanney War Memorial Hall.
 - b. Approximately £60,000 to build a new pavilion/clubhouse and parish council office structure alongside on the new sports pitch (as requested in item 1 above).
 - c. Approximately £50,000 to renovate and update the parish church, St James the Great, West Hanney
 - d. Approximately £35,000 to extend the Community shop
 - e. Reinstatement of the mobile library visit.
 - f. Approximately £35,000 to build and install a MUGA (as requested in item 1 above).
 - g. Approximately £70,000 to be split between local sporting and community groups and clubs as appropriate, including:
 - i. Football (3 local clubs, including youth)
 - ii. Tennis
 - iii. Cricket
 - iv. Scouts and Guides
 - v. Indoor sports
 - vi. Playground equipment
 - vii. Community clubs (such as History, bridge, drama etc)

6.91 Officers have sought clarification on these requests bearing in mind guidance in the NPPF and NPPG mentioned above. The development could place additional pressure on the services and infrastructure mentioned but it is unclear how the requests are fairly

and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Leisure, recreation and sport contributions requested by the District Council's leisure team have been justified and are proportionate and cover items b, f and g of the Parish Council requests. The County Council is the provider of library services and has not requested a contribution towards mobile library reinstatement. The Parish Council request in this respect is not considered justified or necessary to make the application acceptable.

Police

- 6.92 Thames Valley police has requested £28,914 towards staff set up, vehicles, ANPR cameras, and premises. Very limited detail has been provided as to how this request relates directly to this proposal is provided and it appears the contribution would be pooled towards policing costs and not directly relevant to this proposal. In addition, pooling restrictions affect ANPR, vehicles, and mobile IT. The request is not considered justified in planning terms.

Education

- 6.93 The County Council was asked to clarify its initial objection to understand its severity. In re-assessing the proposal the County Council has now raised no objection and whilst it has highlighted concerns with regard to capacity it has sought a financial contribution towards primary school expansion. The primary school figure is based on a cost of £21,888 per pupil at 3rd quarter 2015 prices which then justifies a contribution of £1,181,952 at 3rd quarter 2015 prices although this figure may change depending on the number of dwellings permitted, their mix and land costs for school expansion. The County Council's request is justified in increasing pressure for new primary school places, reasonable and proportionate to this development. The applicant and land owner has offered to set aside land adjacent to the site which can be safeguarded for a new primary school. This 'good will' gesture has been put to the County Council for their comment and any response will be included in the addendum report. Officer opinion is this would not appear to be necessary to make the proposal acceptable.
- 6.94 A secondary school request is reasonable to mitigate for increased pupils from this development and to provide a 1,200 pupil school at the Grove airfield site rather than the 600 pupil school that this authority has resolved to permit. Should the cost of providing the new school prove to be less than the sum requested (£1,049,706 at 3rd Quarter 2012 PUBSEC tender price index).
- 6.95 The SEN request of £33,722 is towards Fitzwaryn school in Wantage based on an increase of 1.1 pupil. It is noted that there have been some 56 previous contributions agreed towards SEN improvements in the district. Furthermore, in response to application no. P15/V2222/O which is another housing application under consideration, OCC advise a contribution towards Fitzwaryn school is not requested due to pooling restrictions. Therefore, this request is not supported by officers.

Transport

- 6.96 The public transport request is justified in seeking to improve services through the village and in seeking to provide a service along Steventon Road which could make access to employment opportunities at Milton Park and Didcot more accessible. Indicative location for bus stops are shown on the access plan. It is reasonable to expect the bus stops to be sheltered and maintained. Two sheltered bus stops should be provided beside the A338 and on the Steventon Road.
- 6.97 The County Council has also sought financial contributions of £9,960 towards increased book stock at Grove library and £41,800 towards adult day care at Wantage day centre. It is advised book stock would need to be increased by 2 volumes per resident based on £20 per resident at 2012 prices. No plan has been put in place to

Vale of White Horse District Council – Planning Committee – 25 November 2015

deliver this expectation, timescales and intent. No evidence has been provided to justify this figure. I am not convinced the request is reasonable or necessary to make this development acceptable. According to this Council's records at least 5 financial contributions have been sought for Wantage social, health and day care facilities. The request is considered prevented by the pooling restriction.

6.98 The application provides for 40% affordable dwellings.

6.99 The following developer contributions have been requested. These contributions are considered fair and proportionate:-

Vale of White Horse District Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
A new AGP training area/MUGA on the memorial grounds, East Hanney	£13,344
Cricket facilities in East Hanney	£6,390
Football pitch improvements and provision in East Hanney	£31,888
New rugby facilities at Grove RFU	£7,963
Sports pavilion and/or changing facility improvements or new provision in East Hanney	£56,677
Rugby pavilion extension at Grove RFU	£9,793
Youth sport in East Hanney including Parish Council plans for a BMX trail	£47,226
Tennis in East Hanney	£42,064
New sports hall at Mably Way, Wantage	£104,109
New swimming pool facility at Mably Way, Wantage	£80,431
Bin collection and provision on site	£34,000
War Memorial hall expansion	£100,000 (further justification required)
Community shop expansion	£35,000 (further justification required)
St James the Great church	£50,000 (further justification required)
Public open space Maintenance (if not management company)	£622,934
Play equipment maintenance (if not management company)	£52,800
Monitoring	£4,750
Total	£1,299,399
Oxfordshire County Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
New secondary school at Grove airfield site	£1,049,706
St James primary school expansion	£1,181,952
Bus services through East Hanney including a service via Steventon Road to Didcot	£169,500
Bus stop provision including shelters and on-going maintenance	£40,000
Monitoring	£8,803

Total	£2,02449,961
Overall Total	£3,749,360

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). These economic benefits outweigh the limited economic benefits this site has in being agricultural land.
- 7.3 The scheme would have a social role as it will provide additional housing that the District needs together with much needed affordable housing. The proposal can provide infrastructure improvements such as an improved bus service, enhanced recreation and sporting facilities which in turn could benefit existing residents of East Hanney.
- 7.4 The proposal has an environmental role including providing housing in a reasonably accessible location, biodiversity enhancements, provision of public open spaces, new grasslands and tree planting. The re-alignment of the A338 from the boundary of the conservation area is an enhancement. Set against this are substantial localised landscape and visual impacts including change to the size of the village with the spread of development to the east, loss of some trees and parts of hedgerows and less than substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets.
- 7.5 The Council does not have a 5-year land supply. It is in the public interest that housing is provided to meet need acknowledged in the District. The economic and social roles of this development are in the public interest and these wider benefits are considered to outweigh the environmental harm identified. Considerable weight is given to the less than substantial harm to heritage assets including the setting of the conservation area. The proposal includes enhancement to the conservation area setting in realigning the A338 away from part of its boundary. On the evidence available and my own assessment I am not convinced the limited harm is outweighed by the public benefits of this proposal which include economic investment and provision of housing needed in the district including affordable housing.
- 7.6 The impacts of the proposal are not considered unreasonably adverse and it is considered the harm does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits,

when assessed against the NPPF as a whole. 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 subject to:

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

2: Conditions as follows:

- 1. Commencement of development – 12 months after reserved matters approval**
- 2. Reserved matters to be submitted within 18 months of the outline consent**
- 3. Landscaping scheme required**
- 4. Landscaping implementation**
- 5. Tree protection to be provided**
- 6. On site open space provision**
- 7. On site open space management**
- 8. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed and implemented**
- 9. Foul drainage strategy to be agreed and implemented prior to occupation**
- 10. Water supply implemented prior to occupation**
- 11. Bus stop with shelters provision and locations to be agreed**
- 12. Vehicular access details to be agreed**
- 13. Carriageways to be provided prior to works on dwellings**
- 14. Provision of footways and cycleways to be provided**
- 15. Archaeological watching brief**
- 16. Implementation of a programme of archaeological work**
- 17. Construction method statement & traffic management plan to be agreed**
- 18. Bat box provision**
- 19. Ecological construction method statement**
- 20. Landscape and ecological management plan**
- 21. Further noise survey and mitigation to be agreed**
- 22. Further air quality survey and mitigation to be agreed**
- 23. Slab levels to be agreed**
- 24. Street lighting scheme to be approved**

Informatives

- 1. Market housing mix to complement the SHMA**
- 2. Affordable housing mix to accord with housing team requirements**
- 3. Bird nesting**

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