

APPLICATION NO.	P15/V2175/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	OUTLINE
REGISTERED	09.09.2015
PARISH	EAST HANNEY
WARD MEMBER	Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Lagan Homes
SITE	Land West nursery, Steventon Road, East Hanney
PROPOSAL	Residential development of 39 dwellings on land off Steventon Road (As amended by drawings and information accompanying agent's letter dated 5 January 2016)
AMENDMENTS	One – layout changes, increase of unit number by two and provision of affordable housing as above
OFFICER	Peter Brampton

SUMMARY

This application comes to Committee due to an objection from East Hanney Parish Council and the number of letters received from local objectors. The application seeks full planning permission for the provision of 39 dwellings.

The main issues to consider in determining the application are:

- Whether the principle of development is acceptable
- Whether the proposal is suitable to meet the district's five year housing supply deficit in terms of the sustainability of the site
- The impact of the development on the character of the area and wider landscape, which forms part of the Lowland Vale
- Whether the design, layout and materials of the scheme can provide a high quality housing scheme
- Whether the scheme will mitigate impacts on flood risk, sewer capacity and water supply
- Whether the scheme will provide an appropriately wide range of affordable and market housing
- Whether the scheme will provide necessary infrastructure contributions

This is a greenfield site beyond the built limits of East Hanney that benefits from an extant outline consent for the erection of 35 dwellings on the land.

The principle of housing on this site is considered to be acceptable, particularly in light of the extant consent and the lack of a five year land supply. Government advice in the NPPF is also relevant as it is considered more up to date and relevant to the assessment of this scheme than the housing policies of the adopted Local Plan 2011 and the emerging Local Plan Part One 2031.

Given the extant outline consent, there are no objections about the impact on the landscape character of the area, which is considered to be localised. The proposal is considered to provide a high quality development that accords with the principles of the Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015.

Through the use of Grampian style conditions, the impact of this development on flood risk, sewer capacity and water supply can be mitigated.

Following the submission of amended plans, the scheme will provide for a policy compliant level of affordable housing. The market housing is unduly biased towards larger units due to perceived viability issues and, since the viability case has not been proven to the council's satisfaction, this does weigh negatively in the planning balance.

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 to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, which is the test within the NPPF that must be applied to this proposal.

Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure the affordable housing and the fully justified developer contributions towards key local infrastructure.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application relates to a single field on the eastern outskirts of East Hanney. It is around 2.3 hectares in size, with access via a field gate that opens onto Steventon Road, which runs to the south of the site. The field has most recently been used for the grazing of horses but has a historical agricultural use.
- 1.2 A strong boundary of trees defines the limits of the site, particularly along Steventon Road. The site itself is largely featureless.
- 1.3 To the north of the site lies a small industrial estate. Beyond that lies a housing estate that has recently been extended by fifteen dwellings, with a further extension having secured full planning permission in summer 2014, which is now being implemented. Along the western boundary lies a field known as Crown Meadow. In 2013, the applicants received planning permission for the erection of 25 houses on this land. This application is designed to appear as a second phase of that development, which is now nearing completion.
- 1.4 Also to the west lies a couple of detached dwellings which benefit from large rear gardens. To the east lies a plant nursery and other isolated buildings. To the south lies open countryside.
- 1.5 The A338 runs along the western boundary of Crown Meadow, with the historic core of East Hanney beyond. The redevelopment of Crown Meadow incorporates a pedestrian crossing across the A338, which this scheme would also benefit from.
- 1.6 East Hanney is one of the larger villages of the district, benefiting from a primary school, shops, a regular bus service and recreation facilities.
- 1.7 A location plan is **attached** as Appendix One.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This is a full application seeking planning permission for 39 dwellings. This follows a previous outline application for 35 houses on the site that was allowed on appeal in January 2015. The council did not contest this appeal, which was submitted against non-determination, rather than a refusal of permission.
- 2.2 Following negotiations between officers and the applicant, the application has been amended to provide 40% affordable housing, where no affordable units were proposed initially. The introduction of more smaller units to meet local demand for affordable housing has allowed an increase in the total number of units from 37 to 39.

- 2.3 The application has also been amended to address concerns about the layout of the development and potential conflicts between some of the units and adjacent trees that are now subject of a Tree Preservation Order.
- 2.4 Access to the site will be taken from Steventon Road along the southern boundary.
- 2.5 The proposed layout includes a central spine road from which a number of private drives provide access to the housing. The site includes a large area of public open space in the northeastern corner of the site. The affordable units are provide in two clusters close to the eastern and western boundaries of the site.
- 2.6 Parking is generally provided on-plot on private driveways or within garages. The affordable houses are served by front parking courts. The site includes a footpath link with the adjacent Crown Meadow site which will offer pedestrians and cyclists the quickest route into the main part of East Hanney. A footpath link is also proposed in the southeast corner of the site that will potentially link this scheme to one that benefits from outline planning permission to the east (planning Ref: P15/V0898/O) for up to 40 dwellings.
- 2.7 The initial application did not offer any affordable housing, as the applicant contended the provision of such units would leave the scheme commercially unviable. The council contracted BNP Paribas to review the confidential financial information provided by the applicant. BNP Paribas formed the view that this site could accommodate 40% affordable housing whilst offering a competitive commercial return. After further negotiations, the applicants have accepted this stance and offer a policy compliant level of affordable housing, as well as financial contributions to local infrastructure. These issues are discussed in more detail in later sections of this report.
- 2.8 The following documents have been submitted in support of the application:
- Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Affordable Housing Statement
 - Landscape and Visual Recommendations
 - Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan
 - Arboricultural Method Statement
 - Ecological Appraisal
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
 - Ground Investigation Phase One report
 - Historic Environment Desk-based assessment
 - Transport Statement
 - Utilities Statement
 - Foul Water Strategy

Extracts from the current application drawings are **attached** at Appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 3.1 Below is a summary of the responses received to both the original plans and the amendments. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

East Hanney Parish Council	Objects to the application for the following main reasons, taken from the Executive Summary accompanying the main letter of objection:
----------------------------	--

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 27 January 2016

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed design and materials are out of keeping with the character of the village • Overdevelopment of the site • Lack of provision for safe pedestrian crossing of A338 • Proposed access is unsafe • Current infrastructure cannot accommodate further housing growth – particularly sewers, water supply and local roads • Increased light pollution • Increased flood risk • Lack of information on drainage strategy • Lack of access to employment • Lack of access to adjacent development • Open space is likely to suffer from standing water and should be considered unusable <p>In response to the amendment, the Parish Council have maintained their objection, which is attached in full as Appendix 3.</p>
Neighbours	<p>Five letters of objection have been received from neighbours. The main points are concern can be summarised thus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foul sewer capacity • Increased flooding • Lack of local infrastructure – particularly schools, retail, employment, GPs • Increase in traffic on local roads • Tree protection
Oxfordshire County Council Highways	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 106 contribution requests to improving frequency of bus services in East Hanney. £847.50 per dwelling requested, totalling £33,052.50 • Section 106 contribution request for £2,000 to improve bus stops near the site • Section 278 agreement to provide basic bus stop infrastructure • Conditions covering Travel Information pack, car and cycle parking, estate roads, visibility splays, Travel Plans, construction traffic management plan and drainage requested
Oxfordshire County Council Archaeology	<p>No objections</p>
Oxfordshire County Council Education	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 106 contribution of £183,235 to expansion of St James CE Primary school requested • No Section 106 contributions are requested to secondary school infrastructure due to concerns of pooling of financial contributions as outlined in Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 • No Special Educational Needs education contribution is requested due to concerns of pooling of financial contributions as outlined in Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 27 January 2016

Oxfordshire County Council Property	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 106 contribution of £2.342 is requested to local library book stock Section 106 contributions towards the local library itself, the central library, waste management, the museum resource centre and adult day care are not requested due to concerns of pooling of financial contributions as outlined in Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010
Oxfordshire County Council Minerals and Waste	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site lies in an area underlain by sand and gravel, of which the quality is believed to be poor and the area is not identified for mineral working in the existing or emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan
Contaminated Land Officer	No objections
Thames Water Development Control	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests Grampian style condition relating to foul sewers requiring a drainage strategy to be agreed prior to work commencing and for the agreed strategy to be implemented prior to occupation No conditions required related to surface water drainage Requests Grampian style condition relating to water supply strategy to be agreed prior to work commencing and for the agreed strategy to be implemented prior to occupation
Environment Agency	No comments
Drainage Engineer	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests pre-commencement conditions relating to strategy for surface water drainage from the site and strategy for foul drainage
Leisure	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 106 contributions in relation to local sport and recreation facilities requested and maintenance of on-site open space if adopted by the Parish.
Countryside Officer	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition necessary to secure biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement in line with proposals of Ecological appraisal accompanying the application
Housing	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirms mix of housing and tenure types needed for a policy compliant provision of affordable housing
Urban Design Officer	<p>No overall objection following receipt of amended plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about lack of natural surveillance of pedestrian link between site and Crown Meadow development and the potentially overly-dominant street presence of the pumping

	<p>station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify role of public open space
Landscape Architect	<p>No overall objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection with regard to landscape and visual impact. • Lack of information on hard and soft landscaping and will need to be covered by condition
Forestry Officer	<p>No overall objections following receipt of amended plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Preservation Order (TPO) has been on the most important trees within and adjacent to the site
Waste Management	<p>No objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 106 financial request towards provision of wheeled bins for each house requested • General comments on council's waste contract provided

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 P13/V2266/O – Appeal against non-determination allowed (13/01/2015)

Outline application for 35 houses and new access to Steventon Road (as clarified by topographical survey accompanying agent's e-mail of 20 November 2013 and amended drawings and clarified by contamination questionnaire, archaeology report and planning statement all accompanying agent's letter of 19 February 2014 and drainage information accompanying agent's email of 3 June 2014)

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
HE10	Archaeology
NE9	Lowland Vale

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

- Affordable Housing – July 2006
- Flood Maps and Flood Risk – July 2006
- Planning and Public Art – July 2006
- Institution of Highways Transportation guidelines for journeys on foot (2000)

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012

5.5 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)

5.6 Neighbourhood Plan

The East Hanney Neighbourhood Plan received area designation in 2015. To date, no neighbourhood plan has been submitted to this council for consideration and no weight can be attached to any draft policies.

5.7 Environmental Impact

This site falls below the screening thresholds outlined in Schedule Two of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 and so the council is not required to screen this proposal for the need for an Environmental Statement.

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 and future living conditions
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. Archaeology
14. Developer Contributions

The Principle of Development

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan for this application 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. As of March 2015, the Council can demonstrate a 4.2 year supply of housing land.
- 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. 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. Nonetheless, this application still needs to be considered against the NPPF and its presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 14). Sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through the decision making process. This means that the adverse impacts of a development would need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal is to be refused.
- 6.6 The relevant housing policies of the adopted and emerging Local Plans hold limited weight in the light of the lack of a five year housing supply. Having a five year supply is considered an essential part of sustainable development within the NPPF. Thus, this proposal is acceptable in principle unless adverse impacts can be identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Both the benefits and negative impacts of this proposal are discussed in detail in later sections of this report.
- 6.7 Furthermore, it is important to remember that an extant outline consent for the erection of 35 dwellings on this site remains (See Para 4.1). Although this application is a

stand-alone proposal, it shares close links with that outline scheme, including the access for which detailed approval was secured at outline stage.

Cumulative Impact

- 6.8 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.
- 6.9 East Hanney has been subject to a number of planning applications for housing development in recent times. Application P15/V0343/O resolved to grant 55 dwellings, application P13/V2608/FUL permitted 16 dwellings, application P11/V2103 permitted 15 dwellings whilst the Crown Meadow development of 25 dwellings referenced above was permitted under application P13/V0381/FUL. The emerging Local Plan proposes to allocate 200 dwellings on land south of Summertown Road. At the meeting of this committee on 25 November 2015, an application for 197 houses on this emerging allocation site was refused. At that same meeting, an application for 200 houses on the land south of Steventon Road (opposite this site) was also refused.
- 6.10 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

- 6.11 Paragraph 17 of the NPPF encourages the effective use of land by reusing sites that have been previously developed (brownfield land) providing that it is not of high environmental value. This is a greenfield site, being agricultural land most recently used for grazing. The Natural England agricultural land classification broadly classifies agricultural land around East Hanney as Grade 3 – “Good to Moderate”. This application would result in the loss of 2.3 hectares of Grade 3 agricultural land from production and this does weigh in the planning balance. The amount of development planned for the village will cause further loss of agricultural land from production.
- 6.12 In an area such as the Vale of White Horse where there is a relatively limited supply of previously developed sites and a significant under-supply of housing, it is inevitable that some greenfield sites and agricultural land will be lost. There is some limited harm from this site being taken out of agricultural production, but this harm has already been accepted through the granting of outline permission in 2015. This limited harm should be weighed against the benefits of this 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. The pedestrian link from this site into the adjacent Crown Meadow development is crucial in allowing residents of this development more direct access to the village, via a pedestrian crossing across the A338 that will be provided as part of the Crown Meadow scheme. This scheme will provide for new bus stops, potentially on the A338 and Steventon Road. The precise locations of the bus stops would be discussed between developer, Highways Authority and the local bus operator. However, they will be within tolerable walking distances from this site, whilst not making accessibility from existing housing undue. Local bus services provide regular access to Grove, Wantage and Oxford. It is understood that the County Council believe there is potential for a bus service along Steventon Road, which could link Easy Hanney to Milton Park and other employment opportunities

- 6.15 Within East Hanney, there is a range of services reasonably close to the site. Using the access through Crown Meadow and across the A338, the primary school is 1.4 kilometres away, the shop and community hall 1.2 kilometres, allotments 1.1 kilometres and The Black Horse public house 850 metres away. La Fontana, which is a restaurant, is closer, although no direct footpath link along Steventon Road exists at the moment. Officers accept that the walking distances to key facilities in the village are largely greater than 400 metres, which is the desirable distance outlined in the Institution of Highways Transportation guidelines for journeys on foot (published 2000). These guidelines do indicate that distances up to 800 metres are acceptable and 1,200 metres (1.2 kilometres) is a preferred maximum.
- 6.16 The issue of access from this site to the services and facilities of the village was a point of discussion during the assessment of the previous application. There, it was agreed that, subject to linking this site to Crown Meadow for pedestrian and cycle access, the distances involved were reasonable, and comparable to existing housing within the village. In determining that appeal, the Inspector raised no issue over access to services.
- 6.17 Overall, officers are satisfied that this site benefits from acceptable access to services and facilities within East Hanney and residents will be able to enjoy regular bus services to local service centres.

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 6.18 Following the submission of amended plans, the application makes provision for 40% affordable housing which accords with Policy H17 of the adopted local plan. The proposed mix for the affordable units is set out below.

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	Total
Rent	0	8	3	0	11
Shared Ownership	0	0	4	0	4
Total	0	8	7	0	15

- 6.19 This proposed mix differs slightly from that requested from the council’s housing officer, who requested three 2-bed shared ownership houses and one 3-bed shared ownership unit. However, the deviation is not considered significant.
- 6.20 Policy H16 of the Adopted Local Plan requires 50% of houses to have two beds or less. However, as stipulated at paragraph 47 of the NPPF this policy is out of date as it is not based on recent assessments of housing need. The Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) is the most recent assessment and estimates the following open market dwelling requirement by number of bedrooms (2011 to 2031) for the District:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	Total
SHMA %	5.9%	21.7%	42.6%	29.8%	100%
SHMA Expectation no’s	1.4	5.2	10.2	7.2	24
Proposed Nos	0	0	7	17	24

- 6.21 Set against the SHMA expectations, there is a clear bias within the market mix to larger private units. The applicants’ justification for this relates to the viability issues

outlined in previous sections. It is understood that there are significant abnormal costs with the construction of this development, particularly related to drainage, public sewers and foundations. Whilst there was some doubt over the justification behind the precise level of these assumed additional costs, officers', from their own knowledge of the site, are satisfied that there are challenges with this site. During the processing of the outline application in 2014, the applicant at the time challenged the inclusion of this site within Flood Zone 2 of the Environment Agency Flood Maps. This was successful but surface water remains a challenge for building on this site. Similarly, significant upgrades to the local foul sewer network are required to serve development on this side of the village. These issues are likely to increase construction costs, although the precise amounts remain in dispute.

- 6.22 In reviewing the financial information accompanying the application, BNP Paribas concluded that, based on a housing mix more heavily weighted towards larger units than is now proposed, that this scheme can afford to provide 40% affordable housing and Section 106 contributions and still offer a competitive return to the developer. The developer has contested some of the conclusions of the report, but has agreed to provide 40% affordable housing, fifteen units on site with a commuted sum to make up the part unit necessary to achieve 40%.
- 6.23 The applicant has confirmed verbally that they are not willing to accommodate a SHMA compliant housing mix on this site as they consider would render the scheme unviable. The council has been unable to sensitivity test the impact of a SHMA compliant housing mix on the viability of this development. However, a greater proportion of smaller market units would have some impact on the overall return to the developer.
- 6.24 The PPG states, *"In making decisions, the local planning authority will need to understand the impact of planning obligations on the proposal. Where an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the planning obligation would cause the development to be unviable, the local planning authority should be flexible in seeking planning obligations."*
- 6.25 In this particular case, the applicant has demonstrated that viability issues do exist with this scheme. However, the council is not wholly satisfied that these issues are so severe that a SHMA compliant market housing mix cannot be achieved. Thus, the lack of smaller market houses must weigh negatively in the planning balance. Similarly, the policy compliant provision of affordable housing must weigh heavily in favour of the proposal in the balancing exercise.

Design and Layout

- 6.26 The NPPF provides that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment (paragraph 60). It gives considerable weight to good design and acknowledges it is a key component of sustainable development.
- 6.27 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.
- 6.28 Policy H15 of the Local Plan requires densities of at least 30 dwellings to the hectare. Principle DG26 of the design guide states that density should be appropriate to the location. 39 dwellings on this site would represent a density of just under 17 dwellings a hectare. This is more consistent with development in East Hanney than the policy requirement. This is an edge of village location which justifies a lower density to

ensure that the scheme knits into the more rural character of the surroundings. Officers do not agree with the views of the parish council that this scheme represents an overdevelopment of the site.

- 6.29 The site layout is based around a single main access road from which private drives lead. Given the size of the site, this arrangement is acceptable. Active frontages are achieved throughout the development, with housing looking out over the internal roads, the public open space and onto Steventon Road. Through the submission of amended plans, officers have secured improvements to the natural surveillance of the footpath through to Crown Meadow and the footpath in the southeastern corner that could provide future links with development to the east. The link through to Crown Meadow remains somewhat unattractive, as pedestrians will pass alongside the foul pumping station and the sides of houses within the neighbouring development. However, it is a relatively short, straight, footpath so the security risk is limited. Overall, the amended layout is considered to provide a well-defined network of streets and dwellings that provides a coherent environment and a sense of enclosure, as required by Principles DG28 and DG35 of the Design Guide.
- 6.30 Parking is generally delivered on plot and so does not overly dominant the street scene. Rear to front access is provided for each plot, including mid-terrace dwellings. It is noted that such rear alleyways do contravene Secured By Design principles, but they do allow residents easy access from front to rear for bin collections. The layout provides for a good number of street trees, and details of these can be secured by condition.
- 6.31 East Hanney Parish Council considers the design and materials of the proposed development do not properly reflect the characteristics of the village. Officers accept this point but are mindful that, when complete, this development will be read closely with Crown Meadow. The house types proposed here are directly comparable to those built at Crown Meadow, which is to be expected given the developer is the same. Officers are satisfied with this approach and will condition materials as part of any consent. Officers consider that a good quality red brick and natural clay tiles would reflect the local area appropriately.
- 6.32 The house types themselves generally consist of 2 and 2 ½ storey buildings that are traditionally proportioned under pitched roofs. Dormer windows, porches, arched headers and integral garages are all used to add interest to the range of dwellings proposed.
- 6.33 Boundary detailing will be important, particularly as the return of a number of rear gardens face the public realm. In these instances, a brick wall using a brick comparable to those used in the construction of the housing will be necessary. Hard and soft landscaping proposals will be carefully conditioned as these treatments will have a key role in the overall success of the scheme. These proposals will need to include the foul pumping station to ensure that above ground apparatus is kept to a minimum given the prominent position of the station within the site, next to the link to Crown Meadow.
- 6.34 Subject to these conditions, and others as recommended at Section 8, officers are satisfied that this proposal will provide for a high quality development, which is a key part of sustainable development as defined by the NPPF.

Residential Amenity and future living conditions

- 6.35 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.

- 6.36 In submitting amended plans, the applicant has confirmed that all plots will benefit from adequate amenity space in line with the Design Guide requirements (Principle DG63). It is also noteworthy that the proposal over-provides on public open space against Local Plan requirements.
- 6.37 Back-back and back-to-side distances are generally in line with Design Guide requirements (There is a slight under provision against the standards between Plots 31 and 33). This is the case both within the scheme itself and with neighbouring housing such as Crown Meadow and the larger detached houses to the south and west of this site. Officers are satisfied this proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 6.38 The NPPF seeks to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (paragraph 109). This site falls within the Lowland Vale, which is a local landscape designation. Policy NE9 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the long, open views that characterise this part of the district. Paragraphs 7.67 and 7.68 of the Local Plan states, *“the long views over the patchwork quilt of fields, farms and village in the Vale are an essential part of the landscape quality of the District”* and that *“insensitively located or designed proposal could have an adverse impact on these open vistas and on the intrinsic qualities of the Lowland Vale.”*
- 6.39 In allowing the outline application, the Inspector has confirmed that the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable, and that landscape and visual impacts do not represent a reason to resist this principle in light of the lack of a five year supply. Accordingly, the council’s landscape architect has recorded no objections to the scheme.
- 6.40 Crucially, this detailed application follows the earlier outline consent by retaining the front boundary hedging with Steventon Road (save for some limited removal to achieve the new access). There is also an opportunity to enhance this important boundary planting. With this hedgerow in place, the overall impact of this proposal on the landscape becomes localised and the scheme will not interrupt the long views that characterise the Lowland Vale.
- 6.41 The Landscape Architect has identified that lack of detailed information on hard and soft landscaping proposals within the site. The choice of tree species will be important within the scheme, to reflect the verdant character of East Hanney.
- 6.42 Overall, officers are satisfied that the impact of this proposal on the landscape and local character is not so severe as to warrant objection.

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. The amended layout demonstrates that 4,353 square metres will be provided, which is approximately 19% of the residential area. Officers are mindful of local concern that the part of the site allocated for public open space will be affected by surface water, rendering it unusable, and this is discussed in the next section.
- 6.44 The need for a comprehensive landscaping strategy for hard and soft landscape works has been highlighted by both the council’s landscape architect and urban design officer

in previous sections.

- 6.45 There are no trees of particular interest within the internal part of the site. However, there are a significant number of mature and maturing trees around the boundaries of the site. Consequently, another key aspect of the amended plans has been to address the forestry officer's initial objection to the scheme, relating to the proximity of the proposed housing to trees along, in particular, the western boundary of the site. The primary concern was that certain units, particularly Units 26 and 37 (amended layout), were so close to trees on this boundary that future conflict would arise as new residents sought to prune the trees back to address shading concerns relating to their gardens. The perception of such large trees close to dwellings can also motivate pruning requests.
- 6.46 During the assessment of the planning application, the council's forestry officer has chosen to place a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the trees most affected by the proposed layout. This is because of the quality and long life expectancy of the trees, their amenity value beyond the confines of the site and the threat this development proposed to their longevity. As such, any future pruning works will require prior consent and the council can retain an appropriate level of control over such pruning to ensure the long term health of these trees is protected.
- 6.47 Furthermore, the amended plans do increase the separation between the houses and the affected trees, such that Plots 26 and 37 do enjoy larger gardens than normally required, with a good portion of each garden unaffected by the crown of the nearby tree(s).
- 6.48 There are similar potential conflicts with trees on the eastern boundary, including a group of mature Hornbeams. The conflict here is not so acute and the trees are not considered worthy of a TPO. Nonetheless, a carefully worded tree protection condition is necessary to ensure that all the important trees around the boundaries of the site are protected during construction and that provision is made to avoid future conflicts between these important landscape features and future residents of the development.

Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

- 6.49 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).
- 6.50 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.
- 6.51 The application has been supported by a Drainage and Flood Elevation Proposals document that references the high level drainage strategies submitted in support of the outline application. This identifies the need to raise the ground levels of the dwellings above the 1:1000 year flood event level. In doing so, there will be a loss of flood plain. It is proposed that the area of public open space will be excavated downwards to

mitigate this loss. There will also be a lined porous system underneath the roads of the development to accommodate excess rain water.

- 6.52 Generally, it is not acceptable to use public open space for flood attenuation. However, in this particular instance, officers are satisfied that the open space will not be left damp on a regular basis. The porous system is designed to capture run off water from the roofs and external areas of the developed part of the site. The amount of storage offered underneath the road will amply accommodate a 1 in 100 year storm event (with a 20% allowance for climate change). This storage is important as the low permeability of the soil prevents a soakaway system. The stored water will be discharged in a controlled manner into an existing ditch. The discharge rate will be no quicker than accepted greenfield rates (i.e. no quicker than existing).
- 6.53 As such, the public open space will only be need to accommodate surface water run-off in the event of a storm in excess of a 1 in 100 year event (with the 20% allowance for climate change). By its definition, such a storm event is unlikely to occur regularly and so the attenuation offered by the public open space remains a reserve option.
- 6.54 In consultation, the council's drainage engineer has raised no objections to the proposal, subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring detailed designs of the drainage scheme to be provided and agreed prior to commencement on site. Officers are satisfied that, with this condition, a sustainable drainage solution can be provided on the site that does not rely on regularly holding standing water within the open space.
- 6.55 Turning to foul drainage, Thames Water have identified a lack of capacity in the local sewer network to accommodate the additional flows from this development. This tallies with some of the responses received from local objectors. Therefore a Grampian style condition is necessary that requires the developer to agree upgrade works to the public sewer and implement them prior to first occupation. The pumping station referenced above already serves the properties within Crown Meadow (with Thames Water agreement) and can accommodate additional flows from this development. This pumping station will discharge foul flows into the public sewer in a controlled manner.
- 6.56 The PPG 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 therefore, a matter for Thames Water and the developer and not for this authority to adjudicate on.
- 6.57 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 effectively 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.
- 6.58 The PPG 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 drainage strategy discussed above covers this point and subject to the identified conditions, there are no concerns that this proposal will unduly increase the risk of surface or foul water flooding in the area.

6.59 Thames Water also identify that this proposal will negatively impact on fresh water supply in the village. Again, a Grampian style condition will require the developer to ascertain the likely impact of this proposal on supply and agree a mitigation strategy so as not to compromise the water supply received by existing or proposed residents. Officers are satisfied this condition is necessary to mitigate the impact of this development.

Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

6.60 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.

6.61 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.”*

6.62 The application is supported by a Transport Statement that builds on the information supplied at outline stage. As Highways Authority, Oxfordshire County Council did not object to the outline application and officers are satisfied the small increase in units proposed with this detailed application does not make a material difference to the overall conclusions about highway safety reached in respect of the outline application.

6.63 This proposal utilises the exact same access arrangement as approved at outline stage. This access opens onto Steventon Road at a point where sufficient visibility in both directions can be achieved. This conclusion holds when the access proposed to serve the residential development to the east at the nursery is considered. It is likely that the 30 MPH speed limit of Steventon Road will be extended eastwards to accommodate both this development and that at the nursery. Given the good visibility and intention to reduce traffic speeds at this point of Steventon Road, the access arrangements are acceptable. It is likely that a footpath will be provided along Steventon Road from the nursery site into this development to ensure all three sites are linked.

6.64 It is important to note that the junction between Steventon Road and the A338 may be upgraded as part of the overall highway improvement package associated with the Grove Airfield application. A similar improvement scheme to this junction was also proposed as part of the application on land south of Steventon Road. However, as the Grove Airfield application has not been determined, and the south of Steventon Road scheme was refused by this committee in November 2015, this application has been assessed based on the current junction arrangements. In that regard, the overall increase in traffic on local roads associated with this development has been found to be within acceptable tolerances.

6.65 Parking within the site is in line with Highway Authority standards, whilst adequate turning and manoeuvring spaces are provided within the internal road layout for larger vehicles. A condition covering bin provision will be necessary as it is not clear if refuse vehicles will be able to access all properties on private drives.

6.66 In consultation, the Highways Authority have confirmed no objections to the scheme,

reiterating the need for conditions in line with the appeal decision on the outline. These are summarised at Section 8 of this report. The Highways Authority have requested Section 106 contributions towards increasing the regularity of local bus services and the provision of bus stops in the vicinity of the site. These are considered necessary, proportionate and reasonable and will help mitigate the additional impact of this proposal on the highway network. A travel plan will also be required by condition.

- 6.67 Subject to the recommended conditions, there are no concerns this proposal will have a materially harmful impact on highway safety.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.68 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...”

- 6.69 In consultation, the council’s countryside officer has confirmed the ecological interest of the site is largely limited to the hedges and trees around the site boundaries. The need to retain these features has been highlighted in respect of landscape impact and tree protection in earlier sections of this report. Their ecological value strengthens their importance further.

- 6.70 The application is supported by an Ecological Assessment that proposes a number of mitigation measures such as the provision of bird boxes, the need for landscaping proposals to include foraging and nesting opportunities, the management of grassland and the use of low-level lighting. These are all supported by officers and a compliance condition can ensure their implementation.

Archaeology

- 6.71 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. In consultation, the County Archaeologist has confirmed there is no archaeological interest with this site, which is a conclusion borne out by trial trenches that were dug in support of the outline application.

Viability and Section 106 contributions

- 6.72 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.

- 6.73 Paragraph 204 of the NPPF also quotes this expectation. The NPPG provides further guidance on how to apply these tests and notes the following:

- i) Planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of development which benefits local communities and supports the provision of local infrastructure.
- ii) Planning obligations should not be sought where they are clearly not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- iii) Planning obligations must be fully justified and evidenced. Where affordable

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 27 January 2016

housing contributions are being sought, planning obligations should not prevent development from going forward.

- 6.74 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. Regard also need to be had to the restrictions of pooling of any financial contributions to no more than 5 schemes.
- 6.75 Due to pooling restrictions, the County Council have been unable to ask for financial contributions to secondary school expansion in the area, special educational needs accommodation or a range of property based contributions such as the museum resource centre or waste sites in the district.
- 6.76 The Parish Council have also asked for financial contributions to local projects, but only the scheme to restore and renovate the St James the Great church is considered to meet the above tests. This is consistent with the consideration of those same requests in respect of the two larger applications refused by committee in November.

Vale of White Horse District Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>	<i>Comments on justification</i>
Swimming Pool at Mably Way, Wantage	£16,288	Justified - project identified
Sports Hall at Mably Way, Wantage	£21,083	Justified - project identified
Tennis Courts in East Hanney	£7,782	Justified - project identified
MUGA at Memorial Ground in East Hanney	£11,439	Justified - project identified
Health and Fitness provision at Mably Way, Wantage	£19,640	Justified - project identified
Football pitch provision in East Hanney	£5,899	Justified - project identified
Cricket pitch provision in East Hanney	£2,885	Justified - project identified
Rugby pitch provision in East Hanney	£1,473	Justified - project identified
Clubhouse in East Hanney	£12,297	Justified - project identified
Football pitch maintenance in East Hanney	£6,701	Justified - project identified
Cricket pitch maintenance in East Hanney	£1,283	Justified - project identified
Rugby pitch maintenance in East Hanney	£1,812	Justified - project identified
Play Equipment provision in East Hanney	£4,669	Justified – policy requirement
Public Open Space maintenance	£115,659	Not justified – public open space will be passed to management company
Renovation and updating of St James the Great church	£10,000	Justified – project identified
Improvements to Memorial Hall and	£20,000	Not justified – need for

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 27 January 2016

community shop		contribution not demonstrated. Community shop will receive additional income from new trade.
Contributions to local sports teams/Scouts and Guides/Community Clubs	£25,000	Justified – but accommodated within above requests so not included in S106 total
Waste bin provision	£6,630 (£170 per unit)	Justified – money towards bin provision at each property that would be at the cost to the Council otherwise.
Public Art	£11,700 (£300 per unit)	Justified – proportionate contribution required by policy
Street Naming	TBC	Justified – proportionate contribution
Monitoring	£1,815	Justified – cost to the council involved in monitoring the S106.
Total VoWH package sought	£143,396	
Oxfordshire County Council (3Q15 indexed)	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>	
Primary Schools	£183,235	Justified – proportionate contribution to expansion of St James CE Primary School
Strategic bus services	£31,357.50	Justified – proportionate contribution to improving bus services easily accessed from site
Bus stop improvements	£2,000	Justified – specific to the development to facilitate bus stops outside the site.
Library book stock	£1,332.80	Not justified – not a necessary contribution to make scheme acceptable
OCC Monitoring	£3,750	Justified – monitoring costs.
Total County Council package sought	£220,342.50	
OVERALL S106 PACKAGE	£363,738.50	

Contribution per unit	£9,326.63	
-----------------------	-----------	--

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 should enhance the vitality and viability of existing local services and facilities in East Hanney. Through increasing the housing stock, it would contribute to an expansion of the local housing market and could potentially improve the affordability of open market housing. In the Highworth Road, Faringdon appeal case (proposed up to 94 dwellings) it is noted that the Secretary of State considered that the *"benefits of the scheme would include the provision of much needed market and affordable housing to contribute towards acknowledged substantial shortfalls, and would generate considerable economic benefits of the type arising from housing development"* and that he gave these benefits significant weight (application no. P13/V1366/O, appeal reference APP/V3120/A/13/2210891).
- 7.3 The scheme would have a social role as it will provide housing and affordable housing to meet the needs of present and future generations through the provision of a range of housing types and sizes and would meet the social dimension of sustainable development which should be afforded significant weight. Other social benefits will arise through the contributions to local infrastructure identified including towards local bus services and recreation and sport 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, new highway infrastructure, provision of public open spaces and new tree planting. This is achieved with extremely limited harm to the local landscape.
- 7.5 It is accepted that the proposal will have some adverse impacts. In particular, the market housing mix is unduly biased towards larger units and the viability case justifying that mix has not been proven to the council's satisfaction. The relationship between certain plots and boundary trees and hedging is less than desirable and is likely to require carefully managed pruning throughout the lifespan of each tree. Pedestrian and cycle access to the rest of the village is reliant on a rather poorly integrated footpath into adjacent development.
- 7.6 However, in view of the emphasis in the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing, the development is considered to amount to sustainable development, and whilst there will be some adverse effects, these do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, to which very substantial weight is attached. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure affordable housing and developer contributions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

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 both the county council and district council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and
2. Conditions as follows:
 1. Commencement within one year.
 2. Approved plans.
 3. Slab levels for all dwellings to be agreed.
 4. Samples of all materials to be agreed.
 5. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.
 6. Sustainable urban drainage system to be agreed.
 7. Travel plan to be agreed.
 8. Foul drainage strategy to be agreed.
 9. Water supply strategy to be agreed.
 10. Tree protection and pruning regime to be agreed.
 11. Landscaping scheme to be agreed.
 12. Implementation of landscaping scheme to be agreed.
 13. Boundary details to be agreed.
 14. Foul pumping station treatment to be agreed.
 15. Bicycle parking and bin storage to be agreed.
 16. Vehicular access as approved.
 17. Parking as approved.
 18. Turning spaces as approved.
 19. New estate roads to highway authority specification.
 20. No drainage to highway.
 21. No occupation until drainage schemes implemented in full.
 22. Garage accommodation to be retained.
 23. Ecology mitigation as approved.

Author: Peter Brampton
Tel No: 07717 271509
Email: peter.brampton@southandvale.gov.uk