

APPLICATION NO.	P16/V2868/RM
APPLICATION TYPE	Reserved matters
SITE ADDRESS	Land to the West of Longcot Road, Shrivenham
PARISH	Shrivenham
WARD MEMBER	Simon Howell Elaine Ware
APPLICANT	Taylor Wimpey
PROPOSAL	Reserved matters application following outline planning permission P13/V1514/O 'Outline application for residential development comprising up to 59 dwellings with associated highways works, landscaping and infrastructure improvements (As amended by Drawing Nos: 12.189/001 Revision A, 12.189/162 Revision B - "Concept Masterplan", 12.189/187 Revision B - "Illustrative layout", 12.189/221 Revision C - "Massing", 12.189/232 Revision D - "Landscape", 12.189/261 Revision C - "Movement", 12.189/901 - "Illustrative street elevation", 14326-08 - alternative access plan, TWEDP01 - easement diversion plan and as clarified by Ecological Surveys Report and Flood Risk Assessment all accompanying agent's letter dated 22 July 2014). (Amended Plans 2017 03 02).'
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that reserved matters are approved subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approved plans.**
- 2. PD removal – Classes A and B (plots 1 to 23 and plot 32)**
- 3. No side windows – plots 28 and 32.**
- 4. Implementation of landscaping scheme and maintenance.**
- 5. Development in accordance with great crested newt strategy.**
- 6. Development in accordance with travel plan.**
- 7. Development in accordance with arboricultural statement.**
- 8. Development in accordance with archaeology report.**
- 9. Locations of the amphibian friendly wildlife kerbs and gully pots to be agreed.**

The planning conditions and s106 agreement for the outline permission remain applicable.

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This is an application seeking approval of reserved matters subsequent to the grant of outline planning permission on appeal for up to 59 dwellings on this site.
- 1.2 Access to the site was permitted at outline stage. This submission is not an opportunity to reconsider access arrangements or traffic movements from the proposal. Likewise it is not an opportunity to revisit the principle of development. The reserved matters to be considered are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 1.3 The application site is on the southern edge of Shrivenham with access to Longcot Road. It is an open area of grass land with a footpath beside the southern boundary. A site location plan is included below:



- 1.4 The proposal includes single storey and two-storey dwellings accessed from a main spine road and private drives. The dwellings are separated from housing to the north (Vicarage Lane) by a planting belt some 5m wide. Open space is to the south adjoining the footpath and open fields. The layout plan is **attached** at Appendix 1. The plans have been revised seeking to address comments expressed by officers and interested parties.

2. SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS ON CURRENT SUBMISSION

- 2.1 A summary of the responses received to the current proposal is overleaf. The Parish Council and local resident's comments relate to the original and amended scheme. The technical responses summarised are the most up to date responses received. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk

Parish Council	<p>Object</p> <p>The objections may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous objections remain valid particularly those relating to design and layout. Also support the objections of residents • Lack of public consultation by the developer • Out of character with the pattern and form of housing in Vicarage Lane • Proposed house types are not characteristic of Shrivenham • Destroy the character of this part of the village • Houses are massed into the northern part of the site and close to Vicarage Lane dwellings • Terraced dwellings abutting 33 Vicarage Lane is not acceptable • Northern buffer should be widened and southern buffer narrowed • A maintenance plan for the northern buffer is needed • Loss of sight lines to the AONB • Inadequate pedestrian access is proposed along Longcot Road • Speeding traffic on Longcot Road • Inadequate parking – a space should be set aside for visitor parking • Construction traffic should be directed by Majors Road to and from the site • Development should not impose a covenant restricting the types of vehicles that can be parked, as this leads to parking issues elsewhere • Major changes to the scheme should not be made without agreement • Agree with the detailed comments made by neighbours
Ward Members	<p>Councillors Ware and Howell have written to make comments which may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing no longer needed now we have a five-year land supply and strategic allocations for Shrivenham • Access remains a concern even though agreed • Construction traffic should use Majors Road and should not travel through the village • All construction traffic must park on site • Little information for the buffer at the rear of Vicarage Lane including width, security, maintenance and safety of great crested newts • Significant visual and landscape impact

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding should not be exacerbated • Will the foul drainage condition on the outline permission still apply? • It would be preferable for phasing to be west to east rather than east to west • Affordable housing should be pepper potted; it seems to be grouped to the north • Better design and less intrusive development is needed
Local residents	<p>Objections have been received from or relating to 14 local addresses with the objections relating to the original and revised schemes. The objections may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amendments do not address previous objections raised • Overdevelopment. Density of development is out of keeping • Increased flooding • No drainage details provided. A scheme needs to prevent flooding and sewage problems and local residents should be consulted on the details • Adequate measures need to be provided to slow traffic – a 20mph speed limit should be set on Longcot Road • A pavement beside Longcot Road needs to be provided before dwellings are sold • Site should only accommodate single storey dwellings • Dangerous access on a bend • Is adequate access provided for emergency vehicles? • Not elderly or disabled friendly as bins need to be wheeled to collection points • 5m wide strip on the northern boundary has different names. It is not a newt corridor but a landscape buffer between the development and neighbours which is how it has been described by the developer in the past • It is unclear as to how the 5m buffer will be managed, how rubbish tipped in the area will be removed, will it be publicly accessible? Covenants need to be in place for fence maintenance - a better solution would be a wall. The buffer should be of variable width and deeper. 5m is inadequate to accommodate the planting proposed and the planting will take 20-25 years to be established and provide a buffer. Stock should be planted at 3.5-4.5m height

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Latest planting proposals for the 5m buffer are inadequate and it is difficult to see how effective the buffer might be• No details are provided that will prevent public access to the 5m northern buffer• Clarification is needed as to whether the 5m northern buffer is under the ambit of the s106 agreement• Overlooking of Vicarage Lane gardens partly due to the high density of development towards the northern boundary. Could the high density housing be to the south?• Overlooking between a summerhouse in the garden of 27 Vicarage Lane and the proposals• Lack of information on materials• Better to phase development from west to east• Garden boundary details are unclear• How will the landscape and biodiversity management strategy be implemented in the decades to come?• Appeal conditions need to be rigorously enforced• Ponds are unsafe• Affordable housing should be for local people and not sold off to absent landlords or rented to overseas students at the Defence Academy• Bungalows should be adjacent to existing bungalows• Higher density would be better to the south of the site and lower density and open spaces against Vicarage Lane gardens• A Construction Management Plan needs to protect the village from HGV's and white vans. Construction traffic must be parked on site. Construction traffic should be directed via the Watchfield roundabout, Majors Road and Longcot Road and not through the village• The 5m buffer on the north boundary should be the first part of the development and be planted with mature trees• Access to the 5m buffer would be needed to maintain buildings. All buildings should be set back from the buffer to allow access• Still concerned about the 5m buffer and fencing.• Confusion over boundary details proposed against the 5m buffer.• How can future residents be prevented from removing the fencing or putting in a gate to access the buffer? Who will replace the fencing once rotten?
--	--

- Hope mature trees will be planted in the 5m buffer (although one objector is concerned at the height to which planting could grow)
- The northern boundary buffer should be wider
- Landscape and biodiversity management plan lacks sufficient detail
- Cut off Great Crested Newts in Vicarage Lane ponds from areas to the south
- Loss of southerly views – the outline permission suggested vistas would be provided. These are not provided; proposal is not compliant with the outline permission
- Inadequate visibility at the site access
- Terraced housing behind 33 and 35 Vicarage Lane is an unnecessary juxtaposition and could be designed out of the scheme. It is also over dominant
- The commuted sum in the s106 is insufficient to manage the open spaces. If the open spaces are given over to a management company the s106 does not require the applicant to maintain the open spaces in accordance with the landscape management strategy submitted with the application.
- Concern at how roads will be managed if not adopted
- The proposed phasing of development could lead to construction compounds next to 33 Vicarage Lane which would be detrimental to amenity.
- Matters reserved by condition should be submitted with this application to allow full consideration.
- Set a precedent for further development south of the village.
- Applicant has not consulted village residents.
- Car parking dominated – cars would need to be moved to park and manoeuvre out of garages
- Inappropriate house types that are a pastiche of older buildings and do not reflect the individuality of neighbouring dwellings
- No need to fence off the newt ponds
- Unclear as to how the ponds will be made safe to prevent drowning
- No street lighting details provided
- Planning conditions on the outline permission need to be enforced
- Materials plan lacks detail of actual materials
- 35 Vicarage lane is not shown on the plans

Without prejudice to objections made one local resident

	<p>suggests conditions be imposed should permission be granted which;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove permitted development rights including loft conversions, chimneys and satellite dishes and aerials • Prevent side windows in plots 28 and 32 • Public access to the 5m northern buffer is not allowed • A planting plan for the 5m northern buffer should specify where each tree and trees species is to be planted and its height • The 5m northern buffer should be the first phase of the development and mature trees between 4.5m and 6.5m high planted • A 2m high wall and access gates be built and maintained along the boundary of the buffer • A health and safety risk assessment be undertaken for the ponds • Bins be provided for litter, dog waste and salt/grit <p>One local resident asks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that expert advice is taken for impact on Great Crested Newt • clarification on what is meant by affordable housing • will there be bungalows for elderly and wheel chair users
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p><u>Highways</u> No objection The proposals have been amended to address previous concerns. Content with the proposals</p> <p><u>Archaeology</u> No objection The archaeological written scheme of investigation for the initial archaeological evaluation satisfies our requirements.</p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u> No objection</p>
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection with regard to water infrastructure capacity. • A 125mm distribution crosses the site which must be located and protected during construction. • Running through the centre of the proposed developed are easements and wayleaves. These are Thames Water Assets and assurance is needed that they will not be affected by the

	proposed development.
Drainage engineer	No objection Recommends a condition addressing surface water drainage.
Urban Design officer	No objection Comments are provided by addressing points raised in respect of the pre-application layout. Points not considered fully addressed in the first set of application plans are provided below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong frontage to Longcot Road (avoid close boarded fences; could have private drives) • Plots 43 and 48 to turn the corners • Plot 50 to be a focal point not the garage • Parking area by plot 11 unsatisfactory • SUDS to be an attractive feature. Use landscaping to add visual interest. Open space seemed to work better in the pre-application proposal • Positive relationship needed between fronts and backs of plots 56 and 57 • Communal bin collection needs careful consideration
Landscape Officer and Forestry officer	Comments Recommend an alteration to the planting mix along the northern boundary. The specification is for Holly, Privet and Blackthorn but also needs to include Geulder Rose (<i>Viburnum oppulus</i>), Dog Rose (<i>Rosa canina</i>) and Dogwood (<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>). The incorporation of the play area into the wider POS now achieves a higher quality of design. The treatment of the grass area it is placed in will need to be subject to a more frequent mowing regime at a frequency of at least 6 per annum. The mown area should extend at least two thirds of the way to the boundary and reach almost as far as the area of marginal planting to the east. This will provide a useable open space fit for passive recreation. Recommend moving areas of native scrub mix (shown on the plan to the south of the marginal planting) nearer to the southern boundary and extended to include the area between the two footpath links
Countryside officer	No objection The proposed ponds are to be lined to ensure they retain water and provide alternative habitats for Great Crested Newt. The proposed hibernacula have been re-positioned within the fenced areas adjacent to the ponds as requested. The locations of the amphibian friendly wildlife

	kerbs and gully pots can be required by condition.
Forestry officer	<p>No objection No arboricultural implications.</p> <p><u>Condition</u> Compliance with tree protection plan</p> <p>(The Forestry officer has also combined further comments with those of the landscape officer – see above).</p>
Housing team	<p>No objection</p> <p>The location of affordable housing and house types are acceptable. The mix is reasonable.</p> <p>Demand has been identified to meet a specific need which could be addressed by combining two of the proposed bungalows to create a single 4 bed property. The tenure/type/size for affordable housing can be changed without the need for a Deed of Variation.</p> <p>Note the applicant does not want to change anything before planning committee. This can be revisited after approval is granted.</p>
Health and Housing (contamination)	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental site assessment report provided has identified the presence of marginally elevated arsenic concentrations within the shallow soils. In addition, it is noted that based on the gas monitoring carried out to date that the site would be characterised as green and that no gas protection measures are required. The applicant should provide further details on the proposed additional arsenic analysis and provide further comment on the ground gas assessment undertaken.</p> <p><i>Planning officer comment: Contamination is subject to condition 12 on the outline permission which will need to be complied with.</i></p>
Waste management team	<p>No objection</p> <p>Confirm clarification has been provided for the bin stores for plots 24 – 27.</p>

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 P13/V1514/O – outline planning permission refused for up to 59 dwellings. The application was refused on five grounds:

- Loss of grade 1 agricultural land
- Detrimental impact on the setting of St Andrew’s church
- Landscape and visual intrusion
- Inappropriate design

- Need for a s106 to secure affordable housing and financial contributions
- 3.2 A subsequent appeal was allowed on 19 February 2016. This approval permits the principle of up to 59 dwellings on the site and the means of access from Longcot Road.
- 3.3 P16/V1424/PEJ – request for pre application advice on a detailed layout. The advice offered may be summarised as follows:
- Advice on housing mix
 - Design guidance including advice from the urban design officer
 - Northern side of access road is car dominated
 - Avoid parking courtyards. Provide parking beside dwellings
 - Vehicle tracking to be designed for a council refuse vehicle
 - Enclose front gardens
 - Increase the size of some gardens
 - Provide 21m between habitable windows
 - Overlooking of 19 Vicarage Lane
 - Show the Thames Water easements on the plans
 - Provide focal points
 - Take account of the adopted Design Guide
 - Open spaces seem reduced compared to the outline illustrative plans
 - Updated arboricultural report recommended
 - Retain hedge adjacent to the permitted access
 - Scheme does not take account of the ecology report recommendations – no newt ponds shown
 - Could not support the layout presented
 - The opinions offered are those of officers only

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

- 4.1 The site area is less than 5ha, fewer than 150 dwellings are proposed and the site is not in a 'sensitive area'. The proposal is not EIA development.

5. MAIN ISSUES

- 5.1 The main planning considerations relevant to the assessment of this application are:

1. Principle of development
2. Affordable housing and housing mix
3. Design and layout
4. Residential amenity
5. Landscape and visual impact
6. Flood risk and drainage
7. Historic environment
8. Biodiversity

5.2 Principle of development

The principle of housing on this site is established through the outline planning permission granted on appeal in February 2016. This also permitted vehicular access from Longcot Road and established that traffic movements to and from the development are reasonable. In addition the financial contributions from the development towards infrastructure improvements is detailed in legal agreements associated with the outline planning permission. This application does not provide an opportunity to review these matters.

5.3 Affordable housing and housing mix

The amount of affordable housing (40%), the mix and tenure mix are secured through the s106 agreement associated with the application. The affordable housing mix proposed and shown in the table below is acceptable to the housing team:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed
Affordable rented	4	9	5
Shared ownership	0	4	2

5.4 The housing team has identified a specific need for a four-bedroom, single storey dwelling for a family in the village. The applicant was asked to provide a four-bedroom bungalow by combining two of the proposed bungalows. It has declined this request as it impacts on the viability of the scheme, there is no requirement in the s106 for any four bedroom affordable dwellings and this has not been raised before including at pre-application stage. The housing team do not object and consider this issue could be resolved post approval and they will continue a dialogue with the applicant on this matter as the s106 allows the affordable housing mix to be varied.

5.5 Parking for the bungalows has been revised and it is now adjacent or directly opposite each unit.

5.6 The market housing mix is shown in the table below:

	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4+ bed	Total
Proposed	0	2	12	21	35

5.7 This is not SHMA compliant but accords with the mix included in the submission at outline stage.

5.8 Design and Layout

This council refused the outline planning application on design grounds considering the illustrative layout inappropriate and that it showed 59 dwellings could not be adequately accommodated. The appeal

Inspector considered *“that the information submitted confirms that a suitable level of amenity space and separation space between the proposed and the existing dwellings could be achieved. In addition, there appears to be scope to provide a soft edge to the development, and hence the village, with the provision of open spaces within or at the edge of the site. If this were to be the case, it would provide a better edge to the village than currently exists”*.

- 5.9 The Inspector added *“Taking account of the illustrative material submitted with the appeal, I am satisfied that a suitable form of development could be achieved here which would be of an appropriate density and form so as not to harm the character of the village. Some of the issues raised by the Council relate to detailed matters and I judge that they could be resolved at the detailed stage, if it were justified to do so. I have had regard to the Council’s Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document and consider that the ultimate form of the development could be designed to be consistent with its aims. In this context, I find no conflict with Policies DC1 and DC9 of the LP and advice in the Framework”*.

Density

- 5.10 At the appeal hearing the council argued the density of a 59 dwelling development would be at odds with the low density character of housing in Vicarage Lane which is some 9 dwellings per hectare (dph). The proposal has a density of approximately 17dph (approximately 22dph if the open space is deducted). The Inspector noted this would be considerably less than the 30dph expected by the then adopted Local Plan and which is now a requirement of core policy 23 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the adopted Design Guide 2015 (principle DG26). The density of development is acceptable.

Layout

- 5.11 The applicant has changed the layout in seeking to respond to concerns expressed by the council at appeal, by officers in pre-application advice and to comments made by officers and interested parties as part of this application. A strong frontage to Longcot Road is provided with dwellings either side of the access with frontage to Longcot Road and turning the corner on the access road. The proposal has a single access (already approved) and a main access road serving the dwellings and which provides a loop towards the south western corner of the site connecting back to the main access road. Curvature and off-setting the line of the road, the street hierarchy and change in materials seek to reduce traffic speeds. This accords with principle DG34 of the Design Guide.
- 5.12 Dwellings, tree and hedge planting front the main road with parking set to the sides of dwellings. Hedges and low walls define the front boundaries. Relevant dwellings turn corners (including plots 43 and 48) by providing windows on the two street elevations. Other dwellings create focal points and visual stops. This includes plot 50. This

provides continuity, enclosure, legibility and landmarks. Plots 56 and 57 are front to side elevation with adequate separation. Communal bin collection points are no longer shown due to road connection now proposed and to discourage bins being left permanently at the edge of open spaces. The proposal accords with principles DG27, 28, 29, 31 and 33 of the Design Guide.

Parking

- 5.13 The four flats have a parking space each. All other dwellings have at least two car parking spaces (garages measure 6m x 3m and can be treated as parking spaces). In total 151 allocated parking spaces are proposed with 14 unallocated spaces. Parking in the vicinity of plot 11 has been changed. The parking is now beside and opposite dwellings and no longer remote. Parking provision is considered in accordance with County Council standards.

Open Spaces

- 5.14 The appeal Inspector accepted *“that people using the adjacent footpath would be able to see the new development close at hand but it is stated that the edge of the development here could be softened by open space and planting and this would form a more coherent edge to the settlement than currently exists. This and further additional planting could be seen as an enhancement to the landscape character as a whole”*.
- 5.15 The proposal provides a large area of public open space (in excess of 15% of the site) along the southern boundary of the site. This accords with saved policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011. I consider the open space works well and is better than shown on the pre-applications scheme. Development fronts the open space and this combination provides a positive edge to the site in accordance with principle DG29 of the Design Guide. Mown paths from the development across the open space to the footpath are proposed. A play area (a LAP) is included in the open space. A management plan required by condition 15 of the outline permission requires the management of open spaces to be agreed. The SUDS area is significantly smaller than the pre-application scheme and there is greater provision of planting and better access to the eastern open space.
- 5.16 The illustrative plan submitted with the outline application included a landscaped buffer approximately 5m wide between the Vicarage Lane dwellings and the proposed development. The Inspector opined *“the information submitted by the appellant confirms that a suitable level of amenity space and separation space between the proposed and the existing dwellings could be achieved”*. Some neighbours would prefer the buffer to be wider. Officers consider the 5m buffer which was also shown on the outline illustrative plans is satisfactory. This space would be planted with hedge species plants (currently shown as blackthorn, field maple and holly), and could be maintained at a height of 2.5/3m to provide a ‘green’ buffer. The Management and Biodiversity Plan

submitted with the application is insufficient and is not approved. The requirement for a Management and Maintenance Plan is a requirement of condition 15 on the outline permission. That condition will need to be complied with.

- 5.17 The 5m buffer is not intended as a publicly accessible open space. It would be maintained by a management company in accordance with the s106 agreement. Some objectors suggest the rear gardens of proposed dwellings backing on to the buffer should be defined by a 2m wall. This is not necessary to make the proposal acceptable. A 1.8m close boarded fence is proposed and this is reasonable. Garages and dwellings have been moved off the boundary to this buffer.

House Types

- 5.18 An eclectic mix of house designs exists in Shrivenham and in Vicarage Lane. The house types proposed are typical of those built by the applicant and the designs or similar have been accepted elsewhere in the district. The dwellings have pitched roofs, flat fronts or gabled frontages with balanced elevations. The house types are reasonable. The designs ensure the affordable dwellings are indistinguishable from the market dwellings.

- 5.19 Four bungalows are proposed (plots 7 to 10). Some representations suggest bungalows should be located in the north western part of the site, as there are single storey dwellings adjacent. The bungalows were shown in the location proposed at outline stage. There is no overriding need to locate bungalows in the north western part of the site. The houses at that location have no unacceptable impact on living conditions. Screening also limits the contextual influence of existing bungalows on this part of the site.

Conclusion

- 5.20 A representation suggests the proposal is contrary to the Design Guide and refers to a number of Design Guide principles. However, most of the principles referred to relate to “*dwellings in relatively large grounds, country estates and small groups of dwellings such as hamlets and farm buildings*” (section 6 of the Design Guide) and are not therefore, relevant to this proposal. I am satisfied that this site can accommodate 59 dwellings and that the layout and house types are reasonable. The proposal complies with the Design Guide and core policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

5.21 Residential Amenity

The Design Guide recommends a minimum distance of 21m between facing habitable windows to prevent unreasonable overlooking. The proposed dwellings achieve this distance in respect of proposed habitable windows facing Vicarage Lane dwellings. The closest is plot 4 being approximately 25m from Maple Trees. In the other cases the distances exceed 28m with most cases being in excess of 30m.

- 5.22 Where side elevations of proposals face existing dwellings the distances between facades is greater than the Design Guide recommendation of 12m. For example the distance between the rear elevation 33 Vicarage Lane and plot 28 is 33m. This ensures loss of light is reasonable and the proposals are not over bearing. A condition can ensure no side windows are installed.
- 5.23 **Landscape and Visual Impact**
Landscape and visual impacts of developing the site are dealt with in the appeal decision. The Inspector held the proposal would not conflict with saved policy NE9 of the Local Plan 2011(Lowland Vale landscape). The inspector decided *“The site is well contained within the wider landscape and only limited views of it are available from anywhere but its immediate surroundings due to the flat and low landform and intervening vegetation. The numerous views contained within the evidence, some of which I had the opportunity to see, confirms this to me. From the much longer distances within the elevated land in the AONB and the Ridgeway, the appeal site would be virtually imperceptible within the wide vista”*.
- 5.24 In addition the Inspector *“accepted that people using the adjacent footpath would be able to see the new development close at hand but it is stated that the edge of the development here could be softened by open space and planting and this would form a more coherent edge to the settlement than currently exists. This and further additional planting could be seen as an enhancement to the landscape character as a whole”*.
- 5.25 Objections refer to the loss of views from Vicarage Lane dwellings which the applicant’s appeal documents suggested could be provided. These views are not strategic views. They are private views and I give limited weight to them. Vicarage Lane houses would remain attractive places to live. The proposal retains some limited views through the development in a similar manner shown in appeal documents and by interested parties.
- 5.26 The tallest units are some 8.8m to ridge (plots 24 to 27 – the flats). All other dwellings have lower heights. The dwellings will not be unduly prominent in the wider landscape. The proposal remains compliant with saved policy NE9 of the Local Plan 2011.

5.27 Flood Risk and Drainage

Planning conditions on the outline planning permission require a sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed, and the foul drainage to be implemented in accordance with solutions presented by Thames Water in their sewer impact study. As these conditions have been imposed this is not an opportunity to re-examine flooding or drainage matters.

5.28 Historic Environment

The site is not within a conservation area and there are no heritage assets on site. The County Council archaeologist has no objection. This council had refused the outline application due to impact on the setting of the grade I listed St Andrew's church, as the tower can be seen across the site from the footpath adjacent to the site. The appeal Inspector considered the *"site does not add appreciably to the significance of the church and it is not in a position where one can readily experience the church"* and that the impact would be negligible. Circumstances have not changed. The proposal accords with core policy 39 of the Local Plan 2031 – Part 1.

5.29 Biodiversity

A planning condition on the outline permission requires the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Strategy submitted with that application to be implemented unless any variation is agreed by the local planning authority.

5.30 That mitigation strategy included four ponds some to a depth of 2m or more. The applicant now proposes two larger and shallower ponds (1m deep at most), with gently shelving banks. The ponds will be surrounded by a 1.1m high post and rail fence. In addition five Great Crested Newt hibernacula are shown within the open spaces adjacent to the ponds. The applicant has provided details of the dropped amphibian friendly wildlife kerbs and gully pots. Their location will be secured by condition.

5.31 The proposal is compliant with core policy 46 of the adopted Local Plan 2031.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 This application has been considered in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 The principle of development, means of access, traffic generation and highway safety implications, flood risk and drainage matters are all established through the granting of the outline permission and conditions attached to that permission. There is no requirement for a s106 associated with this application, as again, these were secured through the outline permission.

- 6.3 The design of the proposal demonstrates that 59 dwellings can be reasonably accommodated on this site in an acceptable form and in compliance with adopted design policies and guidance. In addition, the proposals have no unreasonable impact on neighbours.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2011 – SAVED POLICIES - DC3, DC6, DC7, DC8, DC9, H23, HE10, NE9, NE12

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031: PART 1 – CORE POLICIES 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DESIGN GUIDE 2015

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

Case Officer – Adrian Butler

Email – adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – (01235) 422600