

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P18/V0744/RM</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	RESERVED MATTERS
<b>REGISTERED</b>	22.3.2018
<b>PARISH</b>	EAST CHALLOW
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Yvonne Constance
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Crest Nicolson (Chiltern)
<b>SITE</b>	Land at Park Farm East Challow
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Reserved Matters application following Outline Approval P16/V0652/O (as varied by application no. P17/V2884/FUL) for the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with the exception of access.

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that reserved matters be approved subject to conditions summarised as follows:**

- 1. Approved plans.**
- 2. Relocation of proposed beech trees.**
- 3. Landscaping implementation and retention.**
- 4. Road surfacing.**
- 5. Parking spaces to be provided before occupation.**
- 6. Boundary details to be provided before occupation.**
- 7. Working hours to be Monday to Friday 0730 to 1800 and 0800 to 1300 Saturday. No works on Sundays or public holidays.**

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

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1** The application is presented to committee as East Challow Parish Council objects to the proposal.
- 1.2** The application seeks approval of reserved matters following the grant of outline planning permission for up to 88 dwellings on this site. The reserved matters are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 1.3** This reserved matters application is not an opportunity to revisit the principle of development which is established by the outline permission. Access to the site from the A417 and via a right hand turn lane staggered junction has been approved (application no. P17/V2884/FUL). Surface water and foul water drainage strategies are the requirement of planning conditions attached to the outline

permission and these do not need to be submitted or agreed at this stage.

- 1.4 The site location is shown on the plan below. The land falls from south to north. North of the site are dwellings and open fields. The A417 and housing form the western boundary with the A417 to the south with fields beyond. A house and open fields form the eastern boundaries. A public footpath adjoins the north and east boundaries to the site. The proposed site layout is **attached** as Appendix 1.



## 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS ON CURRENT SUBMISSION

- 2.1 A summary of the responses received to the current proposal is below. A full copy of all the comments made can be seen online at [www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk](http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk)

### East Challow Parish Council

Object. Their concerns may be summarised as follows:

- Following consultation with villagers the outline scheme showed 21 parking spaces within the site for use by villagers. This was an ideal alternative to the on-street parking which still continues along the A417 outside The Park and a benefit for existing residents.
- Concerned the existing lay-by parking beside The Park and A47 may not be available should this development proceed
- Disappointed the developer has not engaged with the Parish Council since the outline permission was granted and this does not seem to be in the spirit of the NPPF.

### Local residents and interest groups

Five letters of objection have been received. The concerns expressed may be summarised as:

- Lack of visitor parking on the site - only 5 shown on the plan and entirely on road. With the shortage of parking in East Challow adjacent to the site the County standards and the Vale Design Guide should be applied.

- Unsafe parking could affect emergency vehicle access
- Previous development has provided additional parking for the benefit of the community
- Unclear if the required amount of 15% open space is provided without the inclusion of attenuation ponds and SUDS. (*Officer note. Over 2ha of open space is provided after subtracting the attenuation ponds. This exceeds the 0.95ha expected by saved policy H23*).
- Deficiency in social facilities such as St Nicholas primary school – no s106 money has been made available towards the school expansion. (*Officer note: The outline permission secures over £350,000 towards St Nicholas primary school improvements and expansion*)
- Lack of village amenities to support the development including an infrequent bus service. The proposal makes no provision for village amenities e.g. a village shop
- Not sustainable development
- Two clumps of social housing are shown and whilst this does not exceed the 15 social houses in a clump as set out in the Design Guide this seems to be contrary to the spirit of community integration and contrary to Core Policy 24.
- Access for construction vehicles would not be acceptable adjacent to a neighbouring dwelling. (*Officer note: construction access is subject to agreement through condition 13 on the outline permission*).
- Houses should be moved closer to the A417 with rear access provided

### **Oxfordshire County Council**

#### Highways and Drainage

No objection.

- All dwellings will be provided with allocated on plot parking. It is noted that there are only a few unallocated on-street parking spaces provided for visitors but this is offset by an over-provision of on-plot parking which averages at 2.84 spaces per dwelling. However, there does appear to be the opportunity to accommodate additional visitor spaces.
- In some locations, while the service vehicle can complete necessary manoeuvres it would do so only by encroaching beyond the adoptable highway. These encroachments into private driveway areas are not preferable.

#### Archaeology

No objection.

- A written scheme of investigation has been submitted and approved and the mitigation will proceed in line with the agreed methodology.

### **Housing team**

Comments:

- The demand for two-bedroom shared ownership properties is much higher than for one-bedroom properties, therefore the overall affordable housing mix may be more suitably delivered with a higher proportion of two-bedroom properties than is indicated in the SHMA guidance.
- The mix of affordable housing should reflect the significant demand for two-bedroom units for both rented and shared ownership tenures with a

<p>reduction in one-bedroom accommodation and an adjustment to the number of larger homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where possible, parking courts should be avoided with parking spaces provided either on-plot or adjacent to the properties.</li> <li>• The affordable housing should be distributed evenly across the site to avoid any concentration in any part of the site and to assist with ensuring that the affordable housing is indistinguishable from the market housing.</li> <li>• Plots 45-49 should be broken up to avoid concentration of children at one part of the development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Thames Water</b></p>
<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of water supply they seek a condition to ensure adequate infrastructure improvements are provided prior to occupation of the dwellings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage engineer</b></p>
<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conditions on the outline permission remain applicable.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Countryside officer</b></p>
<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals which should ensure that the development complies with Policy CP46 and delivers a net gain for biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Conservation officer</b></p>
<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appearance, landscaping, scale and layout for the development are acceptable. The materials and contextual details respond to housing in the village and landscape details will retain the rural setting of the listed buildings.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Landscape officer</b></p>
<p>Generally satisfied with the proposals. Has some comments which could be addressed by condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North west corner of the site proposes mixed native woodland and tree planting. There is an existing property located adjacent to this boundary. The trees should be moved further to the south and the planting adjacent to the fence line changed to native shrub planting rather than woodland planting.</li> <li>• A smaller tree species than beech should be proposed next to Greenacre.</li> <li>• A Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan is required to ensure the long term establishment and management of the landscaping</li> <li>• Can planting be implemented on top of the proposed drainage tank?</li> <li>• The connection from this tank to the offsite headwall passes close to the trunk of a retained tree, has this been covered in the Tree Protection assessment?</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seats should be provided within the wider areas of public open space</li> <li>• Details of the design of the play area will be required but can be covered by condition.</li> <li>• The play area is located within 10m of a property boundary. As this area will have equipment it would be better to move it future away from the adjacent properties. (<i>Officer note: condition 5 on the outline permission requires details of the play area to be submitted</i>)</li> <li>• There are a number of high retaining walls needed to accommodate the level changes with walls 2.6m and 2m in height proposed. Reducing the height of the proposed fencing on top of the walls, or having a combination of fencing and trellis would reduce the impact of the fencing on top of the retaining walls.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Forestry Officer</b></p> <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the trees across the site are retained. The greatest impact will be the creation of the access but the quality of the trees within the hedgerow indicates that a large proportion consists of Elm regeneration that is either dead or in decline. The result is an intermittent unmaintained hedgerow that could be replaced with a much better species mix to ensure a longer life expectancy and an increasing contribution to the visual amenity of the area.</li> <li>• The proposed landscape scheme shows substantial replacement trees to comprise a shelterbelt, set within the public open space along the boundary, to offer appropriate levels of screening when the site is viewed from outside and to give future occupants a measure of visual separation from the adjacent carriageway.</li> <li>• The submitted method statement includes a tree protection plan and a condition requiring compliance with its recommendations should be attached to any forthcoming planning permission.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Environmental protection team (noise)</b></p> <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to the implementation of the scheme of acoustic mitigation submitted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Health and Housing (air quality)</b></p> <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No significant adverse air quality impacts are predicted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Waste Management</b></p> <p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure vehicles are unable to park outside the parking bays marked for plots 36 and 37 as we are required to use this area off the highway to turn the collection vehicle.</li> </ul>

### 3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 P17/V2884/FUL - Approved (15/03/2018). Variation of Conditions 9, 10, 11 and 15 and removal of Condition 8 of P16/V0652/O (as amended 18

January 2018). This application permitted a right hand turn lane into the site instead of a roundabout previously approved under the original outline permission.

- 3.2 P17/V2031/RM – Undetermined - Reserved Matters application in respect of Land at Park Farm, East Challow. Seeking approval of the appearance, landscaping, scale and layout for the development. Pursuant to the permitted outline permission P16/V0652/O: Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with exception of access.
- 3.3 P17/V2084/DIS - Approved (29/09/2017). Discharge of condition 15 - Wildlife Protection on application ref. P16/V0652/O - Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with the exception of access.
- 3.4 P17/V2082/DIS - Approved (30/08/2017). Discharge of condition 8 - Archaeology on application ref. P16/V0652/O - Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with the exception of access.
- 3.5 P16/V0652/O - Approved (27/10/2016). Development of up to 88 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, landscaping and other associated works with all matters reserved with the exception of access.

#### **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

- 4.1 The proposal comprises fewer than 150 dwellings but the site exceeds 5ha in size and is therefore, above the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. A screening opinion previously provided for a proposal for up to 92 dwellings on this site opined it was not EIA development. Considering government guidance in paragraph 58 of the NPPG on thresholds that may trigger the need for EIA this negative opinion remains.

#### **5.0 MAIN ISSUES**

- 5.1 The main planning considerations relevant to the assessment of this application are the reserved matters which are:
  - 1. Appearance
  - 2. Landscaping including impacts on trees
  - 3. Layout
  - 4. Scale

## Appearance

- 5.2 East Challow is a mix of house types and designs of varying ages with no one form dominating. There is no set pattern of dwelling form or arrangement. Housing densities are variable. Adjacent to the site are large dwellings including barn conversions and higher density developments at The Park and The Orchard which comprise smaller dwellings. Dwellings do tend to have simple forms and massing being rectangular under pitched roofs. Materials are mixed comprising red/brown brick, render and some natural stone.
- 5.3 The Design Guide 2015 expects the form and massing of new development to be kept simple with a rectangular floor plan and pitched roof. It does allow more complex forms such as 'L' shaped buildings.
- 5.4 The proposed dwellings comply with the Design Guide in having simple forms with rectangular floor plans, pitched roofs and balanced elevations. Some 'L' shaped dwellings are provided to turn corners with side windows providing surveillance of side roads and open spaces. The proposals accord with Design Guide principles DG52 and DG53.
- 5.5 Proposed materials are red/brown multi stock bricks with some rendered elevations under pitched slate grey coloured tiled roofs. The appearance of the dwellings is considered to respond positively to the Design Guide and general forms of dwellings and materials used in the village.

## Landscaping

- 5.6 The A417 boundary is defined by a hedge mainly comprising elm which is in part dead and in a declining state. Part of the hedge needs to be removed to allow access. The hedge to the east of the access through to the eastern boundary is proposed for removal on grounds of sound arboricultural management. This is acceptable and allows the opportunity for its replacement with a much better species mix to ensure a longer life expectancy and an increasing contribution to the visual amenity of the area. A native woodland mix of trees and shrubs is proposed as a replacement and this is acceptable. Two beech trees are proposed close to the boundary with Greenacre (an adjacent house). The species of tree is acceptable but should be moved away from the boundary given the height and spread that these trees can reach. A condition can secure this. An ornamental cherry tree is adjacent to the northern boundary. The arboricultural statement and drainage strategy plans shows work beyond its root protection zone. Landscaping uses species native to the area. The proposal accords with saved policy DC6 of the Local Plan 2011.

## Layout

### *Affordable housing and housing mix*

- 5.7 The affordable housing percentage agreed at outline stage and reflected in this submission is 40% with a tenure mix of 75% affordable rent and 25% shared ownership. The affordable housing unit size mix

proposed and requested by the Vale housing team are shown in the table below:

<b>No. of beds</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3 (5 person)</b>	<b>3 (6 person)</b>
<b>Proposed</b>	Rent	0	20	3	3
	S/O	0	5	4	0
<b>Housing team</b>	Rent	0	20	4	2
	S/O	0	5	4	0

5.8 There is a unit difference between the 3 bed rented units and this small difference is considered acceptable. There is no planning justification for seeking to avoid a concentration of housing that may accommodate children. Parking is not provided in courtyards. The affordable dwellings are in two clusters of 15 dwellings with one cluster in the west of the site and one cluster to the eastern part of the site, and with five affordable dwellings set slightly away from the eastern cluster. They are reasonably distributed across the site. The affordable dwellings are indistinguishable from the smaller market dwellings. The proposal is considered compliant with core policy 24 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

5.9 The market housing unit size mix proposed is:

<b>No. of beds</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4+</b>
<b>Proposed</b>	0	11	21	21
<b>SHMA</b>	3	11.5	22.5	16

5.10 This mix is reasonably SHMA compliant and is considered acceptable and in accordance with core policy 22 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

#### *Layout*

5.11 A single access road serves the site with cul-de-sacs leading off it. There is a connected road within the centre of the site. Houses face the roads including the A417 providing enclosure and opportunities for landscaping including frontage hedges and tree planting. The boundaries of the site are mainly free of development to retain openness particularly against the adjacent fields. Dwellings turn corners by providing windows on the two street elevations. Other dwellings create focal points and visual stops. This provides continuity, enclosure, legibility and landmarks. Open spaces amount to over 2ha (excluding attenuation ponds) and this is more than the 15% expected by saved policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011. Dwellings front open spaces providing passive surveillance. A play area is also provided as required by the outline permission. Paths are proposed linking the development to the public footpath adjacent to the site and a proposed pavement on the A417 frontage.

5.12 A grade II listed barn exists adjacent to the western boundary of the site. It is well screened by an existing hedge and small trees. Open



space separates the barn from the proposed houses. The rural setting of this listed building is retained.

- 5.13 Parking is set close to dwellings as expected by the Design Guide being to the sides of dwellings or in some cases their frontage. Parking does not dominate the streets. The proposal accords with principles DG27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 39 and 44 of the Design Guide, core policies 37 and 38 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011.

*Parking*

- 5.14 Representations from two local residents and two interest groups and the Parish Council request a village parking area on site to meet the need of existing villagers particularly occupants of dwellings fronting the A417. They point out that such a parking area was shown on the plans accompanying the outline permission. I am also advised that village parking on all major development is an expectation of a proposed policy in an emerging Neighbourhood Plan for East Challow.
- 5.15 This proposal does not include village parking. It was not a requirement of the outline permission. Furthermore, I can give very little weight to an emerging Neighbourhood Plan policy that has not been subject to formal consultation or Examination. In addition, a parking area adjacent to 10 The Park as shown on the illustrative plan with the outline permission would be detrimental to living conditions, as this house has a conservatory exposed to the site. In any event, the council could not ensure such parking would be retained exclusively for village parking.
- 5.16 Core policy 35 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 requires adequate car parking to be delivered on site in accordance with County Council standards. These standards provide a means for calculating allocated and unallocated parking spaces for a proposed development.
- 5.17 Applying the parking standards results in the following parking requirements:
- 176 allocated spaces
  - 37 unallocated spaces
- 5.18 The proposal includes space for 278 on plot (allocated) spaces (including garages) and 5 unallocated spaces. Overall 70 more parking spaces are provided compared to the total required by the standards.
- 5.19 I note the parking standards allow the number of unallocated spaces to be reduced in the interests of good design. Core policy 37 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 seeks to ensure the needs of traffic do not undermine the quality of places. The adopted Design Guide acknowledges parking is rarely aesthetically pleasing and poor design can have a significant impact on the appearance of streets and spaces. It expects a balanced approach to achieve convenient parking close to households whilst reducing the dominance of car parking in the street scene. Providing an

extra 32 unallocated parking spaces would result in parking dominating the street scenes and erode open spaces.

- 5.20 The highway authority has no objection. It suggests more visitor parking could be provided but that there is an over provision of parking. Surplus on plot parking can be used by visitors to occupants of the dwellings.
- 5.21 There is no development plan policy expectation that this proposal should provide more parking than required by this development. Should Members consider it necessary, more unallocated parking could be provided throughout the site and secured by planning condition. However, in this case I consider adequate car parking is provided as proposed and I give greater weight to good design, as expected by the NPPF. I also note a parking lay-by beside the A417 will remain for village parking. Overall, the proposal complies with saved policy DC5 of the Local Plan 2011 and core policy 35 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

#### *Residential Amenity*

- 5.22 The Design Guide recommends a minimum distance of 21m between facing habitable windows to prevent unreasonable overlooking. In the only cases of proposed dwellings facing existing dwellings (The Barn and Park Farm to the north of the site), distances are at least 55m or more. New tree, shrub and hedge planting is also proposed on the site boundary. In the case of the neighbouring house called Greenacre the distance from proposed dwellings are a minimum of 45m (to plot 88). In respect of the existing house at 10 The Park, plot 19 is side on to its garden at a distance of 8m and with a first floor landing window. As this is a window to a non-habitable room overlooking is considered acceptable. 10 The Park also has a conservatory facing onto the site. The distance from the nearest house (plot 19) is 22m although any views would be at an oblique angle. Open space and planting is proposed adjoining the conservatory. In all instances there is no unreasonable overlooking or overbearing impact on neighbouring residents even considering the higher level of the site. The proposal complies with the Design Guide and policy DC9 of the Local Plan 2011.

#### **Scale**

- 5.23 Scale relates to the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings. Neighbouring dwellings vary in scale. The proposed dwellings have heights that vary from approximately 8.3m to 9m. Lengths and widths of the dwellings also vary from some 7.5m to 12m. The scale of the dwellings is consistent with the variations in heights, widths and lengths of dwellings on adjacent sites and within the village.

### **6.0 CONCLUSION**

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

- 6.2 The reserved matters are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Access was approved at outline application stage as was the principle of up to 88 dwellings on this site.
- 6.3 The site can accommodate 88 dwellings whilst providing acceptable design, adequate public open space including a play area, without detriment to the character of the area and living conditions of neighbours. On plot parking exceeds expectations. Unallocated parking is limited and this is agreeable to secure good design. There is no clear justification for parking to meet needs other than this development.
- 6.5 It is recommended that this proposal is approved

The following planning policies have been considered:

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031: PART 1 – CORE POLICIES 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 20, 22, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2011 – SAVED POLICIES DC3, DC5, DC6, DC7, DC9 H23, HE9, HE10, NE9 and NE10

DRAFT VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031 PART 2 –AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES 2, 16, 21, 23, 25, 28, 31 and 33

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DESIGN GUIDE 2015

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

**Case Officer** – Adrian Butler

**Email** – [adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk)

**Tel** – (01235) 422600