

APPLICATION NO.	P17/V2973/RM
SITE	Land North of Summertown East Hanney Oxon
PARISH	EAST HANNEY
PROPOSAL	Approval of details for construction of 45 dwellings (Use Class C3) and associated parking, infrastructure and landscaping, and provision of public open space.
WARD MEMBER(S)	Matthew Barber
APPLICANT	Bovis Homes Limited
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. **Approved plans**
2. **Materials to be submitted and approved**
3. **Landscaping scheme needed**
4. **Landscaping implementation**
5. **Ecological mitigation and enhancement to be delivered**
6. **Barn owl/bat building provision before final occupancy**
7. **Car parking and turning spaces to be provided before occupation of each dwelling**
8. **Provision of final wearing course to roads**
9. **No street lighting**
10. **Noise mitigation**
11. **Boundary treatments to be submitted and approved**
12. **Permitted development removal – means of enclosure, extensions and roof alterations**

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 Hanney Parish Council objects.
- 1.2 It is an application seeking approval of reserved matters for 45 dwellings following the grant of outline planning permission in May 2016 for up to 55 dwellings on this site. The reserved matters for consideration under this application are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 1.3 This application is not an opportunity to revisit the principle of development, the means of access or traffic generation as these are established by the outline permission. Surface water drainage details are also the subject of a condition on the outline permission which will need to be complied with. The council is only considering the detail of

East Hanney Parish Council

Object: Their objections and comments may be summarised as follows:

- Changes made do not address fundamental reasons why the Parish Council objects
- Overdevelopment – the density is too high at 18 dwellings per hectare (dph) with open space and 23 dph without. This compares to 16/ha for the village and 6/ha for neighbouring development; densities should be lower at the village edges. The density is out of keeping and detrimental to the character of the area contrary to CP37 of the Local Plan
- Density is too high for this edge of village location; development should reflect the transition from rural village to open countryside. This is important due to open views from the south including from the new railway bridge on the A338
- A housing proposal on land south of Summertown was refused and the subsequent appeal dismissed. The Planning Inspector in that case advised there were important visual impacts of development at this location in the village with the village having a pleasing foreground and advising development in the Lowland Vale should not be permitted if it has an adverse landscape impact
- The Planning Inspector advised: *“There are clear public views of the site from almost all directions. The land is flat and as well as the views from the adjoining roads there is a public footpath that runs parallel with the Brook along its west bank. When travelling north on the A338, the site forms the foreground for the village. The site can be seen from the railway to the south”.... “there would be some harm to the landscape particularly in local views. While the sensitivity of most receptors would be low, as most views would be by travellers on the A338, the landscape setting of the village would be harmed when viewed from the south”.*
- The proposal would have the same visual impact as the appeal scheme dismissed on the southern side of Summertown Road
- The proposal is contrary to Core Policy 44 (ii) and (v) due to its harmful impact on the landscape setting of the village and impact on important views and visually sensitive skylines
- No affordable bungalows provided which are needed in the village
- Not convinced adequate accessible and usable open space has been provided
- Inappropriate pallet of materials that do not reflect the rural nature of the village – painted brick is inappropriate. The village has interesting brick patters such as orange and dark brown bricks. The brick construction is neither interesting or reflective of the historic nature of the setting
- Unsafe pedestrian access to bus stops which will require crossing the busy A338 with no pedestrian refuge
- Proposals are too high especially with an uplift in levels by around 1m; further harms the character of the area
- Need to consider light pollution

- Most of the site is subject to noise pollution from the A338 and this is significant and intrusive
- Residents of new developments fronting the A338 have reported vibration from traffic using the A338

The Parish Council has raised the following concerns which were considered in deciding the outline planning application for housing on this site:

- This is not an allocated housing site and therefore, does not accord with the Local Plan (*Officer note: the principle of up to 55 dwellings on this site has been permitted.*)
- Request the open space is transferred to the Parish Council (*Officer note: The s106 accompanying the outline permission requires the open spaces to be transferred to a Management Company.*)
- Inadequate pedestrian access to the centre of the village
- The junction of Summertown Road with the A338 should not be widened (*Officer note: means of access was considered at outline stage and is not part of the reserved matters to be considered*)
- Not sustainable – unconnected and isolated from the village
- It has not been identified that there is insufficient capacity in the sewage system at the nearest connection point. Development should not progress until Thames Water has upgrade the system (*Officer note: Thames Water does not object*)
- Flood risk assessment (FRA) is inadequate as it only assesses the site as a catchment area, fails to take account of subterranean water flows, The FRA should consider the wider area (*Officer note: surface water drainage is subject to a planning condition on the outline permission requiring a scheme to be agreed prior to development commencing. The council's drainage engineer does not object*).

Local residents

Letters of objection have been received from 19 local addresses. The objections may be summarised as follows:

- Urban form of development is out of keeping
- Village character is being significantly eroded by development including this proposal
- Extends the village to the south and has a detrimental impact in public views from the A338 and a footpath along the northern edge of the site
- Presents a hard edge to the village which is out of keeping
- Loss of the pastoral edge to the village – an issue raised by Planning Inspectors considering proposed housing applications to the south of Summertown Road and east of the A338
- Proposed dwellings are too high and dominate the skyline in views from the south
- Density is too high – a scheme of similar density was refused on land south of Summertown Road

- Proposals are poorly related to the surrounding agricultural land, buildings and heritage assets in terms of scale, form, massing and heights
- House types are suburban in appearance and out of keeping
- Loss of privacy for occupants of dwellings backing onto the site due to inadequate fencing proposals (1.2m high post and rail and mesh fencing)
- Do not need any more five-bedroom houses. Need identified in the Neighbourhood Plan is for low cost smaller houses and bungalows
- The affordable housing is not affordable to young people in the village
- Increased noise from the increased traffic
- Proposed roads appear too narrow
- Lack of protection for bats and owls
- All trees and hedges on site should be subject to preservation orders
- Essential part of the village heritage
- Lighting would impact on the dark skies and on wildlife
- Impact on a barn owl nesting site
- Swales with water in them could present a safety hazard to young children
- Inadequate affordable housing provision

The following concerns raised were considered in deciding the outline planning application for housing on this site:

- The site is outside the village and is not allocated for housing. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan housing policy and if permitted could set a precedent
- Does not integrate with the village. It is a self-contained addition out of keeping
- Significantly erodes the village infrastructure e.g. the school lacks capacity
- Increased traffic congestion especially on the A338
- Inadequate pedestrian access to the village centre
- Should extend a cycleway from Grove to East Hanney
- Inadequate car parking
- Increased bus travel through the village will further erode the verges on tight corners
- Bus stop locations on the A338 and Summertown Road could be hazardous
- Loss of site to housing represents loss of part of the flood alleviation system for the village, as the site holds water and has a high water table
- Increased flood risk including for Main Street dwellings
- Flood risk assessment has not been updated since 2015
- Will the attenuation pond hold sufficient water from the development?
- Water is retained on site in the furrows and the housing is at risk to flooding

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian paths to the A338 would be dangerous as there is no evidence that bus stops will be installed on the A338 • Detrimental impact on wildlife with the loss of Calcareous Grassland • Loss of ridge and furrow and Roman archaeology which needs be fully explored
Oxfordshire County Council
<p><u>Highway officer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection. <p>Conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle parking details to be submitted • Car parking to be provided • Estate roads to be provided • Further swept path analysis for a refuse vehicle to be provided <p><u>Archaeology</u></p> <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no archaeological constraints.
Thames Water
<p><u>Sewerage Infrastructure Capacity</u></p> <p>No objection</p>
Environment Agency
<p>No comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise they are not a Statutory Consultee for reserved matters applications. Ask that any advice, conditions or informatives that they provided as part of the outline permission are taken into account. <i>(Officer note: The Environment Agency did not object to the outline application and did not request any planning conditions. They recommended liaison with the council's own drainage advisers).</i>
Drainage engineer
<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised information is acceptable.
Conservation officer
<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised details have improved the overall scheme including reduction in roof heights which will help assimilate the new development into the site relative to the setting of the conservation area. Specific brochure illustrations or photo panels of materials would assist assessment of these.
Countryside officer
<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has now submitted amended versions of the Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) and the

Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) as requested. They provide sufficient information to address the requirements of conditions 7, 8 and 9 of the outline consent which can now be discharged.

Condition

- Prior to final occupation the developer shall provide a letter providing evidence that all the ecological mitigation measures and enhancements in the CEMP have been delivered.

Forestry officer

No objection.

Further to previous comments (available online):

- Plot 8 has been moved approximately 3m further to the north and away from the adjacent Walnut (T7). This is probably the minimum necessary to provide enough usable garden space without the need to prune the tree. This is now satisfactory.
- The arboricultural assessment recommends managing the group of Willow to the south west and I acknowledge that the condition of the trees is such that some remedial management is required. This will assist in avoiding a conflict with the future occupiers of plots 1, 2 and 3 but the extent of pruning and a programme for their long- term management will need to be agreed in advance.
- Site specific tree protection measures will be needed but could readily be controlled by condition. A tree protection plan that relates to the layout will be needed before any work is undertaken on site, particularly as the proposal to strip the site for the wildflower meadow areas may conflict with the root protection areas of the retained trees.

Landscape officer

Comments:

- The play area and hard landscape details shown are acceptable.
- There are still a few issues with regards to planting and boundary details. These issues could all be dealt with by condition if required, as enough space is available for additional tree planting or substitution of boundary details.
- *Planting Plans/ Boundary details* - The original plans proposed instant hedging, this has been changed to close board fencing with an instant hedge beside. As these areas face onto publicly accessible spaces, it would be expected that these areas are walled. Also, it is difficult to maintain a hedge when it is located against a close board fence. In this situation we would usually require weldmesh fences adjacent to the hedgerow as this allows the hedge to be maintained on both sides. The amount of tree planting on the southern edge has repeatedly been raised as an issue, to break down the mass of development in longer distance views from the south. The tree planting on the central and eastern area of the southern boundary

should include larger tree species, such as oak and lime planting rather than the smaller <i>Crataegus monogyna</i> and replacing some of the <i>Acer campestre</i> with larger species.				
Housing team				
No objection. Recommend the following affordable housing mix:				
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed (5 person)	3 bed (6 person)
Affordable rent	4	7	2	1
Shared ownership	0	3	1	0
Environmental Health - Protection Team (noise)				
No objection.				
Environmental Health (air quality)				
No objection.				
Environmental Health (contamination)				
No objection.				
Waste Management Team				
No objection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend a condition ensuring the bin store for the flats is large enough to store the correct number of bins in an appropriate layout. 				

3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 Planning applications P17/V2904/RM and P17/V2972/RM relate to two alternative proposals for this site, respectively seeking reserved matters approval for 50 and 55 dwellings. These applications remain undetermined.
- 3.2 P15/V0343/O - Approved (03/05/2016)
Residential development for up to 55 dwellings, including site access, public open space and landscaping.
- 3.3 P17/V0226/RM - Withdrawn on 21/04/2017
Reserved Matters Application following outline approval P15/V0343/O for the erection 55 Dwellings.
- 3.4 P15/V1616/FUL – Appeal dismissed 25/05/2016
Demolition of redundant agricultural buildings. Erection of 79 affordable dwellings and 118 open market dwellings, with associated access roads, landscaping and public open space. This application and appeal related to land south of Summertown Road, East Hanney.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

- 4.1 The scheme comprises fewer than 150 dwellings on a site under 5ha. The site is not in a 'sensitive area' defined by the Town and Country Planning Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017. The development therefore, does not constitute EIA development.

5.0 MAIN ISSUES

The main planning considerations relevant to the assessment of this application are the reserved matters which are:

1. Appearance
2. Landscaping
3. Layout
4. Scale

Appearance

- 5.1 The site relates to that part of the village on the western side of the A338. This part of the village comprises a mix of house types and designs of varying ages with no one form dominating. Adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site is Dews Meadow comprising a bungalow, farm buildings, farm shop and associated parking. To the west are dwellings ranging in age from this decade to the 1960's/70's. To the north west and north are dwellings that appear to be late 19th/early 20th century. Existing dwellings whilst varying in appearance and size do have consistency being rectangular in plan form under pitched roofs. Materials vary with red/brown brick, white painted or rendered walls and some timber cladding. There is no set pattern of dwelling form or arrangement. Housing densities in the village vary. Dwellings adjoining the western boundary of the site amount to some 7 dwellings per hectare (dph). Development to the immediate north of the site is approximately 16dph (gross). There are areas of higher density nearer 30dph such as the houses and flats close to the Memorial Hall and allotments, and east of the A338 but these are not seen in the context of this site.
- 5.2 The NPPF expects efficient use to be made of land although development needs to respond to its context. Core policy 23 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and the Design Guide seek a minimum density of 30dph (net) subject to the character and appearance of an area, highway safety and impacts on local residents. The net density excludes major elements of supporting uses such as open space, community facilities and infrastructure. In this case the net density is approximately 32dph. (The gross density is approximately 17.5dph). The proposal makes efficient use of the site and responds to its context by locating the higher density elements of the scheme to the eastern parts of the site which is seen in the context of existing development at the village edge namely Dews Meadow and the car parking associated with the farm shop. Lower density development is to the western site boundary with eight dwellings proposed compared to the seven existing dwellings adjoining the western boundary. With the open

spaces within the development the character and appearance of the proposal is considered to respond to its context.

- 5.3 The Design Guide 2015 expects the form and massing of new dwellings to be kept simple with a rectangular floor plan and pitched roof. It does allow more complex forms such as 'L' shaped buildings. The appearance of the proposed dwellings is considered to comply with the Design Guide in having reasonably simple forms with rectangular floor plans, pitched roofs and balanced elevations. Some houses types have projecting gables or a bay window. Most dwellings have a 'flat' frontage broken by a lean-to porch. Some 'L' shaped dwellings are provided. Some of these are used to turn corners with side windows providing surveillance of side roads. The proposals accord with Design Guide principles DG52 and DG53.
- 5.4 Proposed materials are red bricks with some rendered and painted brick elevations, an artificial cladding to mimic timber cladding and artificial stone. Blue/black 'slate' and russet coloured tiles are proposed. Considering the site adjoins a conservation area timber cladding ought to be used rather than an artificial version, as could plain tiles (as permitted on a new development adjacent the site). Proposed condition 3 seeks to secure appropriate materials.
- 5.5 A characteristic of East Hanney is the lack of street lighting. A condition is recommended to ensure no street lighting is provided.
- 5.6 Another characteristic of East Hanney is grass verges and ditches beside tree lined roads. The proposal seeks to emulate this with a central linear green lane and spaces including a swale. Open spaces with trees, hedges and other landscaping are proposed to the northern, eastern and southern boundaries. The main road into and around the site includes conservation kerbs and the use of materials to define pedestrian and vehicular spaces. Changes in materials also define the hierarchy of roads and junctions.
- 5.7 Plans showing boundary treatments are contradictory. The boundary treatment plan shows the use of some fencing in the public realm and weld mesh fencing on the eastern and north western boundaries. The landscaping plans suggests planting backed by fencing and planting on the eastern and north-western boundaries. In this semi-rural location fencing is inappropriate in the public realm, uncharacteristic of this part of East Hanney and in conflict with the Design Guide. The boundary treatment plan is not approved. A planning condition can secure more appropriate boundary treatments which should include hedges, walls and railings, and weld mesh fencing with planting. A condition should also remove permitted development rights for means of enclosure.
- 5.8 In summary it is considered appearance accords with core policies 37 and 38 and the Design Guide, subject to the imposition of conditions.

Landscaping

- 5.9 A detailed landscaping and hard landscaping scheme accompanies the application. These include native trees and hedges, meadow planting in open spaces and more ornamental plants to the fronts of dwellings. Existing trees and hedges are retained and additional hedging proposed to fill gaps in existing hedges.
- 5.10 Hard surfacing materials vary to define road hierarchies, junctions and pedestrian areas. These materials include macadam for the main entrance from Summertown Road and permeable paving for the remainder of the roads with different colours for secondary roads and at junctions.
- 5.11 The landscaping scheme includes details of a play area in the north western part of the site. This includes five pieces of play equipment, willow tunnels and grass safety matting.
- 5.12 The landscaping is largely acceptable but there are shortcomings as pointed out by the landscape officer. The submitted landscaping details and boundary treatment plans are therefore not recommended for approval. Conditions requiring a revised landscaping scheme and boundary treatments to be submitted for approval are recommended instead to address the outstanding points.

Layout

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 5.13 Core policy 22 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 requires a mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households. This should be in accordance with the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) unless an alternative approach can be demonstrated to be more appropriate through the Housing Register or where proven to be necessary due to viability constraints.
- 5.14 The affordable housing percentage and tenure mix are set in the s106 agreement accompanying the outline permission. These require 40% of the dwellings to be affordable with a tenure mix of 75% rented and 25% shared ownership. The proposal complies with this.
- 5.15 The affordable housing mix proposed is the same as that requested by the housing team who in accordance with core policy 22 have used the housing register to inform current affordable housing need as follows:

No. of beds		1	2	3 (5 person)	3 (6 person)
Proposed	Rent	4	7	2	1
	S/O	0	3	1	0
Housing team	Rent	4	7	2	1
	S/O	0	3	1	0

5.16 The affordable housing is distributed across the site in three clusters with no cluster exceeding seven dwellings. This is acceptable. The affordable housing is indistinguishable from the market dwellings in appearance. There is a small courtyard of parking associated with the four one-bedroom flats which is not encouraged by the council's housing team. Four of the affordable houses have a single allocated parking space compared to the market dwellings which all have two allocated parking spaces. These parking arrangements need to be balanced against design expectations in the Design Guide and parking standards which are considered in the *Layout* section of this report below.

5.17 The proposed market housing unit mix is shown in the table below.

No. of beds	1	2	3	4+
Proposed	0	6	9	12
SHMA	1.5	6	11.5	8

5.18 The NPPG advises that *“Establishing future need for housing is not an exact science. No single approach will provide a definitive answer”*. The SHMA text clearly acknowledges this and is equally clear that the dwelling mixes it identifies are an estimate of need. The SHMA also adds that in applying the estimates to individual sites regard should be given to the nature of the development site and character of the area. It also recognises that the ‘market’ is to some degree a better judge of what is the most appropriate profile of homes to deliver at any point in time. The market housing mix needs to be considered against this background and market housing mix does not have to be an exact match to the SHMA. The applicant advises it has introduced four bespoke bungalows to the scheme as a direct response to comments received from East Hanney Parish Council. The applicant advises this demonstrates that they have sought to address local market needs in accordance with the spirit and purpose of Core Policy 22 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

5.19 The SHMA is clearly an estimate of housing need and it allows other circumstances to be considered including the character of an area and the market. The proposed market housing mix is considered by officers as reasonably close to the SHMA estimate of housing need and the scheme responds positively to the character of housing in the area.

5.20 In these circumstances, officers consider the proposal is acceptable, accords with the ambit of core policy 22 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 and it is not necessary for the applicant to provide a viability assessment.

Layout

5.21 At the time of resolving to grant the outline permission it was strongly anticipated that land to the south of Summertown would be allocated for approximately 200 dwellings in the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

However, a planning application proposing housing on that site was dismissed at appeal and the proposed allocation of that land was removed at the recommendation of the Inspector examining part 1 of the Local Plan. The current application site therefore, represents open land at the edge of the village. Existing dwellings at the southern edge of the village are not prominent in views from the south; open land with landscaping dominate current views of this village edge.

- 5.22 In dismissing the appeal for the land south of Summertown Road (application no. P15/V1616/FUL) the Inspector recognised the views available from the A338 and advised *“When travelling north on the A338, the site forms the foreground for the village. The site can be seen from the railway to the south”*.... *“there would be some harm to the landscape particularly in local views. While the sensitivity of most receptors would be low, as most views would be by travellers on the A338, the landscape setting of the village would be harmed when viewed from the south”*.
- 5.23 The proposal sets housing back from the Summertown Road edge by over 26m at the south eastern corner of the site and over 30m at the south western corner of the site. These gaps with open space between the houses and Summertown Road and the opportunity for landscaping are considered to provide a reasonable landscape setting to the site and this extended part of the village, although officers would not wish to see this gap reduced.
- 5.24 The eastern parts of the site are more intensively developed compared to other parts of the site. These parts of the site are seen in the context of existing development at the village edge namely Dews Meadow and the car parking associated with the farm shop.
- 5.25 The proposal provides lower density development to the western site boundary with eight dwellings proposed compared to the seven existing dwellings adjoining the western boundary. With two exceptions the proposal provides connected streets with dwellings facing them. The proposal seeks to emulate some of the lanes in East Hanney through providing landscaping and open spaces including swales. Public open spaces exceed 15% as required by saved policy H23 of the Local Plan 2011. The public open spaces are at the edges of the site and include an acceptable area of play with play equipment.
- 5.26 Parking is largely set to the sides of dwellings although there is a single area of overlooked courtyard parking which the Design Guide can permit provided on-street and on-plot solutions have been exhausted, they are small in scale, immediately adjacent to properties and naturally surveyed. The small area of courtyard parking is considered to pass these tests. Visitor parking is at the cusp of beginning to affect the character and appearance of the streets and intrude in to open spaces but overall parking is not considered to dominate the streets. 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.

- 5.27 The eastern half of the site contains the most intensive parts of the development. These areas are visually contained within the development and less publicly visible. The southern and western edges of the site have lower density development, and in the case of the southern boundary, a reasonable open space buffer. These lower densities and the buffer are considered reasonable in the context of public views from the south as referenced by the Planning Inspector, and in the setting of the conservation area.
- 5.28 The proposal is considered to comply with the adopted Design Guide and core policies 37, 38 and 44 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

Residential Amenity

- 5.29 The Design Guide recommends a minimum distance of 21m between facing habitable windows to prevent unreasonable overlooking. All the proposed dwellings are over 30m from existing dwellings, and even with the changes in floor levels proposed (approximately between 400mm and 1,000mm above existing ground levels), the relationship to existing dwellings is acceptable.
- 5.30 It is noted that a neighbour is dissatisfied with mesh fencing proposed on the western boundary. Planting is now shown on this boundary.
- 5.31 A noise assessment accompanies the application and concludes noise from the A338 can be mitigated by appropriate glazing to ensure future living conditions are not unreasonably affected. The environmental protection team comment on the issue of vibration. They advise that they have not received any complaints and consider vibration from the A338 is unlikely to exceed vibration limits and they would be surprised if it were a significant problem.
- 5.32 The proposal is considered to accord with saved policies DC9 and DC10 of the Local Plan 2011.

Drainage

- 5.33 Both foul and surface water drainage are subject to conditions on the outline permission which will need to be complied with outside this application. The applicant has provided a Thames Water assessment of the foul sewerage network which concludes there is adequate capacity for the development. This is confirmed by Thames Water in their consultation response.
- 5.34 Local residents and the Parish Council reference flooding incidents in the village, subterranean water flows and the high water table on site. I notice the site does pool water in the furrows in winter and after periods of heavy rainfall. I am also aware of flood events in the village. The applicant has provided an updated Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and

drainage strategy and sought to address drainage comments from the council's drainage engineers. The surface water drainage scheme comprises a mix of an attenuation basin, swales and cellular storage and permeable surfaces. It aims to reduce run-off from the site to 5 litres per second (l/s) from the existing run-off rate of some 8l/s. Surface water will be released from the attenuation basin to a ditch at the north eastern boundary of the site which in turn runs northwards beside the A338 into and through an area part of land in flood zone 2.

- 5.35 The council's drainage engineer who is aware of the high water table and flood occurrences in the village has no objection.

Historic Environment

- 5.36 The north western part of the site adjoins the larger of the two East Hanney conservation areas. I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the setting of the conservation area. The applicant has reduced ridge heights of the dwellings and I note the conservation officer advises this helps assimilate the proposals into the setting of the conservation area. The proposal is considered compliant with saved policy HE1 of the Local Plan 2011.

Biodiversity

- 5.37 A tree on the southern boundary of the site accommodated an owl roosting/nesting box but this has since become detached from the tree and is no longer on site. Some local residents advise the site is still used by barn owl. Likewise bats forage on site although foraging is likely to be contained close to and along the boundary edges where there are trees and hedges. The proposal includes a building in the north eastern part of the site which will provide a bat and barn owl roost. I note the council's countryside officer is satisfied with the scheme in that it provides a reasonable opportunity for biodiversity enhancement in accordance with core policy 46 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.

Parking

- 5.38 All the market dwellings are allocated at least two on plot parking spaces. Eight of the affordable dwellings are allocated one parking space. The parking standards allow a reduction in allocated parking to one space per dwelling provided an appropriate amount of unallocated parking is provided. In this case the parking standards require eighteen unallocated parking spaces; the proposal provides 20. The parking proposed accords with adopted parking standards and is acceptable.

Scale

- 5.39 The definition of scale in the NPPG relates to the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings. The applicant has revised the scale of the house types since the first submission by reducing heights.

- 5.40 Dwellings in the village vary in scale. Existing houses adjacent to the western boundary of the site range in height from 7m (Leider) to 9.1m (Lakeside). Lakeside a house permitted in 2012, is an exception with most of the houses adjacent to the western boundary being 7m to 7.5m to ridge. The dwellings proposed adjacent to the western boundary are between 8m and 8.8m to ridge plus they are proposed some 600mm to 840mm above existing ground levels.
- 5.41 The scale of the dwellings will be publicly noticeable from Summertown Road and the A338 in views from the south and east but not so readily against existing houses to the west which are well hidden in current views especially from the A338. The proposals will be publicly seen from the footpath adjacent to the northern boundary of the site and from within the site itself once developed. In both cases they are not seen readily in the context of adjacent houses. On balance the proposals are considered compliant with the Design Guide and core policies 37 and 38 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 in terms of scale.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This application has been considered in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The principle of housing development on this site and means of access to it have already been permitted through the grant of outline planning permission. This is not an opportunity to reconsider these matters. Drainage is the subject of a planning condition on the outline application and will be fully considered as part of the application(s) to approve matters reserved by condition. Nonetheless, the applicant has sought to demonstrate that the development can be adequately drained to prevent a worsening of flood events. This council's drainage officer does not object.
- 6.3 This application for reserved matters approval. The council is only considering the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development.
- 6.4 The NPPF encourages efficient use of land while safeguarding and improving the environment. Core policies 37 and 38 and the adopted Design Guide all encourage good design.
- 6.5 The appearance of the proposals is considered reasonable with the proposed dwelling designs being reasonably consistent with the dwelling types existing in this part of the village. Proposed materials are not wholly acceptable but can be made acceptable by planning condition.
- 6.6 The net density of development accords with the core policy 23 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 whilst responding to its context with lower density development adjoining the southern and western boundaries with the higher densities within the confines of the site.

- 6.7 The proposed layout provides road connections within it and pedestrian links to the north and south east. Dwellings front the road and provide focal points. A centrally located 'green' corridor with grass verges and a swale is proposed. Open spaces and landscaping form the north, eastern and southern edges to the site. The open space on the southern boundary which can be adapted to contain more tree planting, is considered reasonable and able to soften views of the development from the south. Adequate car parking is proposed to meet standards. Affordable housing amounts to 40% of the dwellings being more than required by the Local Plan 2031 Part 1 but according with policy expectations at the time of the outline permission being granted.
- 6.8 The scale of development is considered acceptable in its context.
- 6.9 The proposal is considered to accord with the development plan and in accordance with paragraph 11c) of the NPPF the application can be approved as it amounts to sustainable development.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2011 – SAVED POLICIES DC3, DC5, DC6, DC7, DC9, DC12, DC20, H23, HE1, HE9, HE10, HE11, NE9

VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031: PART 1 – CORE POLICIES 1, 8, 22, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46.

PUBLICATION DRAFT VALE OF WHITE HORSE LOCAL PLAN 2031: PART 2 – DRAFT POLICIES DP2, DP16, DP21, DP23, DP25, DP26, DP27, DP28, DP33, DP36, DP37, DP39

VALE OF WHITE HORSE DESIGN GUIDE 2015

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) 2018

NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE (NPPG)

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990

Case Officer – Adrian Butler

Email – adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk

Tel – (01235) 422600