

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>APPLICATION NO.</b> | <a href="#">P21/V0293/FUL</a>   |
| <b>SITE</b>            | Land at Park Farm East Challow  |
| <b>PARISH</b>          | EAST CHALLOW  |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>        | Variation of conditions 1 (approved plans), 5 (car parking) & 6 (boundary details in accordance with specific plan) on application P18/V0744/RM.<br>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). |
| <b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>  | Paul Barrow   |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>       | Crest Nicholson (Chiltern)  |
| <b>OFFICER</b>         | Adrian Butler   |

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to:

**1. Conditions as follows:**

**1. Approved plans**

**Pre-Commencement Conditions**

**2. Surface and foul water drainage scheme to be agreed**

**Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions**

**3. Landscaping implementation**

**4. Road and footway construction to each dwelling to be provided before each occupation**

**5. Parking and turning spaces for each dwelling to be provided prior to occupation of each plot**

**6. Boundary treatments as approved plans**

**7. Electric charging point for each dwelling with on plot parking**

**Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions**

**8. Construction hours – 7.30 to 18.00 Monday to Friday 8.00 to 13.00 Saturday no works on Sunday or bank holidays**

**Informative**

**1. Broadband provision**

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION, PROPOSAL AND SITE DESCRIPTION

### Introduction

- 1.1 The application is presented to planning committee as East Challow Parish Council objects.

### Proposal

- 1.2 The application site forms part of an area on which the council has permitted 88 dwellings and that development has commenced with some dwellings completed and others under construction. This application does not increase the number of dwellings on the site and will result in a cumulative decrease in floor space by some 109.4 sqm, if approved. The applicant explains that it seeks to revise the scheme as follows:
- 1.3 *“Changes are proposed in relation to 8 approved house types within the scheme; there are no changes in the overall number of dwellings and all proposed house types are compliant with the Nationally Described Space Standards:*

| Plot No. | Consented House type | Bed no. | Floor Area (sqm) | Proposed House type | Bed No. | Floor Area (sqm) |
|----------|----------------------|---------|------------------|---------------------|---------|------------------|
| 40       | Elsenham             | 3b5p    | 99.6             | Roydon              | 5b6p    | 155.9            |
| 41       | Elsenham             | 3b5p    | 99.6             | Seaton              | 3b5p    | 96.9             |
| 66       | Huntington           | 3b5p    | 95.4             | Chesham             | 3b4p    | 92.6             |
| 67       | Elmswell             | 2b4p    | 75.7             | Redgrave            | 3b4p    | 85.9             |
| 68       | Wolvercote           | 5b9p    | 253.9            | Roydon              | 5b6p    | 155.9            |
| 69       | Tetbury              | 4b7p    | 172.1            | Salcombe            | 4b6p    | 147.5            |
| 72       | Huntington           | 3b5p    | 95.4             | Marlborough         | 4b5p    | 122.8            |
| 76       | Tetbury              | 4b7p    | 172.1            | Seaton              | 3b5p    | 96.9             |

- 1.4 *The change in mix is minor, resulting in the loss of one 2-bed unit and a gain in one 5-bed unit overall. The proposed house types will result in a reduction of the overall floor area by 109.4sqm.*
- 1.5 *Plot 41 has been relocated to the west of Plot 76 and Plot 76 has been subdivided to allow for the re-location of Plot 41. The change to Plot 41 enables a 5 bed detached unit to be provided with a larger garden to be plotted instead.*
- 1.6 *Adjustments are proposed to the boundaries of the identified plots. This including:*
- *The garage and parking space at Plot 68 has been re-located to the south eastern corner of the plot boundary.*
  - *Plots 68 and 69 are now separated by green space rather than hardstanding*
  - *The double garage for Plot 76 has been replaced with a single garage. This was previously a large 4 bed unit, now a smaller 3 bed unit*

- *There has been minor changes in garden sizes to plots 69, 68, 67, 76, 41, and 40 with all adjusted gardens sizes in accordance with policy guidance”.*

- 1.7 The changes proposed require the wording for approved conditions 1 (approved plans), 5 (car parking) and 6 (boundary treatments) to be revised to include reference to the latest plans. The changes to these conditions are set out in **Appendix 1**.
- 1.8 The application has been amended to revise the landscaping scheme providing 9 street trees with greater variety compared to the scheme originally submitted with this S73 application.
- 1.9 Planning committee should be aware that whilst this proposal does not increase the number of dwellings already permitted across the Park Farm site, if approved in combination with application P21/V0738/FUL (which is a currently undetermined application for an uplift of 10 dwellings on the Park Farm site), there would be an uplift of 11 dwellings on the Park Farm overall.
- 1.10 Site Description  
The land falls from south to north. North of the site are houses and open fields. The western boundary borders existing housing and land that has planning permission for housing and which is under construction or built. Housing under construction forms the southern boundary. Open fields adjoin the eastern boundary. The site location plan is **attached** at Appendix 2 and the proposed layout is **attached** at Appendix 3.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

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

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Parish Council    | <p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases the size of houses on a poorly designed, cramped and congested scheme.</li> <li>• Lack of consideration to providing electric charging points.</li> </ul>  |
| Councillor Barrow | <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recent application (P20/V1395/FUL) was rejected by the committee although I was in favour of it as it increased the number of affordable dwellings. One has the feeling that the current market is not very favourable, and the developers are trying to work around this to increase sales. I think that this is another attempt to do so. My main concern is the lack of adequate parking for the proposed changes and I think this needs to be addressed before the proposal is accepted.</li> </ul> |

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A colleague on the East Challow parish council is also, I believe, raising the issue of electric vehicle charging points. I don't think that this is a valid objection, but it should be raised with the developers as had happened in a recent review at committee of the development at Sutton Courtney.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Local Residents</p> | <p>5 letters of objection have been received. The planning related objections may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller houses have been replaced with larger houses; no need for more 4, 5 or 6 bed houses (one local resident notes there is a reduction in floor space compared to the approved development).</li> <li>• Reduction in the number of trees is unacceptable.</li> <li>• The development is an eyesore with ditches, concrete pipes and metal railings.</li> <li>• The village and views have been ruined.</li> <li>• One double garage is being reduced to a single, there are now less parking spaces, Although this may comply with local parking provision requirements, there are not enough parking spaces to meet modern living habits.</li> <li>• With the current government ambitions to become carbon neutral by 2050 and stop the sale of petrol and diesel vehicles in 2030, consideration should be given to providing electric charging points.</li> <li>• The village has had to endure more new housing resulting in flooding at the bottom of Main Street.</li> <li>• Increased traffic and traffic speeds.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure in the village to support more housing.</li> <li>• The village is almost joined to Wantage.</li> <li>• The development will have a detrimental impact on residents of the village.</li> <li>• Poor design with reduced parking, unmanageable garden shapes and reduced gardens leading to inadequate living conditions for future residents.</li> <li>• Does not deliver a high quality and sustainable development contrary to core policies 37, 38 and 44 of the LPP1, the Design Guide and NPPF.</li> <li>• The refusal of application P20/V1395/FUL establishes the principal of refusal on the grounds of poor design, inadequate garden sizes and floor space.</li> <li>• Heat pumps and solar panels should be used to address the climate change emergency and reducing carbon emissions.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road design improvements are required and the developer should commission updated traffic surveys to assess the impact of the staggered junction on traffic generation, the increase in speeding and reduction of road safety.</li> <li>• Urgent action must be taken to address the removal of the roundabout and speeding traffic, by requiring a new independent traffic report instead of the one presented in this application - which is the same one from 2017, riddled with errors and with a questionable methodology upon which the unsafe decision to remove the roundabout was based.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Oxfordshire<br/>County<br/>Council</p> | <p><b>Highways</b><br/>No objection<br/><i>(Planning officer note: The highway officer originally raised a holding objection due to the location of two visitor parking spaces. However, the objection has been withdrawn because the location of the visitor parking spaces had previously been approved with highway officer support).</i></p> <p><b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b><br/>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated surface water drainage details will need to be provided if the application is approved.</li> </ul> <p><b>Archaeology</b><br/>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A programme of archaeological mitigation has been undertaken and completed in line with Conditions 8 and 9 of consent P16/V0652/O. No further archaeological investigation is required.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Thames Water</p>                       | <p>No comments received.</p>  |
| <p>Drainage<br/>Engineer</p>              | <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated surface water drainage details will need to be provided if the application is approved.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Landscape<br/>Officer</p>              | <p><u>Amended Plans:</u><br/>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme has been amended to reduce the loss of street tree planting. The variety of tree planting has also been adjusted to help with biodiversity, visual interest, and seasonality.</li> </ul> <p><u>Original Plans:</u><br/>Holding objection</p>  |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals result in a number of changes to the proposed tree planting with 4 street trees lost, and 4 trees replaced with Malus floribunda, reducing the number, scale and diversity of the proposed tree planting. No alternative planting has been proposed to replace the street trees lost:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Plot 72 - 2 Sorbus torminalls, front garden street trees lost and not replaced</li> <li>○ 2 Prunus avium Plena replaced with smaller Malus floribunda</li> <li>○ Plot 68 - 1 Sorbus Golden Wonder lost from front garden street tree</li> <li>○ 1 Sorbus Golder Wonder in front garden replaced with Malus floribunda</li> <li>○ 1 Malus floribunda lost from the south of plot adjacent to street</li> <li>○ Plot 4 1 Cercidiphyllum japonica replaced with Malus floribunda.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Urban Design Officer  | <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme maintains the design principles and overall rational of the site in relation to its context, including adjoined areas built and or currently under construction.</li> <li>• The character, materiality and overall architectural form of house types are maintained and kept in line with the adjacent parts of the scheme.</li> <li>• I have no concerns regarding the proposal or the slight variation in density as this will still achieve a satisfactory standard of layout which does not impact the masterplanning of the scheme.</li> </ul>   |
| Waste Management Team | No comments.  |

### 3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

#### 3.1 Applications

P21/V0738/FUL – Pending determination – at the time of writing this report officers are awaiting the submission of amended plans

Residential development of 36 dwellings, comprising a partial re-plan of details approved under application reference P18/V0744/RM, to include an uplift of 10 no. additional dwellings, a revised housing mix across the relevant development parcels and associated development works

P20/V3281/NM – Rejected (14/01/2021)

Non-material amendment to P18/V0744/RM - relating to house types and associated garage space and garden sizes, the re-location of Plot 41, and a minor change in overall unit mix 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.

[P20/V1395/FUL](#) - Refused (24/11/2020)

Residential development of 39 dwellings, comprising a partial re-plan of details approved under application reference P18/V0744/RM, to include an uplift of 13 no. additional dwellings, revised housing mix across the relevant development parcels and associated development works (as amended 8 September 2020).

[P20/V0449/FUL](#) - Approved (20/04/2020)

Application for plot substitution (concerning reserved matters application P18/V00744/RM) to provide 6 x 4 bed units

[P19/V2619/NM](#) - Approved (04/11/2019)

Non material amendment to application ref. P18/V0744/RM - substitution of brick material to Atherstone Red Multi

[P19/V2058/NM](#) - Approved (03/09/2019)

Non material amendment to application ref. P18/V0744/RM - substitution of brick material to Weinerberger Dunsford Multi Stock

[P19/V1831/DIS](#) - Approved (27/08/2019)

Discharge of condition 8 - additional and unallocated car parking spaces plan on application ref. P18/V0744/RM

[P18/V2049/FUL](#) - Refused (10/01/2019)

Residential development comprising the erection of 87 dwellings including associated amenity space, access, parking and ancillary development

[P18/V0744/RM](#) - Approved (01/06/2018)

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.

[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)

[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 is for fewer than 150 dwellings and the site is not in a 'sensitive area'. The site area does not exceed 5ha and therefore, the proposal does not

fall within the thresholds set at Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Consequently, the proposal is not EIA development.

## 5.0 MAIN ISSUES

The main issues are:

1. The principle of development
2. Affordable housing and market housing mixes
3. Design
4. Residential amenity
5. Highway safety, traffic and parking
6. Flood risk and drainage
7. Other Matters
8. Financial contributions
9. Conditions

### **The Principle of Development**

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.
- 5.2 The development plan for this proposal comprises the adopted Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (the LPP1) and the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (the LPP2). There is currently no made Neighbourhood Plan for East Challow.
- 5.3 With the construction of housing on the wider Park Farm site underway including the completion of some dwellings plus housing development taking place on land to the east of the site (land west of Challow Park), this site is now considered to be within the built area of East Challow. The proposal is therefore considered sustainable development and accords with the housing strategy set out in core policies 3, 4 and 20 in the LPP1.
- 5.4 Furthermore, the extant planning permission for 88 dwellings on this application site and the wider Park Farm site is a material consideration that adds weight to the favourable conclusion on the principle of this development being acceptable.

### **Affordable Housing and Market Housing Mixes.**

#### Affordable Housing Mix

- 5.5 The approved affordable housing scheme has not changed – providing 40% affordable housing across the wider site as required by the original planning permission (P15/V0652/O).

#### Market Housing Mix

- 5.6 Core policy 22 of the LPP1 states:  
“A mix of dwelling types and sizes to meet the needs of current and future households will be required on all new residential developments. This should

be in accordance with the Council’s current Strategic Housing Market Assessment 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.”

- 5.7 Officers consider the mix of housing for this application needs to be seen in the context of the previously permitted scheme. The applicant’s proposed market housing mix compared to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) estimate and approved scheme is contained in the table below.

| No of beds | 1 | 2  | 3  | 4+ |
|------------|---|----|----|----|
| Proposed   | 0 | 10 | 17 | 26 |
| SHMA*      | 3 | 12 | 23 | 16 |
| Approved   | 0 | 11 | 17 | 25 |

\*The SHMA figures have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number hence the one unit discrepancy between the total number of proposed/approved units and SHMA units

- 5.8 The market mix does not follow the SHMA estimate, but SHMA does acknowledge at paragraph 7.35 that prescriptive figures should not be included in the plan making process and 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 mix is different to that approved by the addition of one 4+ bedroom dwelling and the reduction of a single 2-bedroom dwelling. This difference in mix is not significant and it is noted that the council’s annual monitoring report advises the number of 2-bedroom dwellings provided across the district is currently in excess of SHMA expectations. This deviation from core policy 22 of the LPP1 needs to be considered in the planning balance.

### **Design**

- 5.9 This application will be seen in the context of the wider Park Farm development, which is under construction with some dwellings completed. These changes do not fundamentally alter its design with regards to the street hierarchy or block pattern or density of development. Corner dwellings ‘turn corners’ with windows in the frontages to roads as expected by the Design Guide.
- 5.10 The character, materiality and overall architectural form of house types are maintained and kept in line with the adjacent permitted parts of the scheme and approved house types. Materials for the houses show good variation. The composition of architectural features and detailing ensures a good sense of character and is in keeping with the approved development. The proposed dwellings sizes exceed the space standards expected by development policy 2 of the LPP2.
- 5.11 The proposed changes are contained in the wider development already permitted and being constructed on the Park Farm site and they have no landscape impacts. The proposed changes do not further reduce the gap between East Challow and Wantage.

### Landscaping

- 5.12 The revised landscaping scheme provides nine street trees compared to seven in the approved scheme. The variety of tree species has been changed as suggested by the landscape officer. The landscaping is acceptable.
- 5.13 The proposal is considered to comply with core policies 37, 38 and 44 of the LPP1, the Design Guide and NPPF.

**Residential Amenity**

- 5.14 The adopted design guide recommends a distance of 21m between habitable windows in houses facing one another. The closest distance between windows in proposed and existing dwellings exceeds this distance and there are no unreasonable overlooking or overbearing impacts. The proposals accord with the design guide and policy DP23 of the LPP2.
- 5.15 All the proposed gardens exceed the garden sizes suggested in the Design Guide and public open space on the development site exceeds the policy expectation of 15%. The proposal is therefore considered compliant with DP23 and DP33 of the LPP2 and in this context, the Design Guide.

**Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking**

- 5.16 Access to the site is taken from the A417 via the previously approved and implemented priority staggered junction including right hand turn lanes into the site and Letcombe Hill. Oxfordshire County Council, as Highway Authority does not object to the access arrangements. The traffic generation impact resulting from this proposal would not result in a severe impact on the highway network in NPPF terms (paragraph 109 of the NPPF). The proposal therefore accords with policy DP16 of the LPP2 and paragraph 109 of the NPPF.
- 5.17 In providing at least two on plot parking spaces for each dwelling the proposal complies with County Council parking standards and core policy 35 of the LPP1. Whilst the highway officer initially expressed concern at the location of two visitor parking spaces, their positions accord with the approved scheme (application P19/V1831/DIS), to which the Highway Authority did not object.
- 5.18 Circumstances have not materially changed in this respect and the highway officer has since confirmed the objection on this point is withdrawn.
- 5.19 Electric vehicle charging points can be secured by planning condition for the dwellings associated with this application to comply with paragraph 110 of the NPPF. This can help in improving air quality and may reduce reliance on fossil fuels in journeys by private motor vehicle.

**Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 5.20 The most recent Environment Agency flood map indicates the site is wholly within flood zone 1. Flood zone 1 is least susceptible to fluvial flooding and preferred in flood risk terms for housing development. A surface water drainage scheme has been agreed for the 88 dwellings scheme based on drainage to attenuation basins and gradual release of water at greenfield run-off rates. This principal of drainage remains acceptable. The drainage scheme will require

updating to reflect this proposal if approved and this can be secured by condition.

5.21 Thames Water has not commented on this application but has not objected to previous schemes.

5.22 It is concluded the proposal complies with core policy 42 of the LPP1.

### **Other Matters**

#### Climate Change

5.23 Concern has been raised the development does not adapt or provide for climate change. In accordance with Core Policy 40 of the LPP1 the applicant advises the development includes planting, including the provision of street trees to reduce solar heat gain during the summer. In addition, the development incorporates sustainable design and construction measures and fully complies with the current building regulations. The scheme also incorporates a 'fabric first' approach to delivering sustainable design and construction, ensuring that the building itself is sustainable and able to perform effectively. In terms of incorporating flood resilience, the floor levels of the 8 dwellings have been established in line with the finished floor levels of the other approved dwellings on site. Compliance with building regulations ensures the prevention of the ingress of water and moisture and water efficiency measures will be included such as water efficient taps and showers to accord with policy CP40.

5.24 The applicant also advises dwellings have been designed to be well insulated and energy efficient, encouraging the use of energy monitoring systems so that future occupiers are made aware and are able to control their energy use.

5.25 Officers are mindful of a 29 April 2021 appeal decision recovered by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government (SoS) in which he rejected Swale Borough Council's request to impose planning conditions seeking to reduce carbon emissions from proposed dwellings beyond the requirements of Part L of the Building Regulations. The SoS considered that in the absence of local plan policy and notwithstanding the high level of national commitment to carbon neutrality, and the significant weight attaching to tackling climate change, imposing conditions to reduce carbon emissions would go beyond current and emerging national planning policy and would not be either reasonable or necessary (appeal decision APP/V2255/W/19/3233606). In the absence of such policies in the LPP1 and LPP2 officers advise that conditions could not be reasonably imposed requiring further carbon emission reductions or the installation of renewable energy technology above existing planning policy or building regulation requirements.

#### **Financial contribution requests**

5.26 The planning permission for this site is bound by a s106 agreement that secures affordable housing, open spaces and financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements such as schools and bus services. A clause in the S106 agreement binds any subsequent S73 planning application such as this, to the requirements of the S106 agreement.

### Conditions

5.27 Application P18/V0744/RM was subject to 8 planning conditions which are summarised as follows:

1. Approved plans
2. Landscaping details to be approved
3. Approved landscaping to be implemented
4. Roads and footways serving each dwelling to be provided before occupation of each dwelling
5. Parking for each dwelling to be provided before occupation
6. Boundary treatments to be provided before occupation of each dwelling
7. Construction hours limited to 07.30 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on a Saturday. No work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays
8. Additional unallocated parking spaces to be approved

5.28 An approved plans condition remains relevant and will be updated to reflect this proposal. The submitted landscaping scheme is acceptable and there is therefore no need for a further landscaping scheme to be submitted; condition 2 is not required. A condition is needed requiring landscaping implementation and replacement of any trees or plants that die within five years of planting.

5.29 Roads footways and parking to and for each dwelling need to be provided prior to occupation of each dwelling to provide access and adequate parking. Boundary treatments need to be implemented to provide privacy. Unallocated parking for the site has already been approved and is shown on the plans, therefore condition 8 does not need to be repeated.

5.30 Construction hours should be controlled in seeking to reduce disturbance to local residents.

5.31 With the revised layout a condition is required to ensure the proposals are adequately drained. A new condition is therefore proposed. Electric vehicle charging points should be provided for each dwelling with on plot parking to improve air quality and may help reduce reliance on fossil fuels in journeys.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

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

6.2 A deviation in the SHMA suggested market housing mix provides one additional 4+ bed dwelling in lieu of one 2-bed dwelling compared to the approved scheme. This limited harm is balanced against other material considerations and benefits of the scheme. The council's annual monitoring report suggests there is a current over provision of 2-bed dwellings across the district and a level balance of 4+ bed dwellings. The proposal has economic, social and environmental benefits including creating and maintaining construction jobs, and spending in the locality which can be given modest weight. It provides housing contributing towards identified housing need including affordable housing which can be given weight. The proposal can help maintain the route 67 bus service,

provide housing in an accessible location and provide biodiversity enhancements which can be given modest weight. There is non-compliance with one policy in the development plan but overall, the proposal is considered compliant with the development plan when considered as a whole. The benefits of the proposal therefore outweigh the limited harm identified.

- 6.3 In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

**Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 1 – core policies:**

- CP1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CP2 - Cooperation on unmet housing need for Oxfordshire
- CP3 - Settlement hierarchy
- CP4 - Meeting our housing needs
- CP7 – Providing supporting infrastructure and services
- CP20 - Spatial Strategy for the Western Vale Sub-Area
- CP22 – Housing mix
- CP23 – Housing density
- CP24 – Affordable housing
- CP33 – Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
- CP35 – Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
- CP36 – Electronic communications
- CP37 – Design and local distinctiveness
- CP38 – Design strategies for strategic and major development sites
- CP39 – The historic environment
- CP40 – Sustainable design and construction
- CP42 – Flood risk
- CP43 – Natural resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 – Green infrastructure
- CP46 – Conservation and improvement
- CP47 – Delivery and contingency

**Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031: Part 2**

- CP4a – Meeting our housing needs
- CP20A – Housing supply for Western Vale Sub-Area
- DP2 – Space standards
- DP16 – Access
- DP17 - Transport assessments and travel plans
- DP20 – Public art
- DP21 – External lighting
- DP23 – Impact of development on amenity
- DP25 – Noise pollution
- DP26 – Air quality
- DP27 – Land affected by contamination
- DP28 – Waste collection and recycling
- DP29 - Settlement character and gaps

DP33 – Open space  
DP36 – Heritage assets  
DP39 – Archaeology and scheduled monuments  
CP47a - Delivery and contingency

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

The neighbourhood area was formally designated on 11 November 2016. The parish council has started the process of gathering evidence and engaging with the local community. This is to give the plan a direction and draft policies that will form the neighbourhood plan. To date a draft Plan has not been published and therefore, no weight can be given to any policies that may be emerging.

### **Adopted Guidance**

Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015  
Developer Contributions – Delivering Infrastructure to Support Development  
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) – June 2017

### **Other Relevant Legislation and Guidance**

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)  
Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation (CIL)  
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990  
Human Rights Act 1998  
Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010  
Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

**Case Officer** – Adrian Butler

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

**Tel** – (01235) 422600