

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P20/V0738/FUL</a>
<b>SITE</b>	Land at Park Farm, East Challow
<b>PARISH</b>	EAST CHALLOW
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Land at Park Farm East Challow 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 (as amended 14 July 2021)
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Paul Barrow
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Crest Nicholson (Chiltern)
<b>OFFICER</b>	Adrian Butler

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the head of planning subject to:

1. A S106 agreement being entered into to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and services including education and bus service improvements, management of public open spaces and the play area and to secure affordable housing; and

2. Conditions as follows:

1. Development to commence within three years
2. Approved plans

### Pre Commencement Conditions

3. Tree protection as submitted to be implemented
4. Surface and foul water drainage scheme to be agreed

### Pre-Occupancy or Other Stage Conditions

5. External materials in accordance with approved plan
6. Construction method statement including vehicle routing to avoid using Letcombe Hill
7. Landscaping scheme implementation
8. Play area implementation
9. Boundary treatments in accordance with approved plans
10. Road and footway construction to each dwelling to be provided before each occupation

11. Parking and turning spaces for each dwelling to be provided prior to occupation of each plot
12. Residential travel information pack
13. Active electric charging points for each dwelling
14. Implementation of ecological enhancements
15. Bat box provision

**Post Occupancy Monitoring and Management Conditions**

16. Construction hours – 7.30 to 18.00 Monday to Friday 8.00 to 13.00 Saturday no works on Sunday or bank holidays
17. Retention of garages

**Informatives**

1. Work close to water mains
2. Thames Water aims for water pressure provision
3. Broadband provision
4. Land drainage consent needed for any works to watercourses or ditches

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION, PROPOSAL AND SITE DESCRIPTION**

### **Introduction**

- 1.1 The application is presented to planning committee as the 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 houses completed and others under construction. Plots 60 and 61 which are included in this current application have already been approved and constructed in accordance with the approved 88 dwelling development. This application seeks to revise the central and northern parts of the approved scheme to increase the number of dwellings proposed across the wider Park Farm site from 88 to 98 dwellings; an uplift of 10 dwellings. However, it must be noted that in combination with approved application P21/V0293/FUL the number of dwellings across the wider Park Farm site would be uplifted by 11 dwellings from 88 to 99 dwellings as shown on the submitted site layout plan **attached** at Appendix 1. The approved site layout plan is **attached** at Appendix 2.
- 1.3 Vehicular access is proposed from the A417 using the existing staggered priority junction which includes a right hand turn lane into the site and to Letcombe Hill which is indirectly opposite.
- 1.4 The plans have been amended on two occasions in response to consultee and officer comments including revising the landscaping to increase the number of street trees, revising the affordable housing mix, adding road dimensions to plans and in providing a drainage technical note.

Site Description

- 1.5 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. A public footpath runs along the north and east boundaries to the site.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

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

Parish Council	<p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developer has submitted multiple planning applications to increase the density of the site which is a poorly designed, cramped and congested scheme.</li> <li>• Squeezing in additional houses for financial gain to the developer which is of no benefit to the residents who already occupy the site and is detrimental to the village.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure in the village.</li> <li>• Increased traffic speeds on the A417 due to road widening carried out to accommodate access/exit to this site. The wide, sweeping bend encourages excessive speed. Recent traffic calming measures prove inadequate and ineffective.</li> <li>• Parking spaces promised by the developer for nearby properties to use have disappeared over the months due to modifications made to the initial planning specification along with trees and vegetation promised to enhance the estate in its rural location.</li> <li>• Given the current Government intention to become carbon neutral by 2050, please note our concern regarding lack of consideration to the siting of electric charging points on this estate.</li> </ul>
Residents and Wantage and Grove Campaign Group	<p>17 letters of objection have been received. The objections may be summarised as follows:</p> <p><u>Principle</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for rejecting the previous application (P20/V1395/FUL) have not changed</li> <li>• Three attempts to increase the number of dwellings on the site have been rejected which establishes the principle for rejecting this application.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This proposal does not overcome previous objections.</li><li>• There is now a total of 99 plots compared to the 88 plots granted at reserved matters stage (P18/V0744/RM), dressed up as an increase in just 10 dwellings whereas the increase is 11 dwellings. This is an attempt by unscrupulous developers at manipulating the system for their own financial gain at the expense of providing the much-needed affordable housing our area desperately needs</li><li>• The NPPF expects approved development not to be materially diminished between permission and completion. This is in danger as the developer maintains their pressure on the village through this ever open and changing application.</li></ul> <p><u>Amount of Development and Need</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Core policy 20a of the LPP2 acknowledges the Western Vale does not need more unallocated housing to meet Oxford's unmet need (there is an over-supply according to the five year housing land supply statement (August 2020)).</li><li>• No need for the housing due to the huge number being built in the area</li><li>• The village cannot cope with the extra people</li><li>• The village has increased in size by 60% with the addition of over 200 homes making further development unsustainable</li><li>• This application has been split from application P21/V0293/FUL to avoid attracting 35% affordable housing on the uplift of 11 dwellings.</li></ul> <p><u>Character of the Village</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Destroying the character of the area</li><li>• Loss of views from the A417</li><li>• Cramped and unattractive development; not an efficient use of land and it impacts detrimentally on future residents</li><li>• Very little green space remains</li><li>• Agree with the landscape officer objection with the detrimental impact on the quality of the development and the rural interface between the village and the wider countryside.</li><li>• The Western Vale is typified by smaller settlements and this application will erode the identity of the village further.</li><li>• The site is important open land between East Challow and Wantage maintaining their separate</li></ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identities. Set a precedent for more housing between the settlements.</li> </ul> <p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contrary to core policy 23 of the LPP1 as increased density will have a detrimental impact on the character and legibility of the village</li> <li>Contrary to Principle DG26 of the Vale of White Horse Design Guide relating to lower densities in rural locations; a lower density of development may be more appropriate</li> <li>Style of the proposal is not in keeping with the village housing stock and seems a standard suburban development.</li> <li>Poor, cramped and congested design that is highway dominated, lacks appropriate focal points, adequate street landscaping, attractive public open space and inadequate living conditions. In accordance with the NPPF poor designs should be refused.</li> </ul> <p><u>Access and Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing was only permitted on the site as a roundabout provided road safety and traffic calming benefits. Amendments removed the roundabout and the scheme brings no benefits</li> <li>No plans to relieve the A417 through East Challow so traffic will increase</li> <li>Traffic calming put in place is an absolute disaster with no reduction in traffic speeds but having the opposite effect</li> <li>Add to parking issues</li> <li>Lack of visitor parking leading to on road parking or parking on footways affecting manoeuvring from driveways</li> <li>Traffic speeds are unsafe for those crossing the A417</li> <li>Insufficient public transport for further development in East Challow to be sustainable and therefore, higher density development is not justified</li> <li>Before this application is considered, the impact of the staggered junction on traffic generation, increase in speeding and reduction of road safety should be addressed with the developer providing an updated traffic survey that is conducted independently and then the developer should reinstate the roundabout from the outline permission.</li> <li>Increased traffic</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New access arrangements encourage speeding with the wide sweeping, downhill road</li> <li>• A new traffic survey should be provided and if traffic speeds and volumes have increased then further expansion of the development should be resisted</li> <li>• Poor repairs to the road following sewer connection works</li> </ul> <p><u>Availability of Services and Facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure to support more housing. The NPPF requires that "all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure".</li> <li>• Primary school is full, there are no shops, bus services are limited and not suitable for commuting and Wantage is beyond walking distance. Health services are over stretched and do not have capacity for more housing.</li> <li>• Nowhere to walk to in order to socialise in the community which means walking, driving or catching a bus to other towns or villages which is an environmental issue and inconvenient</li> <li>• Extra burden on the village in terms of roads, water and drainage and more housing will make this worse</li> <li>• Inadequate play space in the village to accommodate new residents.</li> </ul> <p><u>Other Matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connection to the mains sewer has been mismanaged and is an on-going issue</li> <li>• No acknowledgement of making use of new technologies</li> <li>• The proposal provides no value or benefits for the village</li> <li>• Flooding has worsened</li> <li>• Constant disruption from this development with noise, mud on the road</li> <li>• Impacts on the quality of life</li> <li>• Does not provide any improvements to previously agreed schemes</li> <li>• The developer is seeking to exploit the site for financial gain</li> <li>• Core policies 40 and 45 of the LPP1 have not been addressed. There is no provision of solar panels or electric vehicle charging points or climate change adaptation measures</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of mix for affordable housing they should not be centred in a single area.</li> </ul>
Oxfordshire County Council	<p><u>Current Plans:</u>  <b>Highways:</b>          No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant's "Response to Oxfordshire County Council Highways Comments" has been reviewed and it is a useful component of the documentation for this application.</li> <li>The tracked drawings show the use of opposite carriageway by the fire tender and refuse vehicle as the carriageway is not wide enough throughout the layout for these vehicles to pass an on-coming vehicle but this is within the standards as laid out in the Manual for Streets for such infrequently made manoeuvres.</li> <li>The additional information establishes a suite of information suitable to guide the application through the s38 process and establish an evidence base for the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Original Plans</u>  <b>Highways</b>          Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application drawings do not provide sufficient detail, regarding the carriageway and footway widths and, therefore, it is not clear if what is being proposed is feasible (or potentially to an adoptable standard, which would be required if offered for adoption or not).</li> <li>Clarification is particularly required of Equality Act 2010 consistency of inclines.</li> <li>The traffic impacts are not objectionable but require mitigation by financial contributions towards public transport services and infrastructure improvements and a traffic regulation order to ensure that an over-reliance on the private car does not occur to the detriment of sustainable transport.</li> </ul> <p><u>Suggested Conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential travel plan to be agreed</li> <li>Construction traffic management plan</li> </ul> <p><i>(Officer note: the Highway Authority also suggest conditions relating to access to the A417 to be formed and not obstructing, changing a public footpath but integrating it into the site. These conditions are either not necessary or relevant as the access has been formed and public rights of way are protected through other legislation. The public footpath is also outside the application site).</i></p>

Current Plans:

**Education**

No objection.

- Seek financial contributions towards improving existing primary, nursery and secondary schools.
- The application site is part of a site already covered by a s106 agreement for a different quantity of

housing. This response is based on the uplift in housing numbers (11 units).

- The proposed development is within the school planning area of Wantage. Due to the scale of housing development in this area, school pupil numbers are growing, and forecast to continue to do so at a rapid rate. To enable the county council to meet its statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places, primary school capacity is being planned strategically across the area, with a mixture of new schools and school expansions. Local developments are expected to contribute towards the capital costs of this expansion of capacity in a way proportional to their impact.

**Drainage**

No objection:

- The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy report should be updated to comply with current regulations. The report should also be specific to the section of site as the plans in the FRA do not match the overall site boundary presented in separate documents.
- The hierarchy of SuDS should be followed and infiltration should be prioritised. The report shows that infiltration is unfeasible, however infiltration testing results to BRE365 were not provided to demonstrate this. Should infiltration be found unfeasible for SuDS purposes, surface water from the site should be attenuated and discharged to greenfield run-off rates using the FEH method.
- Calculations should be shown for the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year + 40% climate change allowance with an additional 10% allowance for Urban Creep for all residential developments. This was not demonstrated.
- An exceedance flow path layout should be provided to demonstrate the direction of flows for the existing pre-development unmitigated site area and the post-development mitigated site area. It should be clearly demonstrated that any risk of



	<p>flooding to the site from neighbouring sites and/or low points within the site have been mitigated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the proposed SuDS design exceedance flows from the entire site should be indicated, all levels should fall away from any buildings and the exceedance flows should be contained within the site boundary.</li> <li>• Details of the future maintenance and management of the SuDS features should be provided.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Archaeology</u></b> No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A programme of archaeological mitigation has been previously undertaken and completed on the application site.</li> </ul>
Thames Water	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foul Water – no objection with regard to sewerage network infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>• Surface Water – no objection as surface water is not to be discharged to the public network</li> <li>• Water Network – no objection with regard to water treatment infrastructure capacity or network.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Proposed Informative</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approximately 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development</li> <li>• Guidance for any works close to a water mains</li> </ul>
Drainage Engineer	<p>No objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitted drainage technical report has been reviewed.</li> <li>• This application involves a variation to the drainage strategy approved under application P18/V1113/DIS. Whilst changes are relatively minor in terms of drainage requirements, fully updated sustainable drainage layout drawings for the site should be provided for approval. As such drainage conditions 6 and 7 on application P17/V2884/FUL should be reapplied should this application be recommended for approval.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Suggested Conditions:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface water drainage scheme to be approved and implemented</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Foul water drainage scheme to be approved and implemented</li></ul>									
Housing Development Team	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This application is seeking an uplift of 10 additional dwellings and a partial re-plan to the approved application P18/V0744/RM. Due to the increase in number of the dwellings, a 35% affordable housing contribution will be sought on the 10 dwellings additional units.</li><li>Therefore, for a site of 10 units this would equate to 3.55 affordable homes, however the applicant is delivering 4 units as affordable. Of this, 75% (3) should be for rent and 25% (1) should be for shared ownership.</li><li>There is a slight discrepancy in the cover letter stating 2 units for rent and 2 units for shared ownership and the updated plan <b>PL206 Rev C</b>, which shows 3 units for rent and 1 for shared ownership. This will need to be rectified; however, I will advise the changes are policy compliant as per the mix suggested below:</li></ul> <table><tr><td></td><td>2 bed / 4p hse</td><td>3 bed/ 5p hse</td></tr><tr><td>Affordable rented</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Shared ownership</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr></table>		2 bed / 4p hse	3 bed/ 5p hse	Affordable rented	2	1	Shared ownership	1	0
	2 bed / 4p hse	3 bed/ 5p hse								
Affordable rented	2	1								
Shared ownership	1	0								
Landscape Officer	<p>No landscape objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The scheme has been amended increasing the number of street trees and a step back of built form softening the street scene.</li></ul> <p>Previous Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The increase in housing numbers diminishes the quality of the approved scheme.</li><li>The proposal to increase the number of houses on site has a detrimental impact on the quality of the scheme and the rural interface between the village and the wider countryside. This is contrary to Local Plan Policy 44 with regards to development responding to the character of the area and would come under paragraph 130 NPPF. Local planning authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted</li></ul>									

	<p>scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as the materials used).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Design and Access statement of the RM application describes the areas fronting onto public open space (POS) as more informal, to create the transition between urban form and open space.</li> <li>• The north eastern side of the development is in a visually more sensitive part of the site, with the footpath to the north and east and glimpsed views from the village. The proposal increases the density of built form in this area increasing the mass of development in views at the edge of the village.</li> <li>• This application changes the character and the relationship of built form with the POS into a more town centre character rather than a village edge development. Both through the increased density of the built form but also by the proposed introduction of 2.5 storey properties.</li> <li>• The central area of public open space is located at a key nodal point in the scheme, it helps to create a gateway and focus to the development, the addition of 5 visitor spaces on the western side of the central area of POS reduces the quality of this central green. <i>(Planning officer note: These five spaces have already been permitted as part of the approved development and constructed).</i></li> </ul>
Countryside Officer	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This application is supported by an updated ecological survey report. The report confirms that the site was cleared of Great Crested Newts (GCN) under licence from Natural England.</li> <li>• The ecological mitigation and enhancement measures secured previously are still relevant to this development. These measures are reflected in the updated report and can be secured for this development using a compliance condition.</li> <li>• The implementation of landscaping works and ongoing management in the north of the site will need to take account of the fact that GCN are likely to be present in those areas. It would be suitable to secure an ecologically sensitive landscaping management plan for these areas through a planning condition.</li> <li>• It is recommended that an additional plan, showing the number, specification and position of bird and bat boxes, as recommended in the updated ecological report, is submitted to support this</li> </ul>

	<p>application (this could be secured through a prior to occupation condition).</p> <p><u>Suggested conditions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development shall be implemented in accordance with the ecological mitigation and enhancement measures stated in the Ecological Survey Information Report submitted with the application.</li> <li>• Landscaping management plan</li> <li>• Provision of bat and bird boxes</li> </ul>
Urban Design Officer	<p>No objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From a master planning perspective, it is entirely acceptable to subdivide plots and achieve a greater number of units through the more effective use of land, therefor increasing density; providing that does not have a detrimental effect on the overall master planning approach, policy compliance or technical feasibility.</li> <li>• There are no key issues that would need resolving or mitigating in relation to the application from a master planning perspective.</li> <li>• The approach to master planning remains acceptable.</li> <li>• Ensure compliance with policy CP24 of the LPP1.</li> </ul>
Air Quality Officer	<p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests provision of infrastructure at each property with off street parking, to facilitate the installation of an electric vehicle charging point.</li> </ul>
Environmental Protection Team (noise)	No objection.
Contaminated Land Officer	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterisation of the ground gas regime was previously incomplete for the site and further assessments required in the previous consultation comments in relation to P18/V2308/DIS should be provided.</li> </ul>
Waste Management Team	No objection.

### 3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

#### 3.1 *Applications*

[P21/V0293/FUL](#) – approved

Variation of conditions 1 (Approved plans), 5 (Car Parking) & 6 (Boundary details in Accord. with Specification Plan) on application P18/V0744/RM. 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) – appeal lodged

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).

**NB.** This application was refused by planning committee for the reasons summarised below:

1. Poor, cramped and congested design due to inadequate garden sizes for plots 64, 68, 89 and 90; inadequate internal floor space for plot 60; inappropriate house designs and as plot 68 does not turn a corner.
2. The absence of a s106 agreement to secure infrastructure and service improvements and affordable housing.

[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

[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. Landscape and visual impact
6. Highway safety, traffic and parking
7. Flood risk and drainage
8. Financial contributions

##### **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 For this site, the approach to the principle of new residential development is defined by core policies (CP) 3, 4 and 20 of LPP1. The overall spatial strategy of the development plan is to provide development within the built-up area of market towns, local service centres and larger villages.
- 5.4 CP3 of the LPP1 sets out the settlement hierarchy and it designates East Challow as a larger village within the Western Vale Sub-Area. The more recent loss of village facilities as referred to by residents and the Parish Council, does not change the village planning designation and it is not the role of Planning Committee in determining a planning application to change adopted planning policy.

- 5.5 CP4 of the LPP1 and CP4a of the LPP2 specify the minimum amount and locations of housing to be provided in the district. CP4 confirms a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the existing built up areas of larger villages.
- 5.6 CP20 of LPP1 sets out the spatial strategy for the Western Vale Sub-Area. It identifies the strategic housing site allocations for the area and confirms development within the Sub-Area should be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy of CP3 of the LPP1.
- 5.7 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 in the development plan.
- 5.8 Furthermore, the extant planning permission for 88 dwellings on this application site and the wider Park Farm site is a significant material consideration that adds weight to the favourable conclusion on the principle of this development proposal being acceptable.

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

#### Affordable Housing Mix

- 5.9 CP 24 of the LPP1 requires 35% of the proposed dwellings to be affordable dwellings. The original scheme for 88 dwellings provides 40% affordable housing (as per the previous Local Plan 2011 policy). Two of these permitted dwellings are within this application site (plots 60 and 61) and they have been built. To prevent ‘double counting’ of affordable housing, the affordable housing contribution from this application has been calculated on an uplift of 11 dwellings (as in combination with changes permitted under application no. P21/V0293/FUL, there is an uplift of 11 dwellings), which at 35% equates to 3.85 dwellings (or 39 affordable dwellings in conjunction with the wider Park Farm site). The application site associated with this application provides four new affordable dwellings and includes the two affordable dwellings already permitted and built (plots 60 and 61), and a total of 39 affordable dwellings across the wider Park Farm site.
- 5.10 In accordance with CP24 of the LPP1 the tenure split for the four new affordable dwellings is 75% social or affordable rented and 25% shared ownership and the size mix requested by the council’s housing team is now provided as follows:

House size	2-bed /4person	3-bed/5 person
Affordable rented	2	1
Shared ownership	1	0

- 5.11 The house on plot 60 has been built in accordance with a previous approval but is some 8 sq m smaller than the space standard of 79 sq m required by policy

DP2 of the LPP2 for a four person two-bedroom dwelling and this was a reason for refusal as part of application no. P20/V1395/FUL. However, consideration must be given to the fact that this house is built in accordance with an approved scheme and this weighs in favour of permitting the dwelling contrary to the standards required under policy DP2 that has since been adopted after the original approval of applications P16/V0652/O, P17/V2884/FUL and P18/V0744/RM.

### Market Housing Mix

- 5.12 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.”*

- 5.13 A comparison of the proposed market housing for this application (i.e. 30 market dwellings) with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) estimate is shown in the table below:

No of beds	1	2	3	4+
Proposed	0	5	8	17
SHMA	1.77	6.51	12.78	8.94

- 5.14 Across the whole Park Farm site the market housing mix would become:

No of beds	1	2	3	4+
Proposed (60 market dwellings)	0	11	21	28
SHMA (based on 60 market dwellings)	3.54	13.02	25.56	17.88
Consented (53 market dwellings)	0	10	17	26

- 5.15 The market mix does not follow the SHMA estimate but paragraph 7.35 of the SHMA does acknowledge 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 most recent (2020) Annual Monitoring Report advises the authority has been over providing 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings, under providing 3 bedroom dwellings whilst 4+ bed dwellings meet SHMA. The variation from SHMA needs to be considered in the planning balance.



### **Design**

- 5.16 This application will be seen in the context of the wider Park Farm development, which is under construction with some dwellings completed. The proposal is increasing dwellings within perimeter blocks in the same block layout and pattern of development as previously approved. This has involved substituting larger detached house types for a variety of smaller sized semi-detached and detached dwellings. These changes do not fundamentally alter its design with regards to the street hierarchy or block pattern. Dwellings now turn the corners. Over the wider 6.28ha Park Farm site the density increases from 14dph to 16dph or if public open space is deducted, from 22dph to 26dph. CP23 of the LPP1 expects a minimum density of 30dph unless this would have an adverse impact on the character of the area. The proposed changes and increase in density have no adverse impact on the character of the area, with the scheme maintaining the design principles and overall understanding and rational of the wider site in relation to its context.
- 5.17 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. There is one exception whereby a 2.5 storey dwelling type has been introduced which has rooms in the roof lit by flat roof dormer windows. Their occasional use (there are five of these houses) is reflective of 2.5 storey dwellings elsewhere in the village including on Main Street and Claypit Lane and together with the policy compliant density, do not in your officers' opinion, create an overtly urban appearance or harmful impact on the interface with open spaces as suggested by the landscape officer. Materials for the additional houses show good variation. The composition of architectural features and detailing ensures an acceptable sense of character and is in keeping with the approved development.
- 5.18 In response to the landscape officer's comments the landscaping scheme has been revised with additional tree planting in the street between plots 28 and 38. Front boundary hedges are provided and hedging borders roads in the north of the site. Walls are provided to boundaries in the public realm.
- 5.19 The proposal is considered acceptable in design and compliant with policies CP23, CP37, CP38 and CP44 of the LPP1, the Design Guide and the NPPF.

### **Residential Amenity**

- 5.20 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 is no unreasonable overlooking or overbearing impact on existing dwellings. The proposals accord with the design guide and Development Policy (DP) 23 of the LPP2.
- 5.21 A reason for refusing application no. P21/V1395/FUL related to four gardens being below the minimum sizes recommended in the council's 2015 adopted Design Guide. All but one of the gardens in this proposal exceed the garden sizes recommended in the Design Guide. The exception relates to plot 61

which is a house built in accordance with the approved 88 dwelling scheme. The garden size is 90.4 sq m being 9.6 sq m smaller than the guidance. The garden remains a reasonable size providing space for sitting out, play, a washing line, space for a shed and bin storage and has already been permitted. This is material in assessing any conflict with design guidance and in your officers' opinion the adequacy of the space available, plus the excess of 15% public open space, is on balance acceptable.

- 5.22 The proposal is therefore considered compliant with policies DP23 and DP33 of the LPP2.

#### **Landscape and Visual Impact**

- 5.23 Concern has been raised on coalescence of Wantage and East Challow. Open spaces to the eastern boundary that adjoin fields are retained with the housing not encroaching any further to the east than the permitted schemes.
- 5.24 There are no wider unacceptable landscape impacts with the development being visible in the context of the housing in the village and being constructed on this site. The proposal is compliant with CP37 and CP44 of the LPP1 and DP29 of the LPP2.

#### **Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking**

- 5.25 As requested by the highways officer dimensions and vision splays have been added to the layout plan with road widths of 5.5m and 2m wide footways as required and as already permitted. Residents raise concern with regard to the safety of the A417 following provision of the access arrangements which include staggered right hand turns into the site and into Letcombe Hill, the need for a roundabout at the site access, traffic generation and speeding traffic on the A417 and the provision of visitor parking. As the Highway Authority, Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) is an independent expert in highway matters and does not object to the proposal on these grounds.
- 5.26 The increase in traffic from the uplift of 11 dwellings is acceptable. It is predicted to amount to a net increase of 8 extra movements in the AM peak and 8 extra movements in the PM peak (The 88 dwelling scheme was predicted to generate 46 movements in both the AM and PM peak hours). The traffic generation impact would not result in a severe impact on the road network in NPPF terms (paragraph 111 of the NPPF) and the proposal accords with policy DP16 of the LPP1 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.
- 5.27 CP35 of the LPP1 requires adequate car parking to be delivered on site in accordance with County Council standards. 94 allocated parking spaces (including garages) are proposed with each house allocated at least two parking spaces (some have three or more spaces with the extra spaces potentially of use to visitors to these dwellings). There are seven proposed visitor parking spaces. This is sufficient parking which accords with CP35 of the LPP1.

**Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 5.28 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 but the drainage scheme will need to be revised to reflect this proposal should the application be permitted. Planning conditions can secure appropriate surface and foul water drainage schemes as recommended by the council's drainage engineer.
- 5.29 Thames Water has no objection in regard to foul water drainage or capacity.
- 5.30 It is concluded the proposal complies with CP42 of the LPP1.

**Financial contribution requests**

- 5.31 The NPPF and CIL Regulations advise that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
- i. Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - ii. Directly related to the development; and
  - iii. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 5.32 CP7 of the LPP1 will only permit development where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured.
- 5.33 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will require contributions from the development based on floor space of the 36 dwellings and this could amount to over £638,000.
- 5.34 In accordance with the Developer Contributions SPD, a s106 would be needed to secure affordable housing, management and maintenance of on site open spaces and play area, street naming and bin provision for the dwellings, public transport service improvements, and school improvements. There is no known public art scheme for the village and this scheme has not previously sought contributions. In this case a public art contribution is therefore not considered necessary.
- 5.35 Education contributions are to be secured via a s106 rather than CIL. The nearest, and designated, school serving this development is St Nicholas CE Primary School in East Challow, which is controlled by the Vale Academy Trust. Pupil numbers at the school have been rising rapidly, and the school is already full in several year groups, and has been over-subscribed for the 2021 intake. The Trust is working with the County Council to plan the school's future capacity, including capital works to provide more places as appropriate. The first phase of this has recently been approved to expand the school's provision to include 2 and 3-year olds, and a capital project is planned to provide additional accommodation.

- 5.36 The proposed development is within the school planning area of Wantage. There is currently one secondary school in the area, King Alfred's in Wantage, but due to the scale of housing development in this area, a new secondary school has been approved to open in Grove, in order to provide sufficient secondary school capacity. Local developments are expected to contribute towards the capital costs of this expansion of capacity in a way proportional to their impact. The initial phase of the school will be constructed with a 600-place capacity, but the school will be planned to expand in line with the local population.
- 5.37 OCC has previously explained that East Challow is served by Thames Travel route 67 which operates past the site and is funded exclusively by s106 obligations from various developments on the route. Without such contributions from development on the route, continuation of service 67 at its current frequency, and hence, the proximity of the site to public transport services cannot be guaranteed. A financial contribution towards continuing the bus service ensures the site remains accessible.
- 5.38 If permission is granted and based on an uplift of 11 dwellings this authority would expect the following financial contributions to be secured through a s106 agreement:

<b>District Council</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
Bin provision	£1,860
Street naming of this development	£229
S106 monitoring fee	£1,120

<b>Oxfordshire County Council</b>	<b>Amount (£)</b>
Provision and/or improvement of public transport services in the vicinity of the site	£9,801
Education – improvements for nursery, primary education serving the site	£94,390
Education – secondary education serving the site	£132,338
S106 monitoring	TBC

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This application has been determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 A conflict with CP22 of the LPP1 is identified with the market housing mix not being SHMA compliant. This is given significant weight. In addition, an affordable dwelling is approximately 8 sqm smaller than space standards and a garden is 9.6 sq m smaller than the 100 sq m suggestion in the Design Guide. The two plots affected have already been built under the existing planning permission. This is a material consideration and weighs in favour of the proposal. Also weighing in favour of the proposals is compliance with other

policies in the development plan including those relating to the principle of development and design. The proposal also 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 windfall housing contributing towards identified housing need including affordable housing which can be given significant weight. The proposal can help maintain the 67 bus service, provide housing in an accessible location and provide biodiversity enhancements which can be given modest weight. On balance the benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the harm identified.

- 6.3 In conclusion, the proposal is considered acceptable subject to the imposition of conditions and securing a s106 agreement for infrastructure and service improvements as listed above, and providing affordable housing.

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