

APPLICATION NO.	P12/V2653/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	10 January 2013
PARISH	KINGSTON BAGPUIZE
WARD MEMBER(S)	Melinda Tilley
APPLICANT	Taylor Wimpey and The Heathfield Trust
SITE	Land off Draycott Road Southmoor OX13 5NG
PROPOSAL	Erection of 98 dwellings with associated open space, structural landscaping and access
AMENDMENTS	27 March 2013 & 19 April 2013
GRID REFERENCE	439812/198339
OFFICER	David Rothery

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This 4.64ha site lies on the north side of the village, to the west of Draycott Road and the south of the A420 Oxford – Swindon road. It comprises a grassed field enclosed by hedgerows and some inter-spaced trees along the site's north, east and west boundaries, and to the rear of residential and community buildings (village hall and tennis courts) to the south.
- 1.2 Local facilities in the village comprise a primary school, a village hall, post office, shop and public houses. The local sports ground lies south of the village, across the parish boundary in Fyfield and Tubney parish. Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor itself has approximately 950 households and a population of about 2,349.
- 1.3 A location plan is **attached** at appendix 1

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This is a full application to consider all of the planning aspects of the proposed development. The proposal is a major development and is contrary to the policies of the development plan. The proposal has been publicised on this basis.
- 2.2 The proposal is for residential development of the site for 98 dwellings together with roads, footpaths and associated parking areas, landscaping, amenity space, open space and the use of some open land to the south-east of the site as an additional recreational area for use in association with the village hall. Vehicular access is to be taken off Draycott Road, and pedestrian access would also be available to the site from the west, off the footpath / cycle track that allows access to the bridge over the A420.
- 2.3 Cumulatively, this proposal for 98 dwellings would generate an estimated population (based upon district-wide average household figures) of 248 residents. Compared to the approximate 950 existing households and 2,349 population in the parish, therefore the development represents about a 10% increase in the parish. Across the 4.64ha site the 98 dwelling units would produce a density of 21 dwellings per hectare.
- 2.4 Affordable housing for the proposal would amount to 39 dwellings (40%). 26.5% of the dwellings are two bedroom properties or less.
The proposed mix of dwellings is as follows:
1-bedroom = 5 units

2-bedroom = 21 units
3-bedroom = 16 units
4-bedroom = 56 units

- 2.5 In support of the application the following documents have been submitted:
- Planning Supporting Statement (Dec 2012 – Kemp & Kemp)
 - Design and Access Statement (Aug 2012 - Savills)
 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Dec 2012 – edp)
 - Findings of arboricultural assessment (Nov 2012 – edp)
- 2.6 The applicants have been in discussion with council officers and others to agree levels of financial contributions towards off-site services which this proposal (through the increase in population and the activities they generate) would add to the use of, and securing of on-site facilities such as affordable housing. Financial contributions cover facilities and services such as waste collection, street name plates, public art, education (primary, secondary, sixth-form and SEN), library and museums, waste management, social and healthcare, fire and rescue, highways and transport, police equipment, and local recreational facilities.
- 2.7 Extracts from the application plans are **attached** at appendix 2.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor Parish Council – Objects

A copy of the parish council's comment is **attached** at appendix 3.

3.2 Representations from local residents – A total of 52 representations had been received at the time of writing this report, of which 50 object and 2 specify the need to retain existing features. The objections made are on the following grounds:

- Increased traffic leading to safety issues and additional road congestion
- Appearance and density are out of character with the locality
- Loss of an open field
- Increased pressure on local physical infrastructure
- The site is subject to flooding with inadequate drainage
- Cumulative impact on the village which has limited facilities
- Issues of noise pollution and impact on air quality and lighting
- Loss of a field used for village community amenities

3.3 Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) – Object:

1. Over-building in the village as a whole and on this site in particular. The proposed development is too dense. Its approval would change the character of the village to its detriment.
2. Position of the development. The development would be in the middle of the village, next to the village hall, a site specifically ruled out by the recent Parish Plan.
3. Traffic problems. This further new development would generate large amounts of extra traffic in the village which the accompanying highways adjustments would not seem to be able to cope with, causing congestion on Draycott Road and its junctions with other village roads, and the A415 / Faringdon Road junction.
4. Other infrastructure problems.
5. Surveys do not show that proper attention has been paid to the provision of appropriate water pressure, sewerage, and surface water drainage.

6. The application does not seem to satisfy the provisions of the NPPF in preserving the character of the village.

3.4 **County Highways** – no objection subject to suitable conditions to secure highway improvements and contributions towards public transport provision.

3.5 **Design and Conservation Officer** –

The connectivity of the site would be improved if the footpath on the west side of Draycott Road was continued in front of the village hall to link up with the footpath to the south. The footpaths running along the west and north boundaries of the site should be upgraded as part of the development, and the recreational footpath to the north of the site should continue along the entire length of the development (plot 14 would appear to prevent the two ends of the footpath linking up).

Consider providing the local area for play (LEAP) at the village hall where it could be used by the wider community.

The house types in general are acceptable for this location. However, the detailing on the blank side elevation of house type E could be improved and house types 1BC and 2BC (accommodation over garages) are inappropriate for this village location. The north boundary of the village hall site will require a well detailed brick wall and landscaping. Details of the pumping station will need to be agreed by condition.

3.6 **Landscape Architect** – Acceptable layout but there are a number of issues relating to certain plots extending into the existing row of vegetation or with buildings extending too close to the plot boundaries. The tallest buildings are on the northern boundary of the site, closest to the interface between the site and the open countryside to the north of the A420. There is also no pedestrian link between the site and the village hall.

There will also be a sharp transition from the openness of the right of way beside Worcester Place into the south-west corner of the site due to the rear garden of plot 93 and the house position being adjacent to the public right of way.

Also concerned that the proximity and interface of the development on the north-western edge of the development will create an enclosed footpath route with little visual supervision.

The design of the new pumping station is important, as is the proposed linear open space to the east of it. This area will need to be carefully detailed so as not to feel like the left over space dictated by the noise levels of the A420. Currently, the western end of the open space fizzles out into the visitor parking, pumping station and parking associated with plots 85 and 86.

3.7 **Arboriculturalist** – No objection provided relevant tree protection measures are implemented and the vegetation around the perimeter of the development is retained.

3.8 **Ecologist** - Holding objection as discussions relating to the grassland habitat, which is considered to be a UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat, are underway to establish a suitable compensation scheme which would allow for the creation of new priority habitats on an identified receptor site.

3.9 **Natural England** – The site includes a biodiversity action plan priority habitat. This should be adequately mitigated or compensated.

3.10 **Environment Agency** – Standard advice offered as site lies within flood zone 1 and is

therefore not a high risk location.

3.11 **Drainage Engineer** – No objection subject to conditions on drainage and flood risk.

3.12 **Thames Water** – Foul water - An initial investigation has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development. If planning permission is granted, Thames Water recommends a Grampian condition is imposed requiring a drainage strategy to be completed.

Surface water - The applicant should ensure that storm water flows are attenuated through on-site storage. Groundwater would require a discharge permit to be arranged.

Water supply - The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. Thames Water therefore recommends a Grampian condition be imposed requiring impact studies to be carried out.

3.13 **Environmental Health** –

Air Quality Assessment - This follows sound principles and has assessed the likely impacts of the proposed development on existing residents and also the impacts of pollution from traffic on the A420 on the occupiers of the new development. Air quality is not a constraint on the development.

Noise Assessment - The site is adversely affected by road noise. A scheme of sound insulation to ensure that internal noise levels satisfy BS8233:1999 has been proposed. Permission is recommended subject to the full implementation of the noise mitigation scheme outlined in the report.

3.14 **Housing Services** – The proposal for 98 houses requires the provision of 39 affordable houses (40%), which is proposed.

Policy H17 requires affordable housing to be distributed evenly across the site and to be indistinguishable in appearance from the market housing. The current layout is compliant with the policy.

3.15 **Waste Management Team** – Requires storage areas for wheeled bins per plot to be provided with collection points clear of parking areas.

3.16 **Leisure Services** – Maintenance of open space areas should be clarified and secured by adoption by the parish or through a management company.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE** **Vale of White Horse Local Plan**

5.1 Policy GS1 provides a general location strategy to concentrate development within the five main settlements.

5.2 Policy GS2 indicates that outside the built-up areas new building will not be permitted unless on land identified for development or the proposal is in accordance with other specific policies.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 8 May 2013

- 5.3 Policy DC1 requires new development to be of a high design quality in terms of layout, scale, mass, height, detailing, materials to be used, and its relationship with adjoining buildings.
- 5.4 Policy DC4 requires development on sites of 0.5 ha or more to contribute to public art to significantly contribute to the scheme or the area.
- 5.5 Policy DC6 requires hard and soft landscaping to protect and enhance the visual amenities of the site and surroundings and to maximise nature conservation and wildlife habitat creation.
- 5.6 Policy DC9 seeks to ensure development will not unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and the wider environment.
- 5.7 Policy NE7 requires developments within the North Vale Corallian Ridge not to harm the landscape quality of the area unless an overriding need is identified and any impact is minimised.
- 5.8 Policy H11 allows limited development of not more than 15 dwellings in settlements such as Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor subject to design and no loss of open space.
- 5.9 Policy H13 seeks to limit new housing development outside the built-up areas of settlements.
- 5.10 Policy H16 requires about 50% provision of housing to be two bedrooms or less for schemes of more than 10 dwellings and 10% should meet lifetime homes standards.
- 5.11 Policy H17 requires 40% provision of affordable housing for schemes of more than 5 dwellings.
- 5.12 Policy H23 refers to housing schemes providing open space facilities at 15% for larger villages.

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

- 5.13 Residential Design Guide – December 2009
Offers guidance on housing design and layout.
- 5.14 Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009
Code for Sustainable Homes guidance to achieve level 3 and working to level 4 by 2013.
- 5.15 Open space, Sport and Recreation Future Provision – July 2008
Advice for the provision and maintenance requirements for open space areas.
- 5.16 Affordable Housing – July 2006
Provides further guidance in relation to policy H17.
- 5.17 Planning and Public Art – July 2006
Sites over 0.5 ha should provide a contribution towards public art in line with policy DC4.
- 5.18 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** – March 2012
Paragraphs 14 & 49 – presumption in favour of sustainable development
Paragraph 47 – five year housing supply requirement
Paragraph 50 - create sustainable inclusive and mixed communities

Paragraph 99 – flood risk assessment

Paragraph 109 – contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

National advice

- 6.1 At the heart of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Within the context of the NPPF, planning permission should be granted where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, unless any adverse impacts would so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole (paragraph 14).
- 6.2 The current lack of a five year supply of housing sites in the district is due to the lack of delivery of new housing by developers rather than an under-supply of allocated housing land. This has primarily been caused by delays in progressing some major allocations due to the economic downturn and the delay in bringing forward the council's new local plan. The current lack of a five year housing land supply justifies some flexibility in line with the NPPF in the consideration of planning applications which do not accord with local plan policy.
- 6.3 This approach is by necessity of a time-limited duration and is aimed at identifying sites considered suitable to address the housing land shortfall whilst still meeting relevant sustainability and design criteria as referred to in the NPPF. An assessment has been made of the case put forward by the applicants that this proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF for providing sustainable development to help address the current housing land shortfall and, as a result, it is considered that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable.
- 6.4 It is clear the application is contrary to local plan policies GS2 and H11. However, whilst the council does not have a five year housing land supply, these policies GS2 are inconsistent with the NPPF. The proposed development, therefore, needs to be considered on its site specific merits and whether it constitutes a sustainable form of development as defined in the NPPF.
- 6.5 The assessment of the application needs to balance the desire that the scheme should be considered through a strategic sites allocation process against the tests set out in the NPPF (i.e. sustainable location, appropriate design, landscape impact, drainage, and highway safety) given the current lack of a five year housing land supply.

Use of land

- 6.6 Paragraph 109 of the NPPF says that “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment”, and paragraph 111 says that planning decisions “should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has previously been developed (brownfield land).”
- 6.7 The site has been used for agricultural or similar low activity uses in the past. The development of the site for housing is contrary to policy H10 but, as indicated above, this is not a restricting factor given the current housing land shortfall, subject to all other site specific matters being considered acceptable in accordance with the NPPF. The landscape quality of the site is relatively low and so this, in itself, would not prejudice the proposed development
- 6.8 The application site is relatively well visually enclosed. The site is 4.64 ha. and is bounded to the north by the A420, to the east by Draycott Road and housing facing the

site as well as the village hall and tennis courts, on the south by housing backing on to the site from Faringdon Road, and on the west by an open area with a footpath / cycleway route to the bridge that crosses the A420.

- 6.9 The land is physically contained and whilst it may be considered to be an open amenity feature for the village, this is not its authorised use and it is unlikely to remain in such use for the foreseeable future given it not being in public ownership.

Sustainability credentials

- 6.10 The NPPF puts strong emphasis on housing being used to further enhance rural vitality. Kingston Bagpuize is one of the larger villages within the district and scores within the top 20 in the village hierarchy. The location of the site is on the northern fringe of the village and within reasonably close distance to the range of services and facilities available. For these reasons, the principle of the proposal is considered to be acceptable in that the site is a reasonably sustainable location.

Cumulative impact considerations

- 6.11 This site is the fourth major development to have been the subject of an application within the Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor parish area or an adjacent parish area seeking to assist in addressing the identified housing land shortfall across the district. The other schemes have considered 50 dwellings on land south of Faringdon Road, and a scheme for up to 108 dwellings west of Witney Road both of which have been granted planning permission, and a revised proposal still under consideration for 12 dwellings on land adjacent to the sports ground, Abingdon Road, south of Kingston Bagpuize. There may be further submissions on other sites, but there are no other major sites currently before the council for consideration.

- 6.12 This overall level of development already committed comes to 158 dwellings, which amounts to a 17% increase in the existing housing base in the parish. The proposed development would increase this figure to 27% which it is considered can be accommodated in the locality, provided suitable financial contributions are secured for on-site and off-site services and infrastructure and a good proportion of the new development is affordable housing. This takes into account the housing land shortfall which needs to be addressed and the sustainability benefits of the larger villages taking a fair proportion of new housing to help support and ensure the retention of existing services and attract new services to the locality.

Social infrastructure

- 6.13 There has been some local concern that existing social and physical infrastructure within the village could not cope with the proposed increase in population resulting from this proposal. However, contributions can be secured to offset the impacts arising from the development. The applicant has agreed to the principle of addressing these needs through contributions which can be secured through a section 106 legal agreement.

Access arrangements

- 6.14 The site would be accessed off Draycott Road from the east. The access is shown with acceptable vision splays. No direct vehicular access to the site would be provided from Faringdon Road to the south of the site. Some off site highway improvement works, however, would be required.
- 6.15 There is some local concern that the proposed access would cause highway congestion due to the level of traffic already using Draycott Road from the Blandy Avenue estate and the local primary school to the east. However, the County Engineer has raised no highway objections on traffic generation or highway safety grounds.

Affordable housing

- 6.16 The affordable housing requirement has been confirmed by the applicant to be workable as part of the scheme. The distribution of the affordable housing across the site in accordance with council policies can be secured through the section 106 agreement.

Visual impact - appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

- 6.17 Good design and layout is a key aspect of sustainable development and the NPPF is explicit in seeking high quality outcomes. The submitted proposal has been considered in accordance with the advice in the NPPF and it is considered that this scheme is acceptable in terms of the site specific considerations.
- 6.18 The layout includes a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings and some flats with parking below. The revised layout provides a suitable development to complement and add to the existing stock of dwellings in the village. The proposed layout offers external passive surveillance of the surrounding public areas, including the northern boundary footpath which is now to be retained to offer a link into the site from this corner of the site. The dwellings are appropriately separated from the existing dwellings that border the site.
- 6.19 The detailed appearance and design of the dwellings reflect a traditional feel with solid materials and pitched roofscape. There is a mix of dwelling types to cater for different housing requirements, and the pallet of materials offers individuality whilst retaining elements of a common approach throughout the proposed development. The dwelling types providing single level accommodation over garages which were criticised by the Councils Design and Conservation Officer are located in limited and off-street frontage locations. These units are designed to blend in with the overall character of the rural feel of the development and therefore do not have a harmful impact on to the area.
- 6.20 The proposal retains and maintains the existing field boundaries to the site with additional landscaping provided to the boundaries with the A420 and the village hall and tennis courts. The village hall is to be provided with an additional area of land for amenity purposes. There is landscaping shown throughout the proposed layout and on the open areas to be created within the northern and central parts of the development.
- 6.21 The proposed layout show adequate private and public outdoor space, and relates well to the surrounding development. Privacy distances within the development and to neighbouring properties are achieved in accordance with the Residential Design Guide.
- 6.22 Whilst the provision of the proposed two-and-a-half storey dwellings is an uncharacteristic mass of building on the periphery of the development, these buildings adjoin the northern edge of the development close to the A420 and so will assist in defraying possible traffic noise. These properties will include appropriate noise attenuation measures. The provision of these dwelling types as not raised concern from the Council's Design and Conservation Officer.

Impact on neighbours residential amenity

- 6.23 The proposed layout would not have any direct harmful impact on the residential amenity of adjacent properties in terms of overshadowing, light pollution, over-dominance or loss of privacy. The proposed arrangement would provide a generally inward facing development, and adequate spatial separation is achieved between properties in accordance with the Residential Design Guide.
- 6.24 The proposal also includes a revised footpath route at the northern section of the development, linking Draycott Road to the western side of the site, replacing the

permissive path at the northern edge of the site. There is also a need to provide a footway outside the application site along the west side of Draycott Road to the village hall entrance to enable safe pedestrian access. This would be subject to works within the highway which the developer would be required to provide.

Heritage assets

- 6.25 The NPPF requires that account should be taken of the desirability to sustain and enhance heritage assets. The site includes no heritage assets, although there are listed buildings within the surrounding area. None of these are considered to rely on the site as part of their settings. The application has not identified any heritage asset that would be adversely affected by the proposal.

Ecological biodiversity

- 6.26 The submitted habitats survey has identified that the grassland which covers the majority of the site has a relatively diverse species assemblage which would qualify it as a UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat. Priority Habitats have been identified as those which are the most threatened within the UK and those which should be protected from harm. The proposal would involve the loss of the majority of this important habitat and this would result in a significant impact on biodiversity locally. However, it is recognised that the current use of the site as horse pasture limits the value of the habitat to some extent and, as a result, the loss of the grassland could be considered acceptable provided a suitable off-site compensation package can be agreed.

- 6.27 Officers, therefore, have sought to negotiate a compensation scheme which would allow the creation and management of high quality habitats on a suitable receptor site. The applicant is currently in discussions to identify a suitable compensation scheme, the details of which are close to finalisation. A further update report on this matter will be made at the meeting.

Drainage and flooding issues

- 6.28 Surface water drainage - The site is considered large enough to enable water storage facilities to dispose of surface water without causing surface water run-off to the highway or onto neighbouring properties. An attenuation scheme is shown as part of the plans as part of the drainage solution for the site's development.
- 6.29 Foul water drainage - Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this proposal. A drainage strategy is required to enable all water drainage (surface and foul) to be discharged into the public sewerage system before any development starts on site.
- 6.30 Water supply - Thames Water has advised that the water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands of the proposed development. An impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure is requested before any works start on site to determine the magnitude of any additional capacity requirement in the system. The impact study can be secured by condition.
- 6.31 The requirements of water supply and waste water discharge need to be addressed before any development starts on site. The timescale for the implementation of any favourable determination are restricted on the basis of the need to ensure the new housing is delivered in the short term. A delay in implementing the required improvements to the water infrastructure would indicate that there is potentially an issue in meeting the required implementation timescales.

6.32 The applicant, however, has provided a timetable to show that the drainage requirements are technically possible and can be addressed and all other matters pertaining to the proposed development can be submitted and agreed within the required implementation timescale

Thames Water's timescales for the conclusion of their investigations and impact studies based on the scale of the development are:

- a scoping report and impact study that will take two weeks to complete
- the detailed impact study (which will identify Thames Water's preferred solution) will take up to 24 weeks to complete.

This means that the foul water issue can be resolved within the life of a one year planning permission. The timeline will be as follows:

- response to Thames Water's pre-development inquiry - 25 March 2013
- Planning Committee decision on 8 May 2013
- completion of Thames Water's scoping report - expected on 8 August 2013
- completion of section.106 and issue of planning permission by 8 Aug 2013 (three months after the planning committee resolution)
- completion of Thames Water's impact study – expected on 9 Sept 2013 (if it takes the full 24 weeks to complete)
- expiry date of the planning permission – 8 August 2014 (the permission will require the approved drainage scheme to be implemented within one year of the date of the planning decision)

On a worst case basis, this means that there would be at least 11 months in which to obtain condition discharge prior to commencement of development and then make a material start on site following a resolution to grant permission and the completion of the various Thames Water studies.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 This proposal does not accord with the development plan and it has been publicised as a departure. However, in the light of the current shortfall in the council's five year housing land supply, the proposal's location adjoining an existing large village with close availability of services and facilities should be afforded appropriate weight. As the proposal would result in a sustainable development in terms of its relationship and proximity to local facilities and services, the principle of the proposal is considered to accord with the NPPF.

7.2 In site specific terms, the proposal is not considered to be harmful to the landscape character of the area, the residential amenity of nearby properties, any local heritage assets or highway safety and, therefore, given the current housing land shortfall, it complies with the NPPF. The proposed plans show an acceptable development on the site.

7.3 A major issue that has arisen relates to the foul water infrastructure. The council should not grant planning permission if that permission could not be implemented within its 12 month timescale.

7.4 The applicants have proposed a timescale to address the water infrastructure issues and to comply with the expected planning condition and still be in a position to implement the development within the 12 month timescale.

7.5 In addition, the scheme could come on stream quickly, as all the necessary criteria are in place for swift development on site which will assist in helping to address the current housing land shortfall.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 It is recommended that the decision to grant planning permission be delegated to head of planning in consultation with the committee chairman and vice-chairman subject to:

1. Completion within the agreed PPA period of section 106 agreements for on-site affordable housing provision, contributions towards off-site compensation for the creation and management of species rich grassland on a suitable receptor site, contributions to other off-site facilities and services including highway works, education improvements, waste management and collection, street names signs, public art, library and museum services, social and health care, fire and rescue, police equipment, local and area hub recreational and community facility improvements;

2. The following conditions, including the requirement that the development be commenced within 12 months from the date of the planning permission in order to help address the immediate housing land shortfall:

- 1: Commencement within 12 months
- 2 : Planning condition listing the approved drawings
- 3 : Materials as on plan
- 4 : LS1 - LS2 landscaping scheme
- 5 : boundary landscaping with footpath to village hall
- 6 : Tree protection measures
- 7 : Boundary walls and fences
- 8 : Plot curtilage boundaries
- 9 : HY2 - Access in accordance with specified plan
- 10 : HY12 -HY13 Roads specification
- 11 : HY8 - Car parking
- 12 : HY20 - Bicycle parking
- 13 : Construction traffic management plan
- 14 : Sustainable travel information pack (STIP)
- 15 : Childrens' play space
- 16 : Open space
- 17 : Bat mitigation
- 18 : Great crested newt mitigation
- 19 : Refuse bin storage
- 20 : Roof top aeriels
- 21 : Fire hydrants
- 22 : Flood risk details
- 23 : Drainage details
- 24 : MC22 - Contamination

8.2 If the required section 106 agreements are not completed in a timely manner and so planning permission cannot be granted by the determination deadline of 24 May 2013, in accordance with the agreed PPA, it is recommended that authority to refuse planning permission is delegated to the head of planning in consultation with the chairman and vice-chairman.

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 8 May 2013

Author / Officer: David Rothery - Major Applications Officer
Contact number: 01235 540349
Email address: david.rothery@southandvale.gov.uk