

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P21/V0140/FUL</a>
<b>SITE</b>	Workshop And Premises 2A 2-6 High Street Steventon Abingdon, OX13 6RS
<b>PARISH</b>	STEVENTON
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Redevelopment of previously developed land involving change of use from Class E to Class C3, demolition of light industrial buildings (No 2A) and erection of replacement apartment building providing 7 no. apartments with undercroft parking and cycle storage, part-demolition of buildings (Nos 6 and 6A) fronting High Street to facilitate provision of parking and bin and cycle storage, with retained floor area consolidated for commercial use Class E  (as amended by updated contamination report received 1 March 2021, and as amended by plans omitting balcony to flat 4 and reconfiguring parking received 6 April 2021, and as amplified by noise assessment received 13 April 2021 and sun diagrams received 20 April 2021)
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Matthew Barber
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Saxonville Limited
<b>OFFICER</b>	Katherine Canavan

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**It is recommended that permission is granted subject to the following conditions:**

### **Conditions**

1. Work to commence within three years
2. Approved plans
3. Demolition statement
4. Construction Traffic Management Plan
5. If contamination found, development to cease until remediation is complete
6. Detailed sustainable drainage scheme
7. Foul water drainage
8. Flood evacuation and management plan
9. Schedule of materials

10. Hard and soft landscaping details
11. Mitigation in accordance with acoustic report
12. Implementation of parking and cycle provision
13. Boundary Treatment
14. Screening to western edge of the balcony of flat 3

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The application is referred to Planning Committee as Steventon Parish Council object to the proposal. The proposal was presented to committee on 7 July 2021 and deferred for a site visit, which is scheduled to take place on 26 July 2021.
- 1.2 The application site is classed as brownfield land and is located centrally within Steventon. The courtyard sits to the rear of commercial buildings and the Co-Op on the High Street, and behind dwellings on The Causeway. Two accesses link the site to these two main roads.
- 1.3 The site comprises two vacant industrial buildings set back within the site, and a restaurant and café fronting onto the High Street, which are also currently vacant. A barn and 2-storey printworks are also located within the courtyard but fall outside the application area. The Co-Op car park and delivery yard adjoins the southern edge of the site. The western edge of the site faces onto open land and private gardens.
- 1.4 The courtyard falls within Flood Zone 1, but both access points fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The adjoining High Street and The Causeway are in Zone 3.
- 1.5 The site falls within the Steventon Conservation Area and there are listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. The site is also located within an area of archaeological interest known as the Steventon Historic Core.
- 1.6 Following comments from technical officers, amended plans and additional information were submitted to improve the parking provision and to address drainage and noise concerns. A copy of the latest plans is **attached** at Appendix 2.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

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

Steventon Parish Council	April amendment - objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is a clear indication of overdevelopment and all our original objections remain.</li><li>• The Parish Council would prefer an application to cover the whole site. Future development will have no parking provision.</li><li>• Concern over whether the parking provision meets highway standards</li></ul>
--------------------------	---

	<p>Original proposal – objection</p> <p>Steventon Parish Council support the principle of redevelopment of the site but consider the proposal for seven small flats is overdevelopment of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and lack of parking</li> <li>• Reduction in size of commercial units and associated employment</li> <li>• Narrowness of access points</li> <li>• Risk of flooding along the High Street and The Causeway</li> <li>• Insufficient space for bin collection away from pavements</li> <li>• Overlooking towards neighbouring properties, especially from balconies</li> </ul>
Residents	<p><i>18 letters of objection and 1 letter of support have been received raising the following points:</i></p> <p>April amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earlier objections maintained</li> <li>• Designing in additional parking spaces on High Street presents a highway safety issue in terms of reversing across the pavement and conflicting with the commercial uses</li> <li>• Unsuitable access – the High Street entrance appears to have been narrowed further.</li> <li>• The reduction in parking spaces from the original proposal puts pressure on surrounding residential streets</li> </ul> <p>Original proposal</p> <p>The principle of the site being redeveloped for a residential use is generally supported. However, residents raised the following concerns about the proposed scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdevelopment, cramped and too dense</li> <li>• Lack of parking</li> <li>• Access points are unsuitable for the number of households, refuse collection vehicles, construction vehicles and delivery vehicles, being too narrow and having poor visibility onto the adjoining roads</li> <li>• Flood risk and capacity of drainage system</li> <li>• Overlooking and noise disturbance from the proposed balconies</li> <li>• Future residents will suffer noise disturbance from the large air conditioning unit adjacent to the Co-op</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design does not take account of government best practice – ‘Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission report’, ‘Building for a Healthy Life’, the ‘National Design Guide’ or the ‘National Model Design Code’, resulting in a poorly designed scheme</li> <li>• Impact on the conservation area and nearby listed buildings – the proposed materials and detailing are not sympathetic to the character of the village</li> <li>• Uncertainty over parts of the site that are not being developed at this stage, and missed opportunity to improve the street frontage and the conservation area. The site’s redevelopment should be comprehensive addressing the flood zones in a more positive way than just omitting the relevant parts of the site from the application.</li> <li>• Loss of commercial floorspace</li> <li>• Lack of built-in, domestic storage</li> <li>• Lack of biodiversity enhancement and soft landscaping</li> </ul>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council – Archaeologist</p>	<p>April amendment - No objection</p> <p>Original proposal - No objection</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council – Highways Team</p>	<p>June amendment - No objection, subject to condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While there are a number of design improvements that could be made to the parking arrangements, there are no grounds to object on highways safety grounds.</li> <li>• Recommended conditions: Implementation of parking and cycle provision, and construction traffic management plan</li> </ul> <p>April amendment – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of separation between residential and commercial parking spaces fronting on the High Street</li> <li>• Manoeuvrability within the site to access some spaces, and to allow delivery vehicles to load / unload to the apartments, given the distance.</li> </ul> <p>Original proposal – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient number of useable parking spaces</li> <li>• Manoeuvrability within the site to access some spaces, and to allow delivery vehicles to load / unload to the apartments, given the distance.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient cycle provision is shown on plans</li> <li>• Bin collection arrangements are acceptable</li> </ul>
Community Infrastructure Officer & 106 Officer	<p>April amendment – No further comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No strong views The development is CIL liable.</p>
Conservation Officer	<p>April amendment – No further comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No objection</p>
Contaminated Land	<p>April amendment – No objection, subject to condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following receipt of the detailed ground investigation report, no objection, subject to a contamination condition as a precautionary measure</li> </ul> <p>Original proposal – No objection, subject to condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to the desk survey and ground investigation, a more comprehensive land contamination investigation needs to be carried out. This can be secured by condition.</li> </ul>
Drainage Engineer	<p>April amendment – No further comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No objection, subject to condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of foul and surface water</li> </ul>
Env. Protection Team	<p>April amendment – No objection, subject to condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following receipt of the acoustic report, no objection, subject to implementation of the measures set out in the report.</li> </ul> <p>Original proposal – Holding objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development will be placing noise sensitive residential development close to existing noise sources, specifically, air conditioning and refrigeration plant.</li> <li>• The applicant will need to demonstrate that noise from this plant will not have an unreasonable impact of the amenity of the proposed dwellings</li> </ul>
Urban Design Officer	<p>April amendment – No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no design grounds to object to the revised scheme.</li> </ul> <p>Original proposal - No objection The following comments have been raised:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the rear block has been broken down into a finer grain and includes a series of pitched, gable end roofs. The south western corner of the block has also been reduced in height. This works better from a design point of view and feels less obtrusive overall.</li> <li>• The supporting information would benefit from clarification on the design rationale, an explanation of the design cues, details of materials and a sun angle diagram.</li> <li>• Lack of landscaping detail.</li> <li>• It is a missed opportunity for the whole site not to be comprehensively redeveloped.</li> </ul>
Waste Management Officer	<p>April amendment – No further comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No objection</p>
Environment Agency	<p>April amendment – No further comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No objection, subject to condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contamination condition as a precautionary measure</li> </ul>
Thames Water Development Control	<p>April amendment – No comment</p> <p>Original proposal – No comment</p>

### 3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 [P20/V1257/PEJ](#) - Advice provided (13/04/2021)

9no 1-bed apartments, 6no 2-bed apartments, 2no commercial premises following the demolition of all existing buildings except for the Barn which is to be converted with the erection of new buildings. Provision of access, parking, cycles and bin storage.

[P19/V0260/PEM](#) - Advice provided (03/01/2020)

Demolition and redevelopment resulting in 5x3-bedroom, 2x1-bedroom, 1x2-bedroom dwellinghouses.

[P19/V2465/FUL](#) - Approved (20/11/2019)

Replacement of existing external ventilation system with new.

[P14/V2218/FUL](#) - Refusal of Planning Permission on 12/02/2015

Demolition of existing 2-storey workshop buildings and redevelopment to provide three 2-storey residential dwellings.

### 3.2 *Officer comment*

Application reference P14/V2218/FUL was refused in 2015 on the basis of odour from the kitchen extract ventilation associated with the restaurant, and noise disturbance from the chiller units serving the Co-Op store. In addition,

concerns were raised over the design, layout, lack of amenity space, scale and materials, and the adverse impact this would have on residents and the conservation area.

The ventilation system has since been replaced (reference planning application P19/V2465/FUL) and this application seeks to change the unit to a commercial use. The air conditioning and refrigeration plant has been considered as part of the current application alongside mitigation. The design, layout, amenity space and impact on the heritage environment of the current scheme will be assessed on its own merits.

#### 4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The scale of the development and size of the site are below the EIA thresholds, and the site is not designated as a 'sensitive' area. The proposal is not EIA development.

#### 5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 The main issues in this case are:

1. **The principle of residential development**
2. **Flood risk and drainage**
3. **Loss of employment and commercial space**
4. **Heritage impact and design**
5. **Residential amenity**
6. **Access and parking**
7. **Technical matters**

#### 5.2 **The principle of residential development**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to 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.

5.3 The development plan for this proposal comprises the adopted Vale Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1) and the adopted Vale Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LPP2). The site falls within the Steventon Neighbourhood Plan Designation Area, but a plan is yet to be submitted for examination.

5.4 The Council's Local Plan 2031 Part 1: Strategic Sites and Policies (2016) (LPP1) sets out the spatial strategy and strategic policies across the Council area to deliver sustainable development, including the provision to be made for housing.

5.5 Policy CP3 of the LPP1 devises a settlement hierarchy approach, with each tier having a different strategic role. Unallocated development in such villages is to be limited to providing for local needs and to support employment, services, and facilities within local communities. Policy CP4 of the LPP1 goes on to set out how the housing needs will be met, based on the settlement hierarchy

approach. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the existing built area of Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Larger Villages in accordance with Core Policy 1.

5.6 Paragraph 84 of the NPPF sets out that '*the use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.*'

5.7 The site is located centrally within Steventon, which is classified as a larger village, and is within reach of services, shops and bus links to Oxford, Abingdon and Didcot. The site is characterised as brownfield land, with two large, vacant warehouses to the rear of the site. Partial redevelopment of the site would bring back into use land occupied by vacant buildings, and the delivery of 7 apartments in a sustainable location would contribute to the district's housing need.

5.8 The principle of the proposal is therefore supported by local plan policy and is acceptable unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

#### 5.9 **Flood risk and drainage**

##### *Flood risk*

The NPPF sets out that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be appropriately flood resilient and resistant (paragraph 163). The development site is brownfield land, which is covered by a mix of Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. Evidence must therefore be provided to show that the development will be safe for its lifetime, taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. (Paragraph 160 of the NPPF).

5.10 Paragraph 258 of the NPPF clarifies that '*the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.*' This is drawn through to CP42 of the LPP1.

5.11 The proposed residential development is located in the part of the site that is wholly in Flood Zone 1. For this reason, a sequential test is not necessary.

5.12 Whilst parts of the wider site are in Flood Zones 2 and 3, it is noted that existing commercial use will be retained within these zones, which is a 'less vulnerable' use in flood risk terms. This is acceptable.

5.13 The access to this site and connecting roads are in Zones 2 and 3 and have flooded in the past. In response to this, the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that a low hazard access route exists between the site and areas outside of high risk flood zones. In addition, a condition is recommended requiring a specific flood evacuation and management plan linked to EA flood warnings. This combined approach is acceptable in terms of complying with national and local flood risk policy, minimising the risk to future occupants, and



managing any residual flood risk associated with the access points. Overall, the proposal is acceptable in terms of flood risk.

5.14 *Surface Water Drainage*

Policy CP42 of LPP1 seeks to ensure that development provides appropriate measures for the management of surface water as an essential element of reducing future flood risk to both the site and its surroundings. The surface water drainage scheme results in reduced discharge to the nearby watercourse. SUDS have been incorporated into the layout to improve water quality, store water and reduce overall discharge. The scheme also delivers an overall reduction in built footprint. Subject to a condition to secure a detailed sustainable drainage scheme, the Drainage Engineer is satisfied with this approach and the scheme complies with policy CP42.

5.15 **Loss of employment and commercial space**

Policy CP29 of the LPP1 identifies the strategic employment sites in the district which will be safeguarded for employment use. Elsewhere in the District, where there is no reasonable prospect of land or premises being used for continued employment use, a mixed use enabling development which incorporates employment space should first be considered.

5.16 Policy DP14 seeks to protect village and local shops unless the building has become unsuitable for its existing use and is no longer economically viable, or there is no reasonable likelihood of a suitable alternative facility or service of benefit to serve the needs of the local community making use of the building.

5.17 The proposal involves the demolition of two 3-storey industrial buildings, with a combined floorspace of 544sqm. The engineering works has been vacant since 2009, and the employment use is not protected as a strategic employment site in the Local Plan. Given the constrained nature of the site, there is very little opportunity to bring back the building or redevelop the site for an employment use. In this particular case the loss of employment associated with a long-standing vacant building and the conflict with Policy CP29, is outweighed by the contribution 7 dwellings would make to the district's housing need.

5.18 The rear of the restaurant buildings fronting the High Street (No 6 - Mira Spice (Blue Ginger) Restaurant and no 6A - Munchies) is to be reduced in size to accommodate the bin store and parking for the proposed residential development. This would reduce the floorspace from 229sqm to 87sqm. Both units are currently vacant. No alterations are proposed to the frontage onto the High Street.

5.19 Government changes to the Planning Use Classes Order took effect in September 2020. Restaurants now fall within Planning Use Class E, which allows for greater flexibility between restaurants, business uses, financial services etc without requiring planning permission. The proposal to use the building for an alternative commercial use within the Use Class E parameters therefore fits within these regulations. While the proposal would result in a

reduction in floorspace, the commercial use would be retained in the village. The proposal does not conflict with policy DP14.

## 5.20 **Heritage impact and design**

### *Heritage environment*

Policies CP39 of LPP1 and DP36 of LPP2 state that proposals for new development that may affect heritage assets must demonstrate that they conserve and enhance the special interest or significance of the heritage asset and its setting.

5.21 There are no designated assets within the application site. However, the site falls within the Steventon Conservation Area and there are listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. The site is also located within an area of archaeological interest known as the Steventon Historic Core.

### 5.22 *Conservation areas*

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Policy DP37 of LPP2 states development within or affecting the setting of a conservation area must demonstrate that it will conserve or enhance its special interest, character, setting and appearance. Considerable importance and weight are therefore given to the desirability of protecting or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

5.23 The heritage report indicates that this site forms a transition between the very high-quality historic development along the Causeway, the open and unspoilt back-land areas and the High Street, which has a mixed character of both later historic buildings and C20 development. The existing buildings on the site (with exception of the barn, which falls outside the application area) are of a modern industrial nature and do not make a positive contribution to the historic and architectural significance of the area.

5.24 The proposed building is set back within the site and is of a similar scale to the existing industrial building and the Co-Op building. It has a form that is articulated with smaller gabled forms which helps to give an impression of a smaller grain more reflective of that found in the conservation area.

5.25 Some concern has been raised by residents about the use of cladding in an area predominantly characterised by brick. The partial use of a material alternative to brick is not considered inappropriate in this backland location where a less formal palette of materials is not uncommon. It is however recommended that a schedule of external materials is secured by condition to ensure sufficient detail is provided for the new building.

5.26 Having established that the proposed building would not be more harmful to the special character of the area than the existing building, and would not adversely affect the character of the conservation area, no objection has been raised by the Conservation Officer. The development complies with section 72 of the Planning (Listed buildings and conservation areas) Act 1990 and policy

CP39 of the LPP1 and policy DP37 of the LPP2 in not causing unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.27 *Listed buildings*

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Considerable importance and weight should be given to this requirement.

5.28 Policy DP38 of LPP2 states that development within the setting of a Listed Building must demonstrate that it will preserve or enhance its special architectural or historic interest and significance.

5.29 Close to the site are the following listed buildings:

- Raised Causeway, Grade II\* listed feature
- 19 The Causeway, Grade II listed building
- 21 Causeway Steventon, Grade II listed building
- 19 High Street Steventon, Grade II listed building

5.30 On the basis that the building to be redeveloped is set back within the enclosed site, it has limited impact on the setting of the listed buildings. However, the open spaces to the rear of the Causeway, adjoining the western edge of the site, and the views that are gained of these spaces from the Grade II\* listed Raised Causeway, are recognised as important in heritage terms. It is noted that the present engineering works building is visible in the gaps between buildings from the Grade II\* Raised Causeway and that development on the site forms part of its wider setting.

5.31 Since Officers commented on pre-application proposals, the scale and massing of the building has been reduced in size, the design of the rear block has been broken down into a finer grain and provided with a series of pitched, gable end roofs, and the south western corner of the block has also been reduced in height. These measures succeed in presenting a building that preserves the setting of the Raised Causeway, and is not intrusive upon the open space to the west, which forms an important part of this setting. No heritage objection has been raised by the Conservation Officer. The development meets the requirements of Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and policy DP38.

5.32 *Archaeology*

Policy DP39 of LPP2 states that development will be permitted where it can be shown that it would not be detrimental to the site or setting of Scheduled Monuments or nationally important designated or non-designated archaeological remains.

5.33 The county archaeologist has reviewed the site which is classed as previously developed land and is entirely covered by buildings and hardstanding, and has advised that the proposals would not have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. There are therefore no archaeological

constraints to this scheme and the development conforms with Policy DP39.

**5.34 Residential amenity**

Policy DP23 of the LPP2 considers the impact of development on amenity, and requires development to take into account loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, dominance or visual intrusion, and noise. Policy DP25 of the LPP2 requires noise-sensitive development to incorporate an appropriate scheme of mitigation to ensure amenity is safeguarded for future occupiers.

5.35 Policy DP2 of the LPP2 sets out the required internal space standards for new residential development, and section 5.10 of the Design Guide clarifies the requirement for private amenity space.

**5.36 *Environmental impact and noise disturbance***

The proposed development would introduce noise sensitive residential development close to existing noise sources, specifically air conditioning and refrigeration plant attached to the Co-Op. Flats 5, 6 and 7 of the new development are likely to be most affected. An acoustic report has therefore been submitted to support the application. Subject to the full implementation of the measures identified in the acoustic report, officers consider the development will be safeguarded from undue noise and disturbance. This will be secured by condition. The proposed mitigation addresses previous concerns raised by the Environmental Protection Officer, and the proposal now complies with policies DP23 and DP25.

**5.37 *Privacy and overlooking***

The proposed building is similar in height and scale to the existing industrial building and the adjacent Co-Op building. The change to a residential use will introduce windows and balconies and the use of the building would clearly not be limited to work hours as with the existing use.

5.38 Elevations facing dwelling to the north on The Causeway and gardens to the west have been designed to be largely without openings to minimise overlooking and loss of privacy. New openings, and the enclosed balcony serving flat 5, on the southern elevation face directly onto the Co-Op car park, and are 18m from the dwellings opposite. Windows on the eastern elevation face into the courtyard, which is set back from the High Street. First-floor balconies serving flats 3 and 5 are screened to the side to prevent overlooking towards gardens to the west. First- and second-floor balconies serving flats 6 and 7 face north into the courtyard, and would be set back 18m from gardens along The Causeway and over 35m from the rear elevations of these dwellings. The Design Guide clarifies that a 21m separation distance is advisable between upper floor windows to safeguard privacy and amenity, and this has been achieved. Overall, the development is not considered to impact negatively on the privacy of neighbouring occupants and meets the requirements of Policy DP23.

**5.39 *Private amenity space and internal space standards***

Private garden space has been designed into the layout for flats 1 and 2, and balconies have been provided for the remaining flats, apart from flat 4 to

safeguard the privacy of neighbouring dwellings. Flat 6 is to have an enclosed balcony to overcome potential noise disturbance. An area for domestic storage will be made available to four of the properties.

5.40 In the context of a courtyard development, access to private amenity space for 6 of the proposed 7 dwellings is positive and accords with the Design Guide. The internal space also complies with Policy DP2, and the provision of additional lockable storage space is welcome.

5.41 **Access, parking and highway safety**

Policy CP33 of the LPP1 actively seeks to ensure that the impacts of new development on the strategic and local road network are minimised, to ensure that developments are designed in a way to promote sustainable transport access and to promote and support improvements to the network that increase safety and improve air quality. Policy DP16 of the LPP2 requires adequate provision to be made for loading, unloading, circulation, servicing and vehicle turning.

5.42 The existing access points onto The Causeway and the High Street are to be retained and will be largely unchanged from existing. While manoeuvring space is typically more restricted in a courtyard development, the swept path analysis demonstrates that cars and delivery vehicles can manoeuvre within the development in accordance with highways standards, and levels of visibility are appropriate to allow drivers to safely join the highway.

5.43 The proposed 8 on-site parking spaces, and 2 spaces facing onto the High Street, meet Highway requirements for the 7 households. 3 further spaces will be provided to the front to serve the commercial unit, separated from the 2 residential spaces. A time-limited, delivery loading bay will also be provided in the courtyard within a suitable distance from the flats. An internal cycle store has been designed into the building.

5.44 While improvements could be made to the parking in urban design terms, the swept path analysis demonstrates that all spaces are accessible and do not raise highway safety concerns. The concerns previously raised by the Highways Officer have been addressed.

5.45 **Technical matters**

5.46 *Waste and recycling collection*

The residential bin store is an appropriate size and the location is acceptable for collection from the High Street. The proposed waste and recycling collection provision accords with Policy DP28 of the LPP2.

5.47 *Risk of ground contamination*

Given the information provided in the Ground Investigation Report and the absence of any identified land contamination, previous concerns regarding the site's former use have been addressed. A condition is however recommended as a precautionary measure in case any land contamination is encountered during construction of the development. If unsuspected contamination is found,

a programme of investigation and remedial works would need to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

5.48 *Community Infrastructure Levy*

The proposed development results in the provision of new residential floorspace and would therefore be liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge, as set out in the Vale of White Horse CIL Charging Schedule (September 2017). With an element of existing floorspace being offset against the CIL calculation, the development would result in 632sqm of CIL chargeable residential floorspace.

6.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 This application has been assessed against the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and all other material planning considerations. In considering the application, due regard has been given to the representations received from statutory and other consultees. These have been taken in account in assessing the overall scheme.
- 6.2 The principle of residential development through the re-use of brownfield land is acceptable. The loss of employment is outweighed by the benefits brought about by the delivery of 7 apartments in a sustainable location, which would contribute positively to the district's housing need.
- 6.3 By virtue of the residential development being solely located in Flood Zone 1, and supporting evidence demonstrating that a low hazard access route exists between the site and areas outside of high risk flood zones, the development complies with national and local flood risk policy.
- 6.4 The design and layout of the scheme succeeds in protecting the special character of the heritage environment and heritage assets, safeguards privacy and amenity, and meets highways standards in terms of access and parking.
- 6.5 Officers consider the development is acceptable. With justification being provided for the loss of employment, the development does not conflict with the Vale of White Horse Local Plan (2031) and should be approved.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

7.0 **Development Plan Policies**

7.1 *Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1 (LPP1) Policies*

- CP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CP02 - Cooperation on Unmet Housing Need for Oxfordshire
- CP03 - Settlement Hierarchy
- CP04 - Meeting Our Housing Needs
- CP07 - Providing Supporting Infrastructure and Services
- CP08 - Spatial Strategy for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area
- CP23 - Housing Density
- CP33 - Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- CP35 - Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking
- CP36 - Electronic communications

CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness, including design against crime  
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

*Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LPP2) Policies*

CP04a - Meeting Our Housing Needs  
CP08a - Additional Site Allocations for Abingdon-on-Thames and Oxford Fringe Sub-Area  
DP02 - Space standards  
DP16 - Access  
DP23 - Impact of Development on Amenity  
DP24 - Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments  
DP25 - Noise pollution  
DP27 - Land affected by contamination  
DP28 - Waste Collection and Recycling  
DP39 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments

**7.2 Neighbourhood Plan**

*Steventon Neighbourhood Plan*

The site falls within the Steventon Neighbourhood Plan Designation Area, but a plan is yet to be submitted for examination.

**7.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015

Vale Developer Contributions – Delivering Infrastructure to Support Development SPD 2017: The SPD was adopted on 30 June 2017 and provides guidance on how planning obligations will work alongside CIL to deliver the infrastructure needed to support development in the Vale.

**7.4 National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

**7.5 Other Relevant Legislation**

Human Rights Act 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been considered in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equality Act 2010

In determining this planning application, the Council has regard to its equality obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

**7.6 Other Relevant Legislation**

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation

- Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010
- Provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998
- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)
- Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- Environment Act 1995

**Author:** Katherine Canavan  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600  
**Email:** [planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk](mailto:planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk)