

APPLICATION NO.	P21/V0376/FUL
SITE	Land at Ashfields Lane and A338, East Hanney, OX12 0HN
PARISH	EAST HANNEY
PROPOSAL	Full planning application for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of 45 dwellings, provision of public open space, formation of vehicular and pedestrian accesses from the A338, provision of pedestrian access to Ashfields Lane, landscaping and other associated works (as amplified by biodiversity metric information received 3 March 2021) (As amended by agents email and amended plans dated 09 December 2021 reducing the number of dwellings from 50 to 44 and other associated design changes throughout the site as detailed within the revised design and access addendum, and as amended and amplified by information received 27 January 2022, 8 & 24 February 2022, 15 March 2022 & 01 April 2022)
WARD MEMBER(S)	Vacancy for Steventon and the Hanneys Ward
APPLICANT	J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd
OFFICER	Charlotte Brewerton

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, waste and bus service improvements, a mitigation package for Frilford Junction, and secure affordable housing, space standards, public open space, and public art.
2. The following planning conditions:

Standard

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

Pre-commencement

3. Arboricultural method statement & Tree protection
4. Construction Traffic management Plan
5. SUDs Scheme
6. Foul drainage details
7. Biodiversity enhancement plan

- 8. Biodiversity offsetting provider details
- 9. Archaeological staged investigation
- 10. Electric vehicle charging details
- 11. Attenuation basin details
- 12. LEAP Details
- 13. SUDS compliance statement
- 14. Cycle parking details

Pre-Occupation

- 15. Watercourse repair details
- 16. Footpath connection PROW 198/2 details

Compliance

- 17. Car parking as per approved plans
- 18. Materials in accordance with approved plan
- 19. Access as per approved plans
- 20. Biodiversity offsetting compliance
- 21. SUDS compliance report
- 22. Planting management plan

Informative

- 23. No mud on highway
- 24. No Highway Obstruction
- 25. Biodiversity offsetting providers

1.0	INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL
1.1	This application comes to Planning Committee as East Hanney Parish Council object to the proposal. The application seeks full planning permission for 45 dwellings, with access from the A338, public open space and landscaping.
1.2	This site is an allocated site within the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2, for up to 80 dwellings (The North of East Hanney allocation 3.44ha). The proposal site measures approximately 2.5 hectares and sits adjacent to the A338 and Ashfields Lane, on the edge of East Hanney village. The site is currently open land in agricultural use (Grade 3 classification) and is in Flood Zone 1 (land that is least likely to flood). The Site adjoins the East Hanney Conservation Area along the western edge of the site. Existing residential housing is located to the west and south, with open land to the north. The A338 runs along the east boundary with residential housing beyond. There are no listed buildings on the site or nearby. A site plan is attached at Appendix 1.
1.3	The application site was previously submitted as part of a larger proposal for 60 dwellings including land to the north, but that scheme (application P19/V3357/FUL) was withdrawn in April 2020. This northern part of the site has subsequently been omitted from the current scheme due to drainage constraints.
1.4	This application seeks permission for 45 dwellings, 15 of which will be affordable dwellings, together with public open space including a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and landscaping throughout.

1.5	The proposal provides a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings. They consist of mainly 2 storey dwellings but also include bungalows along the western boundary of the site and on plot 5. The materials consist of a mix of plain or slate tiles, red & orange brick, render and timber boarding.
1.6	<i>Amendments to the scheme</i> Since submission of the application in March 2021, there have been several amendments submitted by the applicant to address technical issues raised by the Landscape Architect, Drainage Engineer, Highways Officers, Urban Design and East Hanney Parish Council.
1.7	As a result of these amendments the number of the proposed houses has been reduced from 50 to 45 together with changes to the proposed layout and design. The amended layout plan and indicative street scenes are attached at Appendix 2. All other plans and technical documents are available to view online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk .

2.0	SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS	
2.1	A summary of responses received to the current proposal is below. Full comments can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk .	
	East Hanney Parish Council	<p><i>Comments March 2022</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council wish to take on management of Public Open space • Would question useable public open space. Land to north should be used for public open space or plots 16-19 would provide a suitable area of POS in place of houses. <p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding • Housing density • Housing need • Character • Noise and vibration • Biodiversity • Public open space • Electric charging facilities • Village infrastructure • Sustainability <p><i>Original consultation April 2021</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding • Housing Mix • Housing Density

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability • Road Safety • Village Infrastructure • Character • Biodiversity, water, and soil quality • Noise & vibration • Public Open Space (POS)
	<p>Residents</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation February 2022</i> Six Letters of objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments do not change views • Overdevelopment • High density • Drainage issues • Access safety • Noise • Veteran status of trees • Significant value of mature Ash at entrance should be protected <p><i>Re-consultation December 2021</i> 29 Letters of objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments does little to overcome • Token changes • Phase 2 in north should be shown now not in two phases • Welcome reduction in number of houses • Increased pressure on A338 • Traffic generation detrimental to village • Harmful to character • Revisions useless • Poor layout • Additional house in northwest corner not welcome • Orchard space to north who will use it and maintain it? • There is still a biodiversity net loss • Poor parking provision • Not in keeping • Flood risk and foul water removal? • Out of character • Bus service provision • Proposed footpath unsafe <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i> 90 letters of Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage • Road Safety • Road Congestion • Village Impact • Size • Design • Character & Layout • Poor local infrastructure • Lack of privacy • Loss of light • Noise disturbance • Outside village boundaries • Loss of significant trees • Loss of biodiversity • Detrimental to village • Access • Dangerous footpath provision • Poor Housing density • Poor housing mix • Por relationship with village and school • Dense solid building mass will hard soft green edge • Village infrastructure not adequate • Reduction in dwellings not enough • Local services will not cope with additional pressure of this housing site. • Overdevelopment of rural village • Detrimental impact to Conservation Area <p>Amendments do not overcome all the issues on this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No connectivity to existing village
	<p>Conservation Officer</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revised plans provide a greater opportunity for mitigating planting to soften the appearance of the development from the approach to the north and wider setting of conservation area. <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme results in harm to the designated conservation area but less than substantial harm as per para 195 of NPPF

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme does not directly harm the designated Conservation area but fails to positively address elements of its setting which contribute to our understanding of the historic rural character. • Erodes significance by extending the built form beyond the historic edge of the settlement edge • Opportunities to mitigate visual impacts have been missed.
	<p>Countryside Officer</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity net gain assessment, to reflect changes in the layout will result in loss of 5.46units • Suggested wording change to pre-commencement condition <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No populations of protected species have been found on site • Habitats on site are not considered to be a constraint to development • Removal of tree at access to site has moderate potential for roosting bats • The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has concluded that the proposed development will result in the net loss of 5.25 biodiversity units, which will require offsetting • Pre-commencement and compliance conditions suggested
	<p>Drainage</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation February 2022</i> No objection subject to conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foul Drainage scheme to be submitted prior to commencement • Surface Water drainage scheme to be submitted prior to commencement • SUDs compliant report that demonstrates system is installed and completed on site prior to occupation. • Proposal for opening watercourse and a condition survey along with proposals to repair and cleanse the

		<p>culvert shall be submitted prior to occupation.</p> <p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>Holding Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amendments address some of the previous comments• Further information should be provided in the FRA to confirm groundwater levels requirements in relation to peak monitored GW levels.• Note OCC comments on CV values and these should be addressed in calculations• Crate type storage and storage features such as ponds or basins should be used in coordinated landscape features and justification provided. <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FRA Records showing low flooding affecting the site is not correct.• Historically flooding from surface water and fluvial sources on this site from saturated soils and high groundwater levels within the more permeable gravel and sands deposits below.• Insufficient considerations given to implications of previous flooding on the proposed drainage strategy.• Porous paving proposed – not in accordance with Sewerage Sector Guidance Standards.• Not adequately demonstrated that overflows can be connected to the outfalls to the boundary watercourse• No details provided for attenuation volumes• No balancing pond shown on plans.• Swales need to be shown on landscape plan with cross sections included• Ditch at Ashfields Lane is in a poor condition – confirmation of adequate drainage should be needed to main watercourse adjacent to A338.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watercourse and bank close to A338 in poor condition – difficult to maintain due to proximity to road. To improve the condition and ability to maintain should consider options to reroute this strategic section of the village watercourse through the site for maintenance.
	<p>Forestry Officer</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i> No Objection subject to condition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arboricultural method statement to be submitted prior to development <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No tree preservation orders Trees predominantly growing round the site boundary Trees adjacent to A338 being most prominent in landscape From submitted information it is not possible to determine full impact of proposed development as no details of any S278 highway works have been provided. Main access will require the loss of T31 which has landscape value – no objection to loss as planting suitable for mitigating factors. Pre-commencement conditions suggested for full Arb method statement and tree protection plan.
	<p>Air Quality</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation Feb 2022</i> No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction dust is identified as an issue but can be mitigated as outlined in Table 19 of the air quality assessment. I would recommend a condition requiring adherence to the principles outlined in Table 19. In accordance with the Vale of White Horse Air Quality Developer Guidance, and to offset the predicted small increase in emissions, I would also expect a condition requiring the provision of infrastructure to facilitate

		<p>the fitting of an EV charging point to each property with off street parking.</p> <p><i>Re-consultation Dec 2021</i> No further comments; see previous</p> <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> Holding Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background concentration used is a modelled background from Defra. There is a monitored background, and it would be better to use the 2019 monitored value (10.6) from this. • The part of Marcham AQMA most impacted by air pollution is around S.16, which is a street canyon and the report states that no street canyons have been modelled. • Pending updated modelling, which addresses the points raised above.
	<p>Contaminated Land</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation December 2021</i> No Objection</p> <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant contamination has been identified
	<p>Housing Development</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation March 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new National Planning Policy Framework states that, major development schemes of 10 or more homes or a site of 0.5 hectares or more will need to provide an affordable housing provision. • The affordable housing provision will be 35% of any site within Vale of White Horse Council. • In wake of the Government’s First Homes initiative, the First Homes will now form a part of the 35% affordable housing contribution. • For a site of 45 units this would equate to 15.75 affordable homes • The new commuted sum amount will therefore be £88,298.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site will be required to delivered 4 First Homes in line with the Government's First Homes guidance. <p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amended plans should seek 15.4 affordable units 11 of which should be for rent and 4 units for shared ownership.• Part unit should be a financial contribution – 15 units and £47,093 commuted sum payable for 0.4 unit.• Proposed affordable mix largely acceptable however the proposed 2 bed, 3-person unit (plot5) would not be acceptable – create a 2 bed 4-person home instead.• Current location of affordable units is concentrated on one part of the site. Advise applicant to explore integration of units.• parking court between plots 3-5 & 6-8 should be avoided, with parking spaces• provided either on-plot or adjacent to the properties.• advised that the applicant provides a detailed parking plan for review. <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i></p> <p>No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Site of 50 units should provide 18 Affordable homes of which 75% should be for rent and 25% shared ownership• The demand for 2bed shared ownership is much higher than 1bed properties therefore overall affordable housing mix may be more suitable delivered with a higher proportion of 2bed properties than indicated in SHMA.• Mix should reflect the significant demand for 2bed units both rented and shared ownership.• 2bed delivered as houses, not flats.• Affordable housing should be distributed evenly across the site to
--	--	--

		<p>avoid concentration in any part of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing should be indistinguishable from market housing. Currently concentrated on one part – explore integrating units evenly across site. • Parking courts should be avoided with parking on plot or adjacent to properties. • Explore rearranging bottom corner of layout to provide plot parking for units 1-2 and 3-6.
	<p>Urban Design Officer</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation February 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout improved • Some clarity on x2 sub stations • Landscaping improved • POS central location • Use of materials too much, consider revising materials plan and remove the use of stone <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout • Over engineered turning heads • Enclosures • Car parking • Corner plots should turn a corner • Increased landscaping • Attenuation ponds needed with clarification
	<p>Landscape Architect</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation April 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attenuation basins have now been added to the landscape plans • The design, particularly of the northern boundary basin is disappointing it could have been made to function better as part of the open space • The basin on the northern boundary, pond 2, is tight against the footpath, a level margin adjacent to the path would be preferable • The landscape plan doesn't show a grass mix for the larger basin on the

		<p>eastern boundary, presumably this will be wet grass mix as pond 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Condition for details of attenuation pond prior to commencement. <p><i>Re-consultation March 2022</i></p> <p>Holding Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The additional attenuation areas are still not shown on the landscape plans. These are indicated as 1 in 3 side slopes on the pond and swale cross sections drawing (submitted 24 February 2022), so will not be usable space.• Pond 2 needs to be excluded from the open space calculations, shown on the public open space plan (submitted on 17 February 2022).• The cross sections don't indicate whether there will be any permanent water, please can this be confirmed. Details of attenuation features to be subject to condition.• A management and maintenance plan will be required covering a minimum 20year period, setting out design principles and objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance operations and schedules and including a plan indicating which areas of the site the management plan covers and detailing different management procedures for the various landscape types on the site. This can be subject to condition.• LAP details can be subject to condition, see previous comments with respect to requirements. <p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>Holding Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• POS been revised to incorporate a central area of open space which is an improvement• Visitor parking spaces need to be revised so they do not eat into POS• LAP has been included – full details required- suggested condition• Northern boundary improved with planting although limited space
--	--	---

		<p>opposite 30-33 to fit in swale and tree planting shown. Sections through swale are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification of drainage strategy and landscape plans required • Details of attenuation required • Indicate rooting volumes • Consider practicality of maintaining wildflower grassland • Enclosure plan – Plot 20 should be a wall not a fence. • Management and maintenance plan required showing 20years – suggested condition <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised layout required • Not a suitable development edge • No lighting details • Footpath details to be clarified • Adequate space needed for planting • Extensive use of box hedging not recommended • Footpaths run too close to buildings • Details of swales required • DAS refers to balancing ponds, but none shown on plans • Little street tree planting to soften development • Street corridor not wide enough for all associated works • No consideration of LVIA • Public open space not overlooked and minimum of 15% is required. • No details of play provision •
	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation Jan 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General consultation comments relating to when to notify of applications <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General consultation comments relating to when to notify of applications

	<p>Oxfordshire County Council Highways</p>	<p><i>Re-consultation 14 March 2022</i></p> <p>No Objection - subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• S106 Contributions- Public Transport Services - £39,204.00- Travel Plan Monitoring - £1,040.00• The previous Objection in Detail has been overcome by a close reading of the contents of David Tucker Associates documents 'Response to OCC Comments – 21st December 2021' and 'Land at Ashfields, East Hanney Frilford Crossroads Appraisal Ref. 18316-03d Frilford Crossroads' and recommendations follow from this reading for the mitigation package appropriate for the development.• Updated RSA Acceptable• Tracking details acceptable• Relocated footpath acceptable <p><i>Re-consultation January 2022</i></p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Road Safety Audit still not forthcoming under the amendments• Analysis is required of the scale of the impact on the Frilford junction of the A338 & A415. It has become clearer regarding the potential for over-capacity at the junction at peak-periods.• An obligation to enter a S278 Agreement will be required to secure mitigation/ improvement works.• The bus top infrastructure at Ashfields Lane requires improvement.• Access arrangements will also be required to be delivered through s278. This includes a Designer's Response to the pedestrian access issue of the potential culverting of the ditch to the front of the site in the interests of pedestrian safety.• Proposed extension of the footway along A338 at the side of site, as shown, on Drawing 18316-03/A (Appendix A of the RSA That is Appendix D of the TS). This is contra Drawing 18316-01 of the TS in the
--	---	--

	<p>Education</p> <p>Local Lead Flood Authority</p>	<p>Drawings section.</p> <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Road Safety Audit, Stage 1 is at variance in details analysed with the Transport Statement and no Designer’s Response has been produced. • A revised RSA may need to be produced, if the original one was produced on outdated information regarding the possible visibility splay that can be achieved. • Analysis is required of the scale of the impact on the Frilford junction of the A338 & A415. <p><i>Re-consultation March 2022</i> No objection subject to S106 contributions as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary & Nursery - £327,828 for expansion of school site. • A contribution towards the capital cost of the expansion is sought in proportion to the development’s expected pupil generation at St James CE Primary School. <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> No objection subject to S106 contributions as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary & Nursery - £320,931 for expansion of school site. • A contribution towards the capital cost of the expansion is sought in proportion to the development’s expected pupil generation at St James CE Primary School. • Special education £22,654 • Total: £347,853 <p><i>Re-consultation February 2022</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has taken the LLFA’s comments on board and amended his submission to suit. The application
--	--	---

		<p>now meets the LLFA's requirements.</p> <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i> Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Require more information relating to CV values• Can't see why storage tanks are used rather than open ponds• There is considerable recorded flooding believed to be from groundwater <p><i>Original Consultation March 2021</i> No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although there are no currently known archaeological features within the application site it does lie within an area of archaeological potential.• The applicant has submitted an archaeological desk-based assessment – which we concur with its approach.• Condition - staged programme of archaeological investigation to be undertaken in advance of development. <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• subject to S106 contributions £4,134• Towards the expansion and efficiency of Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) capacity.
	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Waste Management</p> <p>Crime Prevention Design Adviser</p>	<p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pre-commencement condition for application to Secured by Design accreditation• Landscaping should ensure natural surveillance• Measures to prevent vehicle intrusion into pedestrian routes and POS• Design of play areas requires careful selection, lighting, boundary treatment, landscaping etc.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car ports removed or gated, and natural surveillance used. • Straightened footpaths to prevent crime • Difficult to climb boundary treatments to prevent burglary • Recesses of gated areas should be removed. • Permeable boundary treatment adjacent to pumping station boundary treatments along western edge carefully considered and anti-climb • Recessed front doors on western edge could be amended.
	<p>Waste Management Officer</p>	<p>Re-consultation December 2021 No Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised tracking plan acceptable <p><i>Original consultation March 2021</i> Holding Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bin storage at each property and access to present for collection • Tracking plan uses a smaller vehicle than our fleet – resubmit with vehicle attached • Tracking plan does not show a waste vehicle accessing plots 41 – 45. Show retracking for these plots of bin collection point. • A signed indemnity form is required for all unadopted roads. • S106 contributions of £170 per dwelling.

3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 P19/V3357/FUL - Withdrawn (03/04/2020)

Demolition of existing structures and the erection of 64 dwellings, provision of Public Open Space, formation of vehicular and pedestrian access from the A338, provision of pedestrian access to Ashfields Lane, landscaping and other associated works.

4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The development does not exceed 5ha in size and the total number of residential units is below 150. Therefore, the proposed development is below the thresholds set out in Schedule 2 10(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. Consequently, the proposal is not EIA development.

5.0 **MAIN ISSUES**

5.1 **The main issues in the determination of this planning application are:**

- **The principle of development**
- **Affordable housing and market housing mixes**
- **Design and layout**
- **Residential amenity**
- **Landscape and visual impact**
- **Heritage assets**
- **Highway safety, traffic, and parking**
- **Flood risk and drainage**
- **Biodiversity**
- **Air quality**
- **Contamination**
- **Noise**
- **Archaeology**
- **Public Art**
- **Financial contributions**

5.2 **The principle of 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. 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).

5.3 East Hanney Parish Council, as of February 2022, are preparing their submission for a neighbourhood plan but only limited weight can be given to these policies at this time.

5.4 The site forms part of a strategic allocation in the LPP2 for housing development. The principle of development is therefore acceptable.

Affordable housing and market housing mixes

5.5 *Affordable Housing*

Policy CP24 of the LPP1 requires 35% of the proposed dwellings on a major application site to be affordable. Following the implementation of the Government’s First Homes initiative, First Homes will now form part of the 35% affordable housing requirement. The breakdown of affordable mix for this development is:

<i>Tenure mix</i>	<i>Percentage %</i>	<i>Number of units</i>
First Homes	25%	4
Affordable rent	56%	8
Shared ownership	19%	3

5.6 35% of the development equates to 15.75 units. 15 affordable dwellings will be provided on site and a commuted sum payable for the part unit of £88,298. This is to be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

5.7 *Affordable Housing mix*

There were some initial reservations by officers about plot 5 and its size. The applicant has responded to these comments and now provides a 2b/4p house asked for. The housing officer is agreeable with the mix of units which are to be provided onsite in clusters of no more than 8 and which are to be indistinguishable from market dwellings.

5.8 *Market Housing Mix*

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.”

5.9 A comparison of the proposed market housing for this application with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) estimate is shown in the table below:

No. of beds	1Bed	2Bed	3Bed	4Bed	Total
SHMA	2	6	12	9	29
Proposal	2	7	20	1	30

5.10 It is clear the proposed market mix does not follow the SHMA estimate but paragraph 7.35 of the SHMA report 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.

5.11 Furthermore, the most recent 2021 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) advises that the authority has been over providing 1 and 2 bed dwellings, under providing 3 bed dwellings, whilst 4+ bed dwellings meet SHMA estimates. The variation from SHMA therefore needs to be considered in the planning balance.

5.12 In addition, the East Hanney Neighbourhood Plan Community Questionnaire Report (dated March 2017) provides evidence for how the community wish to see their village grow. The report advises that the top two housing needs for the parish are affordable housing and 1 or 2 bed houses.

5.13 Following a challenge by your officers the applicant agent has amended the plans to increase the number of 1 bed market dwellings on site to reflect community aspirations. This has been achieved by replacing one 3 bed market dwelling on plot 36 to create two 1 bed market dwellings.

5.14 Officers consider that in this location and with the evidence provided the housing mix is acceptable when assessed against CP22.

5.15 *Space standards*

Policy DP2 of the LPP2 sets out space standards for new residential development. It states that proposals for major residential development should ensure 15% of market dwellings and all affordable housing are constructed to the Category 2 standard as set out in the Building Regulations Approved Document M Part 2 as per the table below:

Bedroom size	Flat	House
1bed/2person	50 sqm	-
2bed/4person	70 sqm	79 sqm
3bed/5person	-	93sqm
3bed/6person	-	102 sqm

5.16 All affordable units and market dwellings are to accord with these standards. This will be secured via the S106 and are therefore considered in accordance with Policy.

5.17 **Design and Layout**

Policy CP37 of the LPP1 provides that all development proposals will be required to be of a high quality and design. Objections have been received from residents on the design, layout, density, landscaping, and proposed materials.

5.18 In addition, the initial submission was not received favourably by the Urban Design Officer who had concerns over the layout, and the site feeling car dominated, corner plots not turning in the street, lack of soft landscaping to help soften the built form, negative relationships between front and back of properties, confusing palette of materials and inefficient use of space and unusable open space.

5.19 The site sits adjacent to the existing village using its existing built form as its backdrop when travelling south along A338. The surrounding village is one of relatively spacious plots with long front and rear gardens providing a variety of materials, house types and styles.

5.20 The applicant has now fully responded to Urban Design comments amending the plans to achieve a more coherent layout on a reduced plot. Turning heads in the north have been removed so that the site feels less car dominated and overly engineered. The site layout has increased landscaping to help soften the built form with on plot provision and along the northern edge to strengthen the development edge.

5.21 Surveillance, which was of note by the crime prevention officer, has been improved with recessed elements designed out and feature windows on the end of properties which do now turn a corner, particularly in the northern plots facing Public Open Space (POS). Design elements such as ensuring that walls are provided within the public realm along boundaries in place of close board

timber fencing goes to the heart of the Design Guide to ensure high quality materials are used appropriately within developments.

- 5.22 The materials plan has been amended reducing the palette of materials throughout the development, particularly omitting the stone features which do not appear overly prominent in the surrounding context of East Hanney. The proposed materials ensure that the built form will look less ‘fussy’ and contrived with quality brick and tiles being used.
- 5.23 Policy CP23 of the LPP1 expects a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare (DPH) unless this would have an adverse impact on the character of the area. The Parish Council have objected on grounds of overdevelopment and that it is not reflective of the existing settlement character.
- 5.24 Amended plans confirm the density is 18dph. Whilst this is not in accordance with Policy (lower provision), officers consider this is acceptable in the context of the site and its surrounding environment, particularly given the flooding and drainage issues in this part of East Hanney. The low density provides gaps amongst dwellings assisting with the open character on the edge of a rural village location.
- 5.25 The housing plan shows that most dwellings are two storeys in height but there are variations in height throughout the site with some bungalows along the western boundary, along with 1.5 storey dwellings ‘pepper potted’ throughout. The dwellings are set forward in their plots with gardens (which meet the standard garden size requirements) at the rear. The scale of development along with its appearance is now considered to be acceptable.
- 5.26 Officers consider that the amended scheme and layout is therefore in accordance with Policies CP23 and CP37 of the LPP1.
- 5.27 **Residential Amenity**
Policy DP23 of the LPP2 states that new development proposals should demonstrate that they will not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses.

The applicant has ensured that there is a minimum back-to-back distance of 21m between properties, as required by the Council’s adopted Design Guide 2015, and has ensured that garden sizes comply with that laid out within the Design Guide.

- 5.28 The dwellings along the western boundary are set away from the boundary and of a suitable scale to the adjacent built form beyond. Officers are satisfied that their inclusion on this part of the site would not result in harmful overlooking or a loss of light and privacy to those existing dwellings in East Hanney. This is due to the existing landscaping which is to be retained and the proposed house design.
- 5.29 Those dwellings situated along the Southern Boundary also appear to be of adequate distance from newly completed properties in Ashfields Lane and

would not have a detrimental impact upon existing amenity, privacy, noise, or light.

5.30 Officers consider that the amended scheme is compliant with Policies DP23 and DP33 of the LPP2.

5.31 **Landscape and Visual Impact**

Policy CP44 of the LPP1 provides that where developments are acceptable in principle measures will be sought to integrate it into the landscape character or Townscape of the area.

5.32 The Conservation Officer notes in her comments that *'there are glimpsed views between the houses along Ebbs Lane and the lack of built form here is discernible, in particular the open space is framed by the mature tree and hedge line which forms part of the application site along the west boundary and that it is important that the verdant nature of this boundary is preserved'*.

5.33 The Landscape Architect advises that *'the site and adjoining farmland to the north lie within the Vale of White Horse Landscape Character Type RF15: Childrey and Letcombe Brooks River Floodplain. This forms a treed setting to the edge of East Hanney.'* Furthermore, it is noted that the *'proposed layout provides considerable opportunities to introduce new planting into the site that will reinforce the existing vegetated boundaries, break up the proposed built form and enhance the biodiversity of the site'*.

5.34 There will be views of the site when looking North from East Hanney. However, with the increased planting offered along with reduced density and building sizes sought by amendments, these are now considered to reduce its impact on the existing character. Whilst officers acknowledge that the addition of houses in this location will extend the village boundary, the site is an allocated housing site. The amended scheme has responded to officer comments, providing reduced housing numbers to allow for gaps between built form and increased landscaping throughout the site and along boundaries to ensure that the verdant nature of the existing townscape is maintained.

5.35 An updated landscaping plan shows increased tree planting throughout the site to soften the built form and along the northern boundary to soften the 'hard edge' of development. Additional tree planting has been provided to assimilate the site into its surroundings when travelling along the A338 from north to south, thereby improving its rural setting. Officers welcome these amendments to the scheme and consider the landscape character is not substantially harmed. A planting management plan condition is required to ensure compliance.

5.36 *Trees*

Comments from residents note the loss of a prominent tree at the entrance to the site. The Forestry Officer has noted that there would be the loss of a mature Ash at the proposed access which provides some landscape value however this is limited when assessed against the overall benefits of the scheme. Officers consider that the loss of this tree is regrettable but is

unavoidable to ensure a safe access is provided. The remainder of development is located away from all other retained trees and coupled with additional tree planting along the boundaries and throughout the site, officers consider the proposal to be acceptable. The Forestry Officer has requested that a detailed tree protection condition be placed on any grant of planning permission. This is reasonable.

- 5.37 Coupled with the layout amendments, revised heights, and reduction in number of dwellings and increased street and boundary planting, alongside the use of appropriate and reasonable conditions, Officers are satisfied that the scheme is in accordance with Policies CP44 of LPP1.
- 5.38 *Public Open Space*
In accordance with policy DP33 of the LPP2 a minimum 15% of the residential area should be provided as safe, attractive, and accessible POS. This amounts to 3,754m² on this site of 2.5ha.
- 5.39 The Parish Council, along with residents, have raised concern with the lack of useable open space on site, its location within the development and with who will maintain these areas.
- 5.40 There is the provision within the scheme of a LEAP in the central area of the development as well as a meadow/orchard open space to the northeast of the site. Amended landscape plans now show the attenuation basins in relation to these POS as required by the Landscape Architect. These areas combined result in 3,944 m² of useable open space. These spaces now accord with the requirements set out in this policy.
- 5.41 Officers understand that the Parish Council wish to manage these areas in the event of planning permission being approved. This can be secured through a S106 legal agreement. Further details of the LEAP and attenuation basins are to be provided via pre-commencement condition.
- 5.42 Officers consider these details are in accordance with Policy DP33 of LPP2.
- 5.43 **Heritage assets**
Policy CP39 of LPP1 seeks to ensure that new development conserves, and where possible enhances, designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets and their setting.
- 5.44 Whilst there are no listed building structures on this site, the site does adjoin the East Hanney Conservation Area and it is acknowledged by officers that the proposal would inevitably erode some of the open rural setting to the village by extending the built form beyond the historic settlement edge.
- 5.45 In commenting on the original proposal, the Conservation Officer noted that *'whilst the scheme does not directly harm the designated Conservation Area, it fails to positively address elements of its setting which contribute to our understanding of the historic rural character of the settlement'*.

- 5.46 The Conservation Officer does however comment that the scheme is considered to cause less-than-substantial harm to the adjacent Conservation Area and that the public benefits from this allocated site outweigh the harm as per Paragraph 195 of the NPPF.
- 5.47 Coupled with the amendments to layout, design amendments throughout the site and landscaping, officers consider this scheme to be acceptable in terms of its visual appearance alongside the established character of East Hanney and that, in terms of its site layout, context, density, visual separation and landscape features, there would be no reason to refuse this scheme upon its impact to the Conservation Area.
- 5.48 **Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking**
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.
- 5.49 Policy CP35 of the LPP1 promotes public transport, cycling and walking and together with policy DP17 of the LPP2 requires proposals for major developments to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) guidance.
- 5.50 CP35 of the LPP1 also requires adequate car parking to be delivered on site in accordance with County Council standards and DP16 of LPP2 requires evidence to demonstrate that acceptable off-site improvements to highway infrastructure can be secured where these are not adequate to service the development.
- 5.51 Objections have been received with concerns regarding the access to the site, traffic generation and pressure on A338, parking provision, footpath provision and bus service provision.
- 5.52 The Highways Officer initially had objections to the scheme which included the lack of a Road Safety Audit (RSA), car parking provision and refuse vehicle tracking. In addition, there was potential for the development to have a detrimental impact upon the Frilford Junction '*regarding the potential for over-capacity at the junction at peak-periods.*'
- 5.53 The Frilford traffic signals are a signal controlled staggered crossroad between the north to south A338 Oxford Road/Wantage Road and the west to east A415 Kingston Road/Frilford Road. The A415 arms have a stagger of approximately 120m. Both A338 approaches are flared providing separate ahead and turning lanes. The A415 (W) Kingston Road approach is a single lane approach. The A415 (E) Frilford Road approach is flared with separate right and left turn lanes. The internal links both have two lanes with separate ahead and turning designations.

- 5.54 Increased traffic movements from this development to Frilford junction results in an increase of 15 two-way traffic flows at peak times. Without mitigation this additional traffic would add to the queues at the Frilford junction which is considered by the Highway Authority as severe.
- 5.55 In response, mitigation has been identified by increasing the length of the left turn lane on the west bound carriageway of the A415 opposite the existing petrol station. This will allow for a greater flow of traffic to join the south bound A338 thereby mitigating the increase in queue lengths that this scheme might otherwise produce. This mitigation can be secured in a S106 legal agreement as a financial contribution that OCC can use to implement the left lane widening or pool it towards wider improvements at Frilford junction. On this basis, the proposal can mitigate its impact and is therefore acceptable.
- 5.56 Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that '*Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*
- 5.57 The development at East Hanney will increase the traffic demand through the Frilford Crossroad junction by up to 17 vehicles per hour during the peak hour periods (based on a scheme of up to 50 homes) and by up to 15 vehicles per hour during the peak hour periods (based on a scheme of up to 44 homes)
- 5.58 The applicant has submitted additional modelling of this junction which now satisfies previous concerns of traffic generation and its cumulative impacts upon the wider highway network.
- 5.59 The Highway Officer has accepted that a contribution can be sought from the developer, via S106, for additional works to the Frilford Junction that mitigate the impact of the development. It is considered that £124,691.97 for works to the highway is appropriate and reasonable for the necessary highway improvements to ensure that the increase in traffic does not impact upon the surrounding road network.
- 5.60 In addition, improvement works are sought for £44,550 to the bus stop infrastructure along A338, towards the design & provision of improved bus services between Wantage and Oxford. This can be secured through a S106.
- 5.61 Access into the site is acceptable and required visibility can be achieved. Following amendment to the layout a relocated footpath leads to the southeast corner of the site into Ashfields Lane and is considered acceptable to provide safe pedestrian access and connections from the site into the village. This is in addition to the highways officer requesting a connection to the footpath at the northeast of the site onto A338 into an existing public right of way (PROW198/2).
- 5.62 Refuse vehicle tracking through the site has now been shown to be acceptable. In addition, Officers note that the car parking provision has fallen from 116 spaces to 101 spaces through the reduced number of dwellings provided. This

is also acceptable providing 90 off street spaces and 11 visitor spaces throughout the site. In addition to car parking spaces the highways officer notes cycle parking should be provided around the LEAP in the centre of the development. Details of this can be conditioned. Other cycle storage provision is provided for each property.

- 5.63 The Highways Officer has requested that numerous conditions be attached to any grant of planning permission which details of the connectivity to the public rights of way (pre commencement), cycle parking details (pre-commencement), Car parking spaces in accordance with drawing No. 3562.P.304/E, a Construction traffic management plan (pre commencement), access, parking and turning in accordance with plan 18316-03c, new estate roads to be laid out as per the approved plan 3562.P.202/E, carriageways to be built prior to building of dwellings. These are considered reasonable.
- 5.64 The Highway Officer has also requested the submission of a Travel Plan statement (prior to occupation), a residential travel pack (submitted prior to occupation), and for garage accommodation to be retained across the site. Officers do not consider these to meet the six tests for imposing conditions, given the size of the development (45 dwellings) in a rural location and that adequate car parking provision is provided on site.
- 5.65 The proposal is acceptable in respect of highway safety, access, traffic generation and parking and is in accordance with planning policy.
- 5.66 **Flood Risk and Drainage**
Policy CP42 of the LPP1 requires all new development proposals to be located within areas with the lowest probability of flooding, ensuring all new developments to address the effective management of all sources of flood risk, does not increase flooding elsewhere and ensuring wider environmental benefits of development in relation to flood risk.
- 5.67 Concerns have been raised that the site regularly floods and that additional housing in this location would have a detrimental impact upon the surface water and foul drainage in surrounding area.
- 5.68 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. However, the Drainage Engineer has advised historical records show surface water and fluvial sources of flooding on this site. This information formed part of their initial objection, until further information was submitted.
- 5.69 Amended plans to reduce the overall site area, removing housing out of the northern part and that area most likely to cause flooding, have been received with additional assessments carried out on infrastructure groundwater, a revised drainage strategy and calculations. Officers are satisfied the proposal will not increase the risk of flooding of the site and surrounding area. Both the Drainage Engineer and OCC as Local Lead Flood Authority are satisfied that the additional modelling to mitigate flooding potential on this site is acceptable.

- 5.70 This is providing suitable conditions are attached to any grant of planning permission. These conditions are to include two negatively worded pre-commencement conditions for details of a SUDs scheme and foul drainage to be submitted and agreed, and two pre-occupation conditions relating to a SUDs compliance report and details of a proposal to open up the watercourse at the access with details to cleanse and repair existing surrounding watercourses.
- 5.71 Officers consider that drainage concerns on the site have been extensively considered and amendments made to mitigate potential flooding, with the most recent documentations and calculations showing that there is limited harm arising from flooding. Officers therefore consider this is in accordance with planning policy.
- 5.72 Thames Water have no objections to the proposals. Overall, the proposal accords with policy CP42 of the LPP1 and is acceptable in drainage and flood risk terms.
- 5.73 **Biodiversity**
Policy CP46 of the LPP1 requires development to avoid adverse impacts on valuable ecological receptors (priority habitats, protected species, designated sites, etc.) and secure net gains for biodiversity. Where impacts are predicted, proposals must meet the tests (related to need, benefit, and reasonable alternatives) outlined under CP46 to be acceptable. Net losses to biodiversity will not be supported.
- 5.74 Objections to the loss of biodiversity on this site have been received. The Countryside Officer has concluded that there are no populations of protected species on this site. The mature Ash at the front of the site, to be felled for access, could have some moderate potential for roosting bats. However, this can be conditioned on any grant of approval for a license to be obtained if found to be present after surveying.
- 5.75 The Countryside Officer also notes that *“An amended biodiversity net gain assessment, has concluded that development will result in a net loss of 5.46 units”*. This is contrary to policy; however, a suggested pre-commencement condition can be attached to any grant of approval that *No development shall commence until a certificate confirming the agreement of an Offsetting Provider to deliver a Biodiversity Offsetting Scheme totalling a minimum of 5.46 biodiversity units has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*
- 5.76 Officers are satisfied that this will ensure the net loss can be mitigated in accordance with Planning Policy.
- 5.77 **Air Quality**
Policy DP26 of LPP2 confirms that development proposals that are likely to have an impact on local air quality, including those within relative proximity to

existing air quality management areas (AQMAs) will need to demonstrate measures / mitigation to minimise any impacts associated with air quality.

- 5.78 The Environmental Health Officer has advised that regard has been given to the Marcham AQMA to which no significant characteristics have been found. The modelling predicts a very small increase in NO₂ in Marcham which is characterised as not significant in terms of the EPUK guidance. Additional testing and assessment have been submitted to ensure modelling is robust and is now found to be acceptable in accordance with Policy.
- 5.79 Construction dust is identified as an issue but can be mitigated as outlined in Table 19 of the air quality assessment. A condition requiring adherence to the principles outlined in Table 19 can be placed on any grant of planning permission to ensure compliance.
- 5.80 In addition, Officers recommend that a condition be placed on any grant of planning permission to offset the small, predicted increase in emissions along the A338 and fit EV charging points to each property with off street parking.
- 5.81 **Contaminated Land**
Policy DP27 of the LPP2 requires proposals for the development, redevelopment or re-use of land known, or suspected, to be contaminated, to submit a Contaminated Land Preliminary Risk Consultant Report. The relevant report accompanies the application, and this has been reviewed by the Council's Contamination Officer.
- 5.82 Given the open rural agricultural nature of the site no significant contamination has been identified taking into consideration the demolition on site. Officers are satisfied the proposal is in accordance with DP27 of the LPP2.
- 5.83 **Noise**
Policy DP24 of the LPP2 relates to the effect of neighbouring or previous uses on new developments. Noise generated from traffic using the A338 is apparent on site however the Environmental Officer has no objections to the proposed scheme in terms of detrimental impact to amenity by noise levels.
- 5.84 The details relating to noise are therefore acceptable.
- 5.85 **Archaeology**
Policy DP39 of the 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.
- 5.86 The County Archaeologist has assessed the proposals and advises that the site, whilst it does not have any known archaeological features, does lie within an area of archaeological potential.
- 5.87 The applicant has submitted a desk-based study. The County Archaeologist has suggested that considering the report a staged programme of investigation

should be undertaken. This can be conditioned upon any grant of planning permission. This is acceptable to officers.

5.88 Public Art

Policy DP20 of LPP2 seeks all proposals for major development to provide public art. In accordance with the council’s Developer Contributions SPD. A financial contribution could be sought towards public art provision on or off site and its maintenance or public art directly delivered on site with a financial contribution towards its maintenance.

5.89 In accordance with the council’s Developer Contributions SPD a financial contribution of £306 per dwelling; plus, a commuted sum for maintenance where the ownership of on-site art features is to pass to anyone other than the site owner / developer. This will represent 7% of the value of the works to cover the costs associated with monitoring, repairs, and maintenance over a 15-year period.

5.90 Financial contribution requests

The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all the following tests in paragraph 204:

- 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.

5.91 Policy CP7 of the LPP1 will only permit development where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured.

5.92 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will require contributions from the development based on floor space of the development. This amounts to £905,472.67 on this site. This will be secured under the CIL requirements.

5.93 In accordance with the Developer Contributions SPD, a S106 would be needed to secure affordable housing, management and maintenance of onsite open spaces and play area, street naming and bin provision for the dwellings, public transport service improvements, and school improvements and public art.

5.94 Education contributions are to be secured via a s106 rather than CIL. The nearest, and designated, school serving this development is St James CE primary school.

5.95 The following developer contributions (all index linked) are considered fair and proportionate and should be secured through a section 106 agreement:

District Council	Amount (£)
Bin provision	£186 (per dwelling)

Public art on site or in Stanford in the Vale Parish	£306 (per dwelling) (In addition, a commuted sum for maintenance where the ownership of on-site art features is to pass to anyone other than the site owner / developer. This will represent 7% of the value of the works to cover the costs associated with monitoring, repairs and maintenance over a 15-year period).
Street naming of this development	£229 (per 10 dwellings)
S106 monitoring fee	£5,997
Total	£43,218

Oxfordshire County Council	Amount (£)
Public transport services	£44,550
Highway mitigation package	£124,691.97
Travel Plan Monitoring	£1,040.00
Primary and nursery education	£320,931
SEN Education	£22,654
Waste	£4,134
S106 Monitoring	£TBC
Total	£518,000.97

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.
- 6.2 In considering the application, due regard has been given to the representations received from statutory and other consultees. These have been considered in assessing the overall scheme.
- 6.3 The development has benefits including the provision of housing on an allocated site that will assist the council in meeting its identified housing need, as well as providing affordable housing. Substantial weight is given to these benefits. Economic benefits would arise both during construction and through support for local services by way of the spend of the future occupiers. The mix

of house types is policy compliant and affordable housing can be secured through a legal agreement.

- 6.4 The scheme is of an acceptable design with no unreasonable impacts on existing residents. Pedestrian connections to adjacent Ashfields Lane and A338 are proposed and considered safe. Suitable vehicular access can be provided without detriment to highway safety or severe impacts on the road network.
- 6.5 The site is in flood zone 1 which is the preferred location for housing development in terms of fluvial flooding. An appropriate drainage scheme can be delivered on the site.
- 6.6 Impacts of the development including those at the Frilford Junction can be mitigated through financial contributions. Contributions can also be sought for education, bus service infrastructure and waste provision.
- 6.7 In conclusion, subject to the recommended conditions and completion of a s106 legal agreement for infrastructure and highways improvements, education and affordable housing, the proposal is considered to accord with the development plan and should be approved.

The following planning policies have been taken into account:

Development Plan Policies

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

- CP01 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- 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
- CP22 – Housing Mix
- CP23 – Housing Density
- CP24 – Affordable Housing
- CP33 - Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- CP35 - Promoting Public Transport, Cycling and Walking
- CP37 - Design and Local Distinctiveness
- CP38 - Design Strategies for Strategic and Major Development Sites
- CP40 - Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP42 - Flood Risk
- CP43 - Natural Resources
- CP44 - Landscape
- CP45 - Green Infrastructure
- CP46 - Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity

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

CP47a - Delivery and Contingency
DP02 - Space Standards
DP16 - Access
DP17 - Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
DP20 - Public Art
DP21 - External Lighting
DP23 - Impact of Development on Amenity
DP24 - Effect of Neighbouring or Previous Uses on New Developments
DP25 - Noise Pollution
DP26 - Air Quality
DP27 - Land Affected by Contamination
DP28 - Waste Collection and Recycling
DP33 - Open Space
DP37 – Conservation Areas
DP39 - Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments

Neighbourhood Plan

East Hanney Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Stage.

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Vale of White Horse Design Guide (2015)
Developer Contributions SPD - Delivering Infrastructure to support
Development (November 2021)

National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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.

Contact Officer – Charlotte Brewerton
Email – planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk
Tel – 01235 442600