

APPLICATION NO.	P16/S3284/O
APPLICATION TYPE	OUTLINE
REGISTERED	3.10.2016
PARISH	CHINNOR
WARD MEMBERS	Lynn Lloyd Ian White
APPLICANT	Persimmon Homes
SITE	Land South of Greenwood Avenue, Chinnor OX39 4HN
PROPOSAL	Outline planning application for erection of up to 140 dwellings, new public open space, associated landscaping and site infrastructure. All matters reserved.
AMENDMENTS	As amended by plans and additional information accompanying Agents letter dated 21 December 2016.
OFFICER	Emma Bowerman

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee as the officer's recommendation conflicts with the views of Chinnor Parish Council.
- 1.2 This application was deferred from the planning committee meeting on 1 March 2017 for two reasons:
- For councillors of the committee to visit the site and consider the landscape impact of the development (carried out on 24 April).
 - For the Head of the Planning Service to bring together the developers / landowners of the three sites to the south of Greenwood Avenue to discuss how the sites can be better integrated into the local area, with a vehicular access linking the three sites.
- 1.3 The Head of the Planning Service has now chaired a meeting with representatives from the three development sites. All parties agreed as a point of principle that it is sensible for existing and future residents to be able to access between the three housing sites, which will better integrate the developments into the village. It was agreed that improving permeability would demonstrate good planning and urban design best practice.
- 1.4 The following actions were agreed at the meeting:
1. Bellway Homes and Persimmon Homes would meet to reopen discussions / negotiations to achieve a vehicular access between their housing sites.
 2. Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey (with the inclusion of an additional landowner) would meet to negotiate and seek to achieve vehicular access between their housing sites.
 3. The relevant parties would feedback progress and direction of discussions before the planning committee meeting on 24 May so an update can be provided to councillors.
- 1.5 The application site (which is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix A) is positioned to the south of Chinnor and is the middle of the three fields between the rear of Greenwood Avenue and the Chinnor and Princes Risborough heritage railway

line. The recent residential development at the former Cement Works is located to the other side of the railway line.

- 1.6 The site is 3.9 hectares in area and is currently used as an agricultural field. The two fields either side are also currently in agricultural use but both have planning permission for residential developments. The council refused applications for the development of both of these fields but appeals were allowed in October 2015. The field to the east of the application site has detailed planning permission for 80 dwellings. The field to the west of the application site has outline planning permission for up to 120 dwellings.
- 1.7 The site is currently accessed by a single track off Greenwood Avenue. The site does not fall within any areas of special designation.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This is an outline application for planning permission for up to 140 dwellings, new public open space including a children’s play area, associated landscaping and site infrastructure. All matters are reserved for later consideration.
- 2.2 This application is made in parallel with a separate submission for the construction of an access road via Greenwood Avenue. This is considered under application reference P16/3285/FUL and is the next item on the agenda.
- 2.3 The access parameter plan shows three potential access points to the site from the neighbouring developments and one from the demolition of No.s 17 and 19 Greenwood Avenue to allow for the formation of a new access road onto Greenwood Avenue. The application documents advise that these options are reliant on negotiations between the different parties.
- 2.4 The proposed homes would be predominantly two storeys in height with occasional two and a half storey buildings in feature locations. The housing mix outlined in the application is as follows:

	Market	Affordable	TOTAL
1 bed	0	6	6
2 bed	37	31	68
3 bed	37	18	55
4 bed	9	0	9
TOTAL	83	55	138

- 2.5 Amended plans were received during the application process to address some of the comments made by the urban design officer, Parish Council and local residents. The changes to the indicative layout include longer gardens on the plots along the northern boundary, the pumping station has been moved slightly, and a mixture of car ports and garages would be used. The original plans showed a cul-de-sac to the eastern side of the site and the amended plans have changed the layout to incorporate a through road.
- 2.6 An indicative layout plan and some of the parameter plans submitted with the application are **attached** as Appendix B. The application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents and these are available to view on the council’s website at www.southoxon.gov.uk.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Chinnor Parish Council**

Original plans – Recommend refusal as overdevelopment and not in keeping with area. Unimaginative design. Statement from neighbouring appeal decisions confirms a green field in centre. Carports required not garages.

Amended plans – Recommend refusal due to stress on local road network during construction works and additional traffic movements post completion. Cumulative impact with additional developments already approved representing a significant increase in risk to road users and pedestrians. Roads will become rat runs. Hazardous mix of additional vehicles and pick-up of school children.

Commented that the risks will be mitigated and much of the impact reduced if the suggested route through the three developments can be secured.

3.2 **Oxfordshire County Council Highways**

No objection subject to conditions and obligations.

3.3 **Oxfordshire County Council Infrastructure**

No objection subject to funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy towards necessary mitigation of schools, library, day care, museum and waste management.

3.4 **Oxfordshire County Council Archaeology**

No objection subject to conditions requiring an archaeological written scheme of investigation and programme of archaeological evaluation and mitigation.

3.5 **Thames Water**

No objection subject to conditions to secure a drainage strategy for on and off site drainage works and impact studies of the water supply to determine the magnitude of any additional capacity.

3.6 **Drainage consultant (Monson)**

No objection subject to conditions to secure suitable foul and surface water drainage.

3.6 **Housing Development Officer**

No objection subject to appropriate affordable housing mix being secured through the legal agreement.

3.7 **Urban Design Officer**

Original plans – Provided recommendations on how the layout of the development can be improved.

Amended plans – A number of issues addressed in the amended plans and recommended that other issues are picked up at reserved matters stage.

3.8 **Forestry Officer**

No objection subject to conditions to secure appropriate tree protection and landscaping.

3.9 **Countryside Officer**

No objection subject to conditions to secure a reptile mitigation strategy and a biodiversity enhancement strategy.

3.10 **Conservation Officer**

No objection subject to appropriate design details at reserved matters stage.

3.11 **Environmental Health and Air Quality Officer**

Raised concern in terms of the air quality impacts of the development for both the original submission and the additional details provided with the amended plans. Also raised concern regarding the impact of the activities of the adjoining railway on future residents of the site. Confirmed that although it is regrettable that these matters were not fully addressed in the application submission, that these issues would not warrant refusal of the application and could be addressed through suitable conditions. The relevant conditions relate to noise, odour and pollutant mitigation to protect future residents from the activities of the railway and the approval of air quality mitigation measures.

3.12 **Contaminated Land Officer**

No objection subject to conditions to secure a phased contaminated land assessment and any required mitigation.

3.13 **Leisure Officer**

No objection as sport and leisure contributions will be made through CIL regulations.

3.14 **Waste Management Officer**

Provided guidance on the waste service provided by the council.

3.15 **Neighbour Representations**

13 Received in objection to the original consultation raising the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment of village
- The green field should be kept to prevent overdevelopment
- Development of this site would call into legal question the two other sites
- Chinnor has already accepted too many homes
- Unacceptable increase in size of village
- Not a sustainable development – residents will drive to village amenities
- Development out of character and would dominate skyline
- Infrastructure already at crisis point
- Increased flood risk
- Impact on highway safety
- Cumulative impact of additional traffic detrimental to village
- Further congestion on roads
- Misleading and inaccurate information in transport assessment
- Surrounding streets not designed for that level of development
- Lack of footpath and cycle way connectivity
- Inconvenience to residents during demolition works
- Impact on air quality / health
- Proximity of pumping station and possible impact on health and safety
- Loss of a view

8 Received in objection to the amended consultation raising the following concerns:

- Green space should be left as this is a reason why the appeals either side were allowed
- Not within Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan
- Infrastructure provisions are inadequate
- Spoil the character of the area
- Layout regimented and unsuitable for a village development

- Overcrowded in comparison to other sites
- Impact on highway safety
- Exacerbate existing parking problems
- Creation of rat runs
- Too many unknowns about the roads linking up
- Noise and disturbance from additional traffic
- Inconvenience to local residents
- Impact on neighbours – light, privacy and enjoyment of gardens
- Erode village life

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 None directly relevant to this application site.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

5.3 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) 2027

- CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CSB1 - Conservation and improvement of biodiversity
- CSC1 - Delivery and contingency
- CON13 - Archaeological investigation recording & publication
- CON12 - Archaeological field evaluation
- CSEN1 - Landscape protection
- CSEN3 - Historic environment
- CSG1 - Green infrastructure
- CSH1 - Amount and distribution of housing
- CSH2 - Housing density
- CSH3 - Affordable housing
- CSH4 - Meeting housing needs
- CSI1 - Infrastructure provision
- CSM1 - Transport
- CSM2 - Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
- CSQ3 - Design
- CSQ4 - Design briefs for greenfield neighbourhoods and major development sites
- CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

5.4 South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) 2011 saved policies

- C4 - Landscape setting of settlements
- C6 - Maintain & enhance biodiversity
- C8 - Adverse affect on protected species
- C9 - Loss of landscape features
- D1 - Principles of good design
- D10 - Waste Management
- D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
- D3 - Outdoor amenity area
- D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
- D6 - Community safety
- EP1 - Adverse affect on people and environment
- EP4 - Impact on water resources
- EP6 - Sustainable drainage
- EP7 - Impact on ground water resources
- EP8 - Contaminated land
- G2 - Protect district from adverse development

- G4 - Protection of Countryside
- R2 - Provision of play areas on new housing development
- R6 - Public open space in new residential development
- T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
- T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

5.5 South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG) 2016

This guide sets out the standard that we expect developments to meet through a series of checklists which relate to key design principles.

5.6 Emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2032

The council is preparing a new Local Plan, which will set out how development will be planned and delivered across South Oxfordshire to 2032. The consultation on the second 'Preferred Options' for the emerging Local Plan closed on 17 May 2017. The Preferred Options provides draft allocations for strategic development sites. With the exception of Crowmarsh Gifford and Nettlebed, the plan proposes to devolve the delivery of houses in villages to the Neighbourhood Plan process.

5.7 Emerging Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan

Chinnor Parish Council have recently submitted their draft Neighbourhood Plan to us. The six week consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan finished on 21 March 2017. The draft Neighbourhood Plan, supporting documents and comments received will now be considered by an independent examiner.

5.8 Environmental Impact Assessment

This proposal does not exceed 150 dwellings, the site area is under 5ha and is not within a 'sensitive area' as defined by the EIA regulations. Consequently the proposal is beneath the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Although below the relevant thresholds, the proposal was screened under application reference P16/S0617/SCR in March 2016 due to the potential cumulative impact of developments in Chinnor. The decision was that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required as the majority of issues are considered to be of local significance only and can be examined through the normal planning process.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

- The principle of the development, including:
 - how the development of the site fits with the council's spatial strategy,
 - the council's housing land supply position,
 - the level of compliance with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan,
 - the cumulative impact of the developments in Chinnor.
- Matters of detail / technical issues, including:
 - affordable housing and housing mix,
 - highway safety, traffic impact and parking
 - landscape impact,
 - trees and ecology,
 - design and layout,
 - neighbour amenity and amenity of future residents,
 - flood risk and surface / foul drainage,
 - environmental matters (air quality and contamination)
 - heritage impact

- Infrastructure requirements, including:
 - on-site infrastructure to be secured under a legal agreement,
 - contributions pooled under the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The principle of the development

How the development of the site fits with the council's spatial strategy

- 6.2 Chinnor is identified as a larger village within the SOCS. Policy CSS1 of the SOCS sets out the overall distribution strategy for the district and this includes supporting and enhancing the larger villages as local service centres. This distribution strategy is followed through in Policy CSR1 which addresses housing in the villages and indicates that sites will be allocated for housing in the larger villages and that there would be no limit on infill development in these settlements.
- 6.3 The application site falls beyond the built up limits of the village. It is not closely surrounded by buildings or a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage. It does not represent an infill development. It is also not a site allocated for housing. The development therefore conflicts with the development plan, insofar as it does not meet with the policy CSR1 criteria against which proposals for development beyond the built-up limits of larger villages are assessed.
- 6.4 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. One such material consideration, of notable importance, is the NPPF.

The council's housing land supply position

- 6.5 To significantly boost the supply of housing, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. This supply should include an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Alternatively, where there has been persistent under delivery of housing, the buffer should increase to 20% to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply.
- 6.6 The most recent evidence base that informs the council's housing requirements is the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). To meet the identified housing need for the district, the SHMA mid-point is 755 homes per annum. This is a sizable uplift from the requirement for 547 homes per annum set out in the SOCS.
- 6.7 Based on the evidence in the SHMA and past delivery, the council has a housing land supply in the region of 3.9 years (including the 20% buffer for under delivery). The council cannot therefore currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Of relevance to this position are a number of appeal decisions that have been allowed in the past two years¹. In each case, the council's housing land supply was discussed in detail at public inquiries and the Inspectors concluded that the council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 6.8 Para.49 of the NPPF specifies that relevant policies for the supply of housing should

¹ Land at Winterbrook, Wallingford (P15/S0191/FUL), Land North of Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor (P15/S0154/O), Land to the east of Newington Road, Stadhampton (P14/S4105/O) and High Street, Tetsworth (P14/S3524/O).

not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Para.14 adds that where relevant policies are out of date, *planning permission should be granted unless*

- *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.*

- 6.9 This means that the policies for the supply of housing in the SOCS are given significantly less weight. Applications for housing should now be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and should be permitted unless there is planning harm that outweighs the benefit of providing new housing.

The level of compliance with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan

- 6.10 Chinnor Parish Council are progressing with their Neighbourhood Plan, for which the six week consultation closed on 21 March 2017. The draft Neighbourhood Plan will now be subject to an independent examination, and possible modification, before progressing through to a referendum. The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a strategy and land-use planning framework to guide development within Chinnor for the next 15 years.
- 6.11 The draft Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that the delivery of new residential development in Chinnor is a complex and emerging picture with the potential for the delivery of over 700 new dwellings in the Plan period. The application is referenced as a site that is currently being considered by SODC and is one of the sites that makes up the calculation of 700 homes.
- 6.12 Given the level of development that has been approved, or for which there are current applications under consideration, the draft Neighbourhood Plan does not propose any additional housing allocations. Although the site is not allocated for housing in the draft Plan, it is recognised as a site that could contribute towards the housing numbers in the village.
- 6.13 I note that only limited weight can be attributed to the draft Plan at the current time as it is not yet at an advanced stage. As such, only limited weight could be attributed to any conflict with the draft Plan. Therefore the main issue to be taken into account in the determination of this application is still whether any harm that would arise from the development would be so significant and demonstrable that it would outweigh the benefits of the increase in housing.

The cumulative impact of the developments in Chinnor

- 6.14 The level of growth within and around Chinnor over the Plan period will inevitably increase the demands placed on local infrastructure, services and facilities. Considerable concern has been raised by some residents in Chinnor in relation to the capacity of local infrastructure to accommodate further homes.
- 6.15 The cumulative impact of the developments within Chinnor is a matter that has been considered as each application has come forward and we have taken advice from our consultees in relation to the impact on the capacity of the drainage system, highways network and school provision. The consultees that specialise in these matters (Thames Water and the County Council) have not raised any objection and have recommended solutions to help address capacity issues.

- 6.16 Given that the consultees that specialise in these fields have not raised an objection in relation to drainage, transport and education, there is no available evidence to demonstrate that Chinnor cannot accommodate the level of growth proposed. This does not mean that Chinnor has infinite capacity to accommodate even more homes and if any further applications come forward, the cumulative impacts of the developments within and around Chinnor will need to be assessed again.

Matters of detail / technical issues

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 6.17 The application documents state that 40 percent of the homes would be would be affordable and this complies with policy CSH3 of the SOCS. The council’s housing development team have confirmed that the proposed mix would meet local needs and reflects the significant demand for two bedroom affordable homes following the Government Welfare reform and the changes for eligibility for Housing Benefit.
- 6.18 The provisions of the legal agreement would secure a tenure mix of 25 percent shared ownership and 75 percent affordable rent. The council’s housing development team have requested that four of the three bed homes have a capacity for six bed spaces (minimum of 96 sq.m) and this can also be secured through the legal agreement. Where 40 percent would result in a ‘part’ unit a commuted sum would be payable in lieu.
- 6.19 The affordable units would be distributed throughout the development and a Section 106 legal agreement would require the units to be built “tenure blind” in respect of external design and features so they are materially indistinguishable from the general market housing. Subject to the completion of a S106 to secure the affordable housing provision, I consider that the scheme is acceptable in this respect and complies with the relevant policies.
- 6.20 In terms of the market mix, the market housing mix from the SHMA and the application proposal are summarised in the table below.

Market homes	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed
SHMA	6%	27%	43%	24%
Application proposal	0%	44.5%	44.5%	11%

Although not strictly in accordance with the SHMA mix, the proposal would provide for a high number of two bed homes, with less emphasis on larger homes. I support this approach as we often see developments that are weighted heavily towards larger homes. The neighbouring development to the east provided a much higher percentage of larger homes and so overall, the two sites together would provide for a greater range of house sizes to meet the needs of different groups in the community.

- 6.21 Overall, the mix of homes would deliver a wide choice, in accordance with SOCS policy CSH4. The market mix should be secured by condition to inform the reserved matters application.

Highway safety, traffic impact and parking

- 6.22 This application is an outline application with all matters reserved and this includes access. Access is therefore not a matter to be considered under this application. The applicant has submitted a separate application with just the access to Greenwood Avenue. This is the next application on the agenda, under application reference

P16/S3285/FUL.

- 6.23 This application therefore contains no details of the access and instead provides an access parameter plan showing access points from the two development sites either side and also from Greenwood Avenue. The highway matters to be considered are whether the traffic movements from the site would be acceptable and whether there is acceptable space within the site to provide an appropriate level of parking.
- 6.24 The County Council Highways Officer has raised no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions and the completion of a legal agreement to secure site specific highways infrastructure. In coming to this conclusion, the highways officer has taken account of the other developments in and around the village and is aware that Greenwood Avenue is one way at the narrow end and cannot be accessed from B4009.
- 6.25 The highways officer has commented that:
The proposed dwellings will add to pressures on local infrastructure such as the highway network. The submitted transport assessment estimates the trip generation and examines its impact upon the local highway network. The assessment is fair in its appraisal. Subject to appropriate travel planning and provision of sustainable transport infrastructure, I am satisfied the impact of development traffic would not be reason for refusal, which in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework requires any such impact to be severe.
- 6.26 The site is a sustainable location with a range of shops, services and transport links available within walking distance. The County Council have requested a contribution towards public transport to support the bus service and also a contribution towards bus stop infrastructure improvements. A contribution is also required towards monitoring a travel plan. These can be secured through the provisions of a legal agreement and are outlined in the relevant part of the report below.
- 6.27 I am satisfied that there is sufficient space on site to accommodate a level of parking that would accord with the council's parking standards. To enable the three development sites to be linked up, it would be necessary to secure an unfettered access up to both side boundaries of the site and this is best secured through the provisions of a section 106 legal agreement. Subject to the completion of a legal agreement and imposition of conditions, this proposal is acceptable in terms of highway matters.

Landscape impact

- 6.28 The text accompanying policy CSEN1 of the SOCS explains that there will be some further development on the edge of our settlements and that we will take account of and seek to reduce the impact of development on the environment. Policy C4 of the SOLP advises that development that would damage the attractive landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted.
- 6.29 The Inspector who allowed the development of the two fields that adjoin the application site made reference to the application site in both of her decisions. When considering the landscape impact of the two developments, the Inspector commented that:
Together, both developments would cover a larger area of green space on the periphery of Chinnor, would extend into the countryside and together would diminish its rural landscaped setting. However, as that proposed development would be separated from the appeal development by a large field, some green space would still penetrate the settlement, which would reduce the harm identified. Additionally, that development would include an area of open space to its south, open space

within it, it would relate appropriately to the existing village envelope, would retain much of the existing planting and include new planting. Whilst these matters would reduce the harm to the open countryside, and the setting of Chinnor, some additional harm would still arise as a result of both developments.

- 6.30 The Inspector referred to the site as providing some mitigation against the landscape harm of the two developments on the fields either side of the application site. In my opinion, the Inspector did not look at the wider picture and appreciate that by allowing the two fields either side of the site to be developed the result would be an agricultural field in an urban setting.
- 6.31 Once the developments on the fields either side are built, the application site would have modern housing developments on three sides and 1950's semi-detached homes on the fourth. The result would be that the application site would effectively become a large infill site and if retained as a field, would be somewhat of an anomaly given its context. On this basis, I consider that the contribution that this site makes to the rural landscaped setting of Chinnor is limited.
- 6.32 The visual impact of the development would be mitigated by allowing for tree planting to break up the built form. A sensitive treatment of the development edge would also help to assimilate the built development into its setting. Suitable landscaping can be secured under a condition and will need to be provided at reserved matters stage.
- 6.33 This is a site that is well contained by the existing built form of Chinnor and would not extend the settlement footprint into the wider landscape. In my opinion this is a suitable site for a housing development and would not result in any significant harm to the landscape setting of Chinnor.

Trees and ecology

- 6.34 The proposal would require the removal of a small number of trees and also some works close to other trees. The trees that would be removed as a result of the development are not of sufficient arboricultural value to be considered a constraint to the development. With suitable tree protection measures the impact on the retained trees would be minimal and as such, I have no objection to the proposal on arboricultural grounds.
- 6.35 A reserved matters application would need to include a landscape planting scheme that includes larger long lived trees made up of a variety of species to ensure a diverse and robust tree scape. The long term management of the landscaping would also need to be secured and I have recommended conditions to cover these matters.
- 6.36 With regards to ecology, the application was accompanied by surveys which show that the site supports a population of slow-worm. The surrounding sites were also found to support slow-worms and the council's countryside officer has considered the cumulative impact on this protected species. Subject to a condition to secure an appropriate strategy for the translocation of these reptiles, the council's countryside officer has no objection to the impact on slow worms.
- 6.37 Bat activity surveys have shown that the boundary habitats are well used by common species of bats and it is therefore necessary that these habitats are protected and enhanced. In order to ensure that the proposal achieves a no net loss of biodiversity I have recommended a condition requiring a biodiversity enhancement strategy. This should include the provision of bat boxes and enhancements to boundary habitats.

Design and Layout

- 6.38 Securing a high quality design is a key aspect of sustainable development and the importance of securing good design is a theme that runs through national, local and Neighbourhood Plan policies. New development should create a sense of place, optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, respond to local character and create a safe and accessible environment.
- 6.39 The council's urban design officer provided some advice on the plans originally submitted and a number of her comments have been addressed in the amended / additional information that was submitted during the application process. The positive aspects of the design are that the layout is based on strong perimeter blocks and there are opportunities for a number of connections.
- 6.40 The urban design officer has recommended that it would be preferable for the three sites to be developed together. Given that the two sites either side have already been progressed, this would unfortunately not now be possible. Although this is a missed opportunity, the three developers would provide some variety across the three sites in terms of house types and layout. This would ensure that the overall development would not be uniform and would help with the legibility of the wider development.
- 6.41 The development would be 35 dwellings per hectare, which reflects the higher proportion of smaller units on the site. In my opinion the overall level of built development on the site would be acceptable. In terms of height, the central core of the development would be two and a half storey and, subject to appropriate details being secured at reserved matters stage, I consider this to be an acceptable approach. There would be two and a half and three storey buildings on the neighbouring site to the east and there are also higher buildings at the former Cement Works site.
- 6.42 In my opinion the indicative layout achieves a balanced mix of house types to ensure some variety. The layout would have a clear hierarchy of streets and the homes that front onto the front of the public open space would provide some natural surveillance of this area. Based on the indicative plan and parameter plans submitted, I am satisfied that an appropriate layout can be secured at reserved matters stage.
- 6.43 I consider that the scheme represents an appropriate response to the constraints and opportunities of the site and its surroundings. I am satisfied that the scale of the development would be appropriate to the context of the site and that the development would generally meet the design objectives of the NPPF and the development plan policies that seek to secure high quality developments.

Neighbour amenity and amenity of future residents

- 6.44 The indicative layout shows that a separation distance of at least 30m could be achieved between the rear of the new dwellings and the rear of the existing properties in Greenwood Avenue. The South Oxfordshire Design Guide recommends a minimum back-to-back relationship of 25m and so they layout would be in excess of this standard.
- 6.45 The indicative layout shows buildings closer to the rear boundary of Nos. 15 and 21 Greenwood Avenue and if any windows are proposed in the side of these buildings in the reserved matters application, they would need to be obscure glazed. As the gardens of Nos. 15 and 21 are long, I consider that there would be no adverse impact on these neighbours in terms of light and outlook. I am satisfied that there is sufficient space on the site to enable a fixed layout to achieve the level of development on site

without adversely impacting on neighbouring properties in terms of light, outlook and privacy.

- 6.46 The development would create more traffic movements and this would inevitably have some impact on existing residents in terms of noise and disturbance. I do not consider that this would be unacceptable given that the proposal would involve a residential scheme alongside an existing residential development. I have recommended a condition to restrict construction hours to ensure that the disturbance to neighbours during construction works is limited.
- 6.47 In terms of the amenity of future occupiers of the site, the future residents would have the benefit of private or shared amenity space. The public open space, would be accessible to all residents and occupiers of surrounding properties. In my opinion the development would create an appropriate living environment for future residents.

Flood risk and surface / foul drainage

- 6.48 The application site is within Flood Zone 1 (least probability of flooding) and as such, there are no objections to the development in relation to flood risk.
- 6.49 As is now standard practice, a detailed scheme for the site would need to incorporate a Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) compliant strategy to ensure that all surface water run-off is accommodated within the confines of the site and discharged in a controlled manner. As required by the council's drainage consultant, the details of this can be secured by condition.
- 6.50 With regards to foul drainage, Thames Water have been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this development. Thames Water therefore require the Applicant to carry out a drainage strategy detailing any on and off site drainage works that are required to implement this development. This includes a clause that Thames Water will not accept any waste water into the public system until the works in the drainage strategy have been completed.
- 6.51 Thames Water have commented that the water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands of the development and therefore also require impact studies of the water supply infrastructure. These studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.
- 6.52 I have recommended that the conditions required by Thames Water and our drainage consultant are added to the outline planning consent. This will require solutions to ensure that sufficient waste water and water supply infrastructure are available to accommodate the development.

Environmental matters (air quality and contamination)

- 6.53 The proposed development runs along part of the Chinnor and Princes Risborough Railway (CPRR) track and is near to the railway's maintenance and storage shed. The activities of the railway have the potential to impact on future residents of the development in terms of noise, odour and pollutants.
- 6.54 It is important to ensure that appropriate mitigation is secured to provide suitable living conditions for future residents and also to limit the potential for future residents to raise concerns with the railway activities. To achieve this, conditions can be attached to secure appropriate mitigation and this could include acoustic barriers, specified glazing

details and mechanical ventilation.

- 6.55 I note that the illustrative layout shows only a small number of properties located close to the railway line. Furthermore, the issue of noise and odour from the CPRR line was a matter that was addressed through conditions for both of the adjoining sites. This approach was agreed by a Planning Inspector and it would therefore be consistent to again attach conditions to address these issues.
- 6.56 In terms of air quality, the council's environmental health officer requested additional air quality modelling to be carried out and this work has not been undertaken. Having discussed the matter with the council's air quality officer, she has confirmed that the impact of air quality as a result of the development would not be significant and would not warrant refusal of the application.
- 6.57 Based on the size of the proposed development, basic good practice design should be applied to this site in order to help mitigate against the air quality impacts and the potential cumulative effects of piecemeal developments, and to enable future proofing of the development. I have recommended a condition requiring air quality mitigation measures to be agreed. Mitigation measures can include measures such as electric vehicle charging points.
- 6.58 With regards to contamination, the council's contaminated land officer has considered the details that were submitted with the application and has no objection to the development subject to contaminated land conditions. These require a phased risk assessment to include an investigation and any necessary remediation of the land.

Heritage impact

- 6.59 With regards to heritage impact, the council's conservation officer has confirmed that the proposal would not harm the conservation area or any listed buildings in Chinnor. The County Archaeologist has commented that the site is located in an area of archaeological interest and has recommended conditions requiring a scheme of investigation and any necessary processing, research and analysis. Subject to these conditions, I have no objection to the application on heritage grounds.

Infrastructure requirements

On-site infrastructure to be secured under a legal agreement

- 6.60 On-site infrastructure can be secured through a legal agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). A total of 18 percent of the site would be provided as open space and a children's Local Area of Play (LAP) would be provided. These can be secured through the legal agreement and a management company would be required to maintain the spaces.
- 6.61 In accordance with the council's S106 Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, the following additional financial contributions would be required towards on-site infrastructure:
- Provision of recycle bins - £170 per property (indicatively £23,800)
 - Street naming and numbering - £107.80 per 10 dwellings (indicatively £1,509.20)
 - Monitoring fee - £1,244.40
- 6.62 As required by the County highways officer, the following site specific highways contributions would also need to be secured under the S106:
- Public transport contribution - £1,032.26 per dwellings (indicatively £144,516).

- Bus stop infrastructure improvements - £27,722
- Costs of monitoring travel plan - £1,240

6.63 I consider that these contributions / obligations accord with policy CS11 of the SOCS, which requires new development to be supported by appropriate on and off-site infrastructure and services. They accord with the relevant tests in the NPPF as they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and are fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Off-site contributions pooled under the Community Infrastructure Levy

6.64 The council adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on 1 April 2016. With the exception of the affordable housing, any new build floor space is CIL liable at a rate of £150 per sq.m. The floor area would be calculated at reserved matters stage, when the details of the development are provided. The money collected through CIL can be pooled with contributions from other development sites to fund a wide range of off-site infrastructure to support growth, including schools, transport, community, leisure and health facilities.

6.65 Under the CIL regulations, the Parish Council receive a proportion of CIL money. If the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted before the last pre-commencement condition is discharged, the Parish Council would receive 25 percent of the CIL money collected from the development (as oppose to 15 percent without an adopted Neighbourhood Plan). The Parish Council could chose to spend their proportion of CIL money on infrastructure projects that are priorities for the local community or could contribute towards strategic infrastructure.

7.0 CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE

7.1 Para. 7 of the NPPF sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development: social, economic and environmental. The benefits and harm of the development should be considered against these three strands of sustainable development. Of most importance, the proposal would positively support the delivery of housing, including affordable housing, and there is a considerable need for market and affordable homes within our District. The social benefits of providing much needed housing is a material consideration of significant weight.

7.2 With regards to the economic dimension of sustainability, the Government has made clear its views that house building plays an important role in promoting economic growth. In economic terms, the proposal would provide construction jobs and some local investment during construction, as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy. I consider that moderate weight should be afforded to these benefits.

7.3 In environmental terms, the proposal would have an impact on the character and appearance of the site and wider area. Additional traffic as a result of the development would also inevitably have some environmental impacts. Although these impacts weigh against the scheme, I have considered the overall impact on the landscape setting of the village to be acceptable and I consider that an appropriate layout could be achieved.

7.4 The development would result in the loss of agricultural land. However, some loss will be inevitable in order to secure the delivery of the levels of housing required. In addition, given the very substantial area of our District that is covered by protected landscapes or Green Belt, the opportunity to provide new homes on a suitable site that is unaffected by these designations weighs in favour of the proposal.

7.5 Taking into account the benefits of the development and weighing these against the harm, I consider that the proposal represents a sustainable development, consistent with Para.14 of the NPPF and Policy CS1 of the SOCS. The proposal would contribute towards the objective to significantly boost the supply of housing, consistent with Para.47 of the NPPF.

7.6 In conclusion, placing all of the relevant material considerations in the balance, when considered against the development plan as a whole, the proposal would represent a sustainable form of development.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **That authority to grant planning permission be delegated to the Head of Planning subject to:**

i) The prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing, financial contributions and other obligations stated above, and

ii) The following conditions:

- 1. Outline planning permission.**
- 2. Approved plans.**
- 3. Market housing mix to comprise 44.5% 2 bed, 44.5% 3bed and 11% 4+ bed.**
- 4. Sample materials to be agreed.**
- 5. Slab and ridge levels to be agreed.**
- 6. Travel plan to be agreed.**
- 7. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed.**
- 8. Details of access roads, vehicle parking and turning areas to be agreed.**
- 9. Archaeological scheme of investigation to be agreed.**
- 10. Archaeological evaluation and mitigation to be submitted.**
- 11. Drainage strategy for on and off site drainage works to be agreed.**
- 12. Additional water supply infrastructure to be agreed.**
- 13. Surface water drainage to be agreed.**
- 14. Tree protection to be agreed.**
- 15. Landscaping to be agreed.**
- 16. Landscape management to be agreed.**
- 17. Noise mitigation measures to be agreed .**
- 18. Odour and pollutant mitigation measures to be agreed.**
- 19. Air quality mitigation to be agreed.**
- 20. Phased contaminated land assessment.**
- 21. Remediation of any contamination.**
- 22. Construction hours restriction.**

Author: Emma Bowerman
Contact No: 01235 422600
Email: planning@southoxon.gov.uk