
| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | P17/S3206/O |
| APPLICATION TYPE | OUTLINE |
| REGISTERED | 5.9.2017 |
| PARISH | South Stoke |
| WARD MEMBER(S) | Kevin Bulmer |
| APPLICANT | Mr MH Bullock, Miss SJ Bullock and Mrs J Allen |
| SITE | Land at Woodcote Road, South Stoke, RG8 0JJ |
| PROPOSAL | Residential development (up to 5 dwellings), and associated works, including access and amended details (landscape assessment and indicative layout) |
| OFFICER | Tom Rice |

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The site is to the south of Woodcote Road on the edge of South Stoke. **Appendices One and Two** provide a site location and context plan. South Stoke is a small village between Wallingford and Goring, and sits within the River Thames corridor that runs to the west of the village. The village and application site are washed over by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), but there are no other planning designations or constraints that affect the site.

1.2 The site is beyond the existing built edge of South Stoke, but is bounded by a mature and well established tree line on its northern, eastern, and southern edges; those edges which face out into the open countryside.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The applicant is seeking outline planning consent to develop up to five homes. They are proposing that all matters of detail (for example layout, housing mix etc.) are reserved for a later planning application tied to any outline consent. The only exception to this is access, which the applicant wants the council to approve in detail through this application. The applicant is proposing that 2 of the 5 homes would be volunteered as affordable housing.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1

| Consultee | Summary of comments |
|----------------------------|---|
| South Stoke Parish Council | Original comments 19 October 2017 The application should be refused as the applicant had not submitted a landscape and visual impact assessment. The assessment is necessary due to the site's location on the edge of the village and in the AONB. Such an assessment should include winter views when the trees are not in leaf. |
| | Second comments 4 December 2017 The parish maintains their objection. The application site is outside the village boundary and inside the AONB. The additional landscape assessment provided by the applicant is not detailed enough, and was undertaken too early in the season for leaf fall. The assessment takes into account the ivy on the trees as forming |

| | |
|--|--|
| | part of the visual screening from key viewpoints. If the trees are to be secured in perpetuity for visual screening then the ivy will need to be removed, and therefore its inclusion in the assessment is inappropriate. The parish note a badger sett may be present on the site, but no wildlife assessment has been provided. |
| County Archaeological Services | The proposals outlined would not appear to have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme. |
| Forestry Officer | <p>Original comments 2 November 2017</p> <p>The trees on the perimeter of the site form a prominent feature in the AONB landscape. Their retention will be key for softening and screening the impact of future development of the site. Most of the trees are deciduous so would provide less screening in the winter.</p> <p>The proposed access is located within the theoretical root protection areas for Tree 1 and Tree 2, however considering the existing site conditions the officer wouldn't anticipate the construction of the access would cause significantly more damage than what has already been caused by past works on site.</p> <p>Second comments 12 December 2017</p> <p>The amended plans have improved the relationship between unit 1 and Tree 28 (sycamore tree on the eastern edge of the site), but the western elevation will still only be within 1m from the edge of the dwelling. Tree 28 has considerable future growth potential and therefore greater separation will be needed to avoid future conflict.</p> <p>An amended site layout will be needed for any future reserved matters applications, (if permission is to be granted).</p> |
| Neighbour comments Principle issues | Comments identified a conflict with the development plan as the proposals would extend the built form of South Stoke beyond the established settlement boundary, citing that this conflicted with local plan policies that protect the countryside for its own sake. Any decision to extend the built form of the village should take account of the village's own plans for growth, which are focussing on the development on the Glebe. |
| Neighbour comments Landscape issues | Neighbours raised concerns about the impact of building on greenfield farm land in the AONB. Some identified deficiencies in the applicant's landscape assessment, citing the presence of ivy providing additional screening in photos, and assessment images including deciduous trees before they had shed their leaves. |
| Neighbour comments Trees | Residents were concerned that the proposed development could lead to the removal of more, if not all, of the trees surrounding the site, and undermine the pleasant edge of settlement character they provide. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Other residents noted the presence of trees / shrubs on the site that were cleared recently prior to the application being submitted in the summer of 2017. |
| Neighbour comments Transport issues | Many residents identified the Woodcote Road as being incapable of accommodating more vehicular traffic, citing a conflict with recreational users of the route for walking, cycling, jogging and horse riding. They also noted the presence of concealed entrances and on-street parking creating potential safety concerns. Others believed that the road infrastructure of the village as a whole was incapable of accommodating this level of growth. |
| Neighbour comments Character and design | There were fewer comments on this matter. Some identified the site as being too high a density compared to neighbouring properties. Others suggested that it risked becoming a private residential enclave on the edge of South Stoke. |
| Neighbour comments Biodiversity | Several residents have suggested the site may have some wildlife value, and have submitted photos of a potential badger sett. |

4.0

PLANNING HISTORY

4.1

| Planning reference | Summary |
|--------------------|--|
| P86/W0322/O | A planning application for the erection of a new single dwelling. It was refused in July 1987 as it was contrary to the Structure Plan. |
| P72/H0133 | A planning application for the erection of a single dwelling. It was refused in October 1972 due it being an undesirable extension to South Stoke and having a detrimental impact on the AONB. |

5.0

POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1

| Core Strategy Policies | |
|---|--|
| CS1 | Presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| CSS1 | The overall strategy |
| CSC1 | Delivery and contingency |
| CSB1 | Conservation and enhancement of biodiversity |
| CSI1 | Infrastructure provision |
| CSEN1 | Landscape protection |
| CSH1 | Amount and distribution of housing |
| CSH2 | Housing density |
| CSH4 | Meeting housing needs |
| CSQ2 | Sustainable design and construction |
| CSQ3 | Design |
| CSR1 | Housing in the villages |
| Saved policies from the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 | |
| C4 | Landscape setting of settlements |
| C8 | Adverse affect on protected species |
| D1 | Principles of good design |
| D2 | Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles |

5.2

| | |
|-----|---|
| D3 | Outdoor amenity area |
| D4 | Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers |
| D7 | Access for all |
| D10 | Waste management |
| EP6 | Sustainable drainage |
| G2 | Protect the district from adverse development |
| H4 | Housing sites in towns and villages |
| T1 | Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users |
| T2 | Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users |

5.3

Neighbourhood plan

South Stoke Parish Council has not started work on a neighbourhood plan, and so no neighbourhood plan policies apply to the application site.

5.4

South Oxfordshire Design Guide

The South Oxfordshire Design Guide contains a wealth of information for applicants in preparing planning applications. There is too much information in the design guide to repeat here, but where relevant, I have cited the design guide in the planning considerations section below.

5.5

South Stoke Village Plan Refresh

The Parish Council has published a parish plan refresh to identify key actions for the village. There are several elements of the survey that relate to land use planning and therefore relevant to this application. At this stage, the refresh is simply a questionnaire aimed at identifying issues.

5.6

Relevant Paragraphs from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 14 | The presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| 17 | Core planning principles |
| 34 and 35 | Sustainable transport and rural communities |
| 49 | Delivering new homes |
| 56 to 68 | Requiring good design |
| 115 and 116 | Development in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty |
| 118 | Biodiversity |
| 186 and 187 | Determining planning applications |
| 203 to 206 | Use of planning conditions |

5.7

Relevant sections from the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

| |
|------------------------------------|
| Community Infrastructure Levy |
| Design |
| Determining a planning application |
| Natural environment |
| Rural housing |
| Use of planning conditions |
| Planning obligations |

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 I have reviewed the relevant planning history, consultation responses, and planning policies and guidance and consider that the following matters are central to determining the application:

- The principle of development
- Landscape impact
- Arboriculture
- Biodiversity
- Highways and Access
- Drainage
- Housing mix
- Design
- Amenity provision
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Affordable housing

THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

6.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) states that the starting point for determining a planning application is the development plan (in this case the Core Strategy and Local Plan 2011).

6.3 The overall strategy set out in Policy CSS1 of the Core Strategy is supportive of 'limited amounts of growth' in smaller villages such as South Stoke. Policy CSR1 adds greater detail to Policy CSS1, identifying that development in smaller villages should be restricted to infill development of around 5 or 6 homes. While the proposal would be in conformity with the quantum of growth envisaged by CSR1, it would clearly extend beyond the built limits of South Stoke and hence be contrary to the development plan.

6.4 While the Core Strategy suggests this parcel of land shouldn't be granted consent as it is not infill development, it does support the principle of development at South Stoke (CSS1). I therefore consider the conflict with the development plan (in terms of the principle of development) to be narrow, and focussed solely on the proposals not being infill development.

6.5 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) does however require the council to consider material considerations in reaching a decision. This may balance a decision in favour of development where the development plan indicates development should be restricted.

6.6 A key material consideration weighing in favour of the development is that the council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Consequently, per Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework local policies relevant to the supply of housing shouldn't be considered up to date. Policy CSR1 is such a policy and therefore carries diminished weight.

6.7 Where local policies for the supply of housing are not up to date, Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged, triggering a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that decision makers should grant consent unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole; or
- Specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

- 6.8 The proposed development would make a modest contribution of 5 homes toward the district's housing land supply. Although matters of design are reserved for a later detailed application, the applicant has provided an indicative house size mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes.
- 6.9 South Stoke is a smaller village that has some services and facilities that would help future residents meet their day to day needs without travelling by private car. The village has a convenience store (although within a storage container and based on a temporary planning permission), bus route to Wallingford and Goring-on-Thames, pubs, and public open space.
- 6.10 However, there are limited employment opportunities within the village and future residents are likely to be reliant on higher tier settlements such as Didcot, Wallingford or even Reading for these. Furthermore, residents are likely to drive to these places to meet higher order retail needs, potentially including day-to-day convenience goods shopping as the village shop in South Stoke is limited in its opening hours and product offer.
- 6.11 In a rural district like South Oxfordshire, the NPPF (paragraph 29) acknowledges that transport solutions will vary to those in an urban area (where, for example public transport is likely to be more prevalent and viable). Furthermore, the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy considers South Stoke to be a suitable location for developments of this scale (Policy CSR1).
- 6.12 In summary, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan. It extends beyond the settlement boundary and is therefore contrary to Policy CSR1 of the Core Strategy. However, the NPPF is a significant material consideration that the committee should consider when reaching a decision. This indicates that the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged and that local policies relevant to the supply of housing (such as CSR1) should carry less weight.
- 6.13 As Policy CSR1 now carries diminished weight, and the fact that the conflict with it is narrow, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

LANDSCAPE IMPACT

- 6.14 The site lies within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a landscape designation that receives the highest level of protection through both local and national planning policies.
- 6.15 The NPPF sets out at paragraph 115 that:
- “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in [...] Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty...”***
- 6.16 It goes on to state, at paragraph 116, that proposals for major development in these areas should only be granted consent in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. The applicant ascertains in their planning statement that because the development doesn't meet the

planning application definition of major development (i.e. ten units or above), paragraph 116 is not engaged¹.

- 6.17 This approach to the definition of major development for the application of paragraph 116 has been considered and discounted by the High Court. In reaching their conclusion Justice Wyn Williams stated:

“In my judgement to define “major development” as precisely as [the Town and Country Planning Order 2010] would mean that the phrase has an artificiality which would not be appropriate in the context of national planning policy” ²

- 6.18 He went on to conclude that it was appropriate, in the case before him, that it is at the decision maker’s discretion, based on the development proposals and their context, to define ‘major development’.
- 6.19 In reaching my recommendation, I have therefore assessed whether the proposed development would constitute major development and if paragraph 116 of the NPPF is engaged. The outline application is for 5 homes. According to the 2011 Census, the parish of South Stoke contained 216 dwellings. Not allowing for any new dwellings in the last 6 years, the proposed development would result in a marginal increase in homes of 2.3% for the village.
- 6.20 I do not consider, in principle, that the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, would significantly alter the character of South Stoke, nor the wider landscape setting. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not constitute major development, and therefore paragraph 116 of the NPPF is not engaged, and exceptional circumstances do not need to be justified.
- 6.21 As per policy CSEN1 (Landscape) and Paragraph 115 of the NPPF, the council must still attach great weight to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB.
- 6.22 In terms of its local context, there are already residential properties to the west and northwest, meaning the development would represent an extension of the existing built form of South Stoke, rather than isolated development in the open countryside. The proposed development is a discrete parcel of land, shielded from both long and short distance views by a comprehensive tree belt.
- 6.23 The [draft South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment](#) (2017) includes recommendations for how development in certain character areas across the district can be sensitively accommodated. The assessment identifies the development site as falling between the River Thames Corridor and Central Vale Fringes character areas. I have assessed how the development meets the recommendations of the draft South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment on the table overleaf.

¹ As set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010, Article 2

² Deborah Jane Aston and Westcott Meadow Action Group v. SoS for Communities and Local Government, Mole Valley District Council and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.

| Landscape Assessment criteria | Officer's assessment |
|--|--|
| Minimise the visual impact of development on the fringes of villages with the judicious planting of tree and shrub species characteristic of the area. | The site is already surrounded by an existing mature tree line which provides the visual shielding envisaged by the landscape character assessment. Further information on landscape planting will be needed at reserved matters stage. |
| Maintain the nucleated pattern of settlements and promote the use of building material to maintain vernacular style and an appropriate scale of development appropriate. | The proposed development is a short walk from the centre of South Stoke and its development would not extend a significant distance along Woodcote Road. I consider that the development would not detract from the nucleated form of South Stoke. |
| Protect the sparsely settled character of the landscape and the integrity and vernacular character of the estate villages. | The development is not in the open countryside and does not compromise the integrity and character of South Stoke, reinforcing its nucleated settlement pattern. |

- 6.24 Overall, I consider that the development broadly meets the criteria identified in the district's draft landscape assessment, and can therefore be incorporated into the landscape. However, this will be dependent on detailed information on site layout, landscaping, planting and design of the built environment that the council will consider through a reserved matters application.
- 6.25 The applicant has submitted their own [Landscape Assessment](#) which can be viewed on the council's website. The assessment concludes that the proposed development can be implemented with "**minor initial landscape effects**" (Paragraph 4.4), but suggests that later reserved matters applications are accompanied by a comprehensive landscape proposal, including the land to the south of the application site, which is under the control of the applicant.
- 6.26 Many consultees, including the parish council, have identified shortcomings in the methodology of this assessment. They argue that the views shown in the assessment are not true 'winter views', with many of the deciduous trees enclosing the site still holding their leaves. They also suggest that the assessment should not include the visual screening provided by the ivy that has grown on these trees since it will need to be removed to ensure the continued good health (and hence visual screening) of these trees.
- 6.27 I agree with these comments. The Landscape Assessment does not provide a fully detailed assessment of the development of the site. However, at this outline stage, the exact site layout, elevations, materials, and landscaping plan are not known. I believe that the information in the assessment is sufficient to demonstrate that the harm to the landscape caused by this development can be mitigated through judicious planting and high quality design, both are issues to be addressed through reserved matters.
- 6.28 Overall I do not consider that the development would result in significant landscape harm, subject to appropriate conditions. The proposals make use of an existing well screened parcel of land, and follow the broad recommendations of the draft South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (2017). The proposed development is

compliant with policy CSEN1 of the Core Strategy, saved Policy C4 of the Local Plan 2011, and Paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

ARBORICULTURE

- 6.29 The matter of arboriculture is closely connected to landscape on this proposal. The existing trees surrounding the application site form an existing, mature landscape feature that would soften the impact of the development in the AONB. Without the trees in place, it is likely that the landscape harm would be more severe. Development or activity in proximity to trees can place them at risk to disease or death. I believe it is necessary to assess the impact of the development on these trees, since they are an asset weighing in favour of granting consent.
- 6.30 I have consulted with the council's Forestry Officer on this matter. He concludes that some of the trees on the site have defects, but collectively, they make a positive contribution to the area. He identified two trees that could be at risk from the proposed access, a larch (T1) and a poplar (T2) as identified on the applicant's Tree Quality Assessment (Tree plan shown at **Appendix 5**), however, these are unlikely to be put at any more risk than what has already been caused by past works on the site.
- 6.31 The Forestry Officer also raised concerns that a sycamore tree (T28) on the western edge of the site could be at risk from dwelling 1 (see indicative layout plan, S977/BO1a, **Appendix 3**). He is content that this can be addressed through a revised plan at reserved matters stage.
- 6.32 A future reserved matters application will need to address detailed arboricultural matters. This will be interlinked with the landscaping strategy required by condition, and will similarly need to be informed by a detailed site layout plan.
- 6.33 In summary, I consider that the proposed development can be accommodated on the site without adverse impacts on the existing trees. This is an important consideration, since the trees provide a mature and well-integrated landscape screen that significantly mitigates the development in this sensitive, edge of settlement, AONB location. I believe it is necessary to attach a condition requiring details of the proposed tree protection measures required for the proposed access works before the development commences. Furthermore, a detailed arboricultural assessment should accompany future reserved matters applications, and inform the proposed landscaping strategy.

BIODIVERSITY

- 6.34 The applicant has not submitted any ecological assessments. The site is not in a protected, designated area for biodiversity. I consulted with the council's Countryside Officer who advised that no formal comments were necessary at this stage. However, through the consultation process, neighbour comments have suggested that a badger sett could be on site and submitted photos of a potential habitat. I have shared this information with the Council's Countryside Officer who believes it is unlikely that the habitat is a badger sett, although agrees that further investigatory work will be necessary.
- 6.35 Badgers and their setts are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act (1992). It is an offence to injure, disturb or kill a badger, as well as damaging or destroying a sett. At this outline stage, I am satisfied that there is sufficient scope for any potential sett to be accommodated within the site, including an appropriate buffer. If necessary, a badger sett can be relocated subject to a licence being issued by Natural England.

- 6.36 I have suggested a condition is attached to any consent, requiring reserved matters applications to be accompanied by a mitigation strategy and preliminary badger survey.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS

- 6.37 Oxfordshire County Council originally objected to this application based on a lack of information. However, the applicant submitted amended plans (S977/BO1A / Appendix 3) on 13 November 2017 addressing the County Council's concerns. There is therefore no objection to the application on highways grounds.

- 6.38 The County Council has suggested a series of conditions are attached to any consent. I agree that some of these are necessary and have recommended the following are attached:

- New vehicular access onto Woodcote Road
- Vision splay protection (see **Appendix 4**)
- Construction traffic management plan
- No surface water drainage to the highway

The other conditions proposed by the Highways Authority are, in my opinion, too detailed for this stage and will be addressed through reserved matters (once detailed layouts are agreed).

- 6.39 I consider that the proposed development satisfactorily addresses matters of highways and access, and is in conformity with saved Policies T1 and T2 of the Local Plan 2011.

DRAINAGE

- 6.40 The applicant has not submitted any information on the proposed drainage strategy for the site. The application site is an undeveloped area of land, on a slightly elevated position to the highway and neighbouring properties to the west. Although the site is not in an area at risk of fluvial (river) flooding, I am concerned that its development could lead to increased surface water flooding, and be potentially contrary to saved policy E6 of the Local Plan 2011.

- 6.41 At this outline stage, it is not possible to provide a drainage strategy. It will need to be informed by the proposed landscape and arboriculture strategy, as well as the detailed layout of the site. I have recommended a condition is attached to any consent, requiring reserved matters application to be accompanied by a surface water drainage strategy.

HOUSING MIX

- 6.42 Details of housing mix will be reserved for later planning applications. However, the applicant has submitted an indicative housing mix as set out in the table below. The Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is the latest evidence of housing need in the district and provides an indicative mix for market housing. I have set out how this compares with the indicative mix put forward by the applicant below.

| No. of bedrooms | SHMA recommendation | Applicant's indicative mix |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 5.6% | 0% (0 homes) |
| 2 | 26.7% | 40% (2 homes) |
| 3 | 43.4% | 20% (1 home) |
| 4 (+) | 24.2% | 40% (2 homes) |

- 6.43 The indicative mix varies significantly from the latest evidence on housing need. There is a significant over provision of 2 and 4 bedroom homes, and a notable under provision of 3 bedroom homes. Matters of mix will be reserved for a future planning application. If the applicant wishes to deviate significantly from the evidence in the SHMA, I would recommend they provide their own evidence of locally specific needs, undertaken in consultation with the parish council and local community, to justify this. However, for the purposes of an outline application, I am content that the information demonstrates a suitable mix can be achieved on the site.

DESIGN

- 6.44 Design matters, including building heights, locations, materials and scale are reserved for later planning applications. These matters will need to be informed by the strategies I have recommended to be secured by condition, particularly landscape given the site's location in the AONB.
- 6.45 The applicant has submitted an indicative site layout (S977/BO1A / Appendix 3) showing how the site can accommodate up to five dwellings. This shows the proposed dwellings orientated on a parallel axis to the Woodcote Road, served by a central access road running north-south through the site. This demonstrates that the site can physically accommodate up to five homes, but may not be the best design solution. A final site layout, agreed through reserved matters, should reflect the additional technical studies. It should also take design queues from South Stoke village itself, reflecting building forms, scales, heights, materials and layout.

AMENITY PROVISION

- 6.46 As with the above matters of design, this will be explored in detail through a reserved matters application. However, the indicative site layout plan demonstrates that there is sufficient space to accommodate the minimum external amenity area standards contained within the South Oxfordshire Design Guide.

IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

- 6.47 The application site abuts one residential property; Clogwyn Mawr, a detached single storey home accessed off the Woodcote Road by a long driveway. Clogwyn Mawr faces onto the application site, with the land rising up to the east. Therefore, there is a risk that the privacy and access to sunlight of this dwelling could be adversely affected by the location and orientation of new dwellings, their windows, boundary treatments and private amenity space.
- 6.48 At this stage I cannot comment in detail on how the proposed development would affect neighbouring amenity. This will need to be explored in detail through the site layout at reserved matters stage. However, there is sufficient capacity in the site, in my view, to accommodate ample stand off between any new homes and Clogwyn Mawr, while still reflecting the findings of a landscape, ecological, arboricultural and drainage strategy. If, through these detailed studies and design matters, it is not possible to satisfactorily address the impact on neighbouring amenity, the number or size of the dwellings on the site may need to reduce. I consider that the proposed development satisfies saved Policies H4 and D4 of the Local Plan 2011.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- 6.49 The applicant has volunteered to provide two affordable housing units if consent is granted. The application site, for 5 homes, falls below the threshold of ten units as set

out in the National Planning Practice Guidance. Planning obligations and conditions, in order to meet the tests set out in national policy and guidance, must be necessary to make the development acceptable. As the proposed development falls below the threshold for affordable housing, it is not necessary (in this policy environment) for the development to provide affordable housing. I have advised the applicant that the council cannot seek the provision of affordable housing through the planning system, and I attach no weight to its potential provision through other means as a material benefit weighing in favour of the application.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

- 6.50 CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area, and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. This development is CIL liable. The levy will be calculated at reserved matters stage once the exact floor space of the new development is established.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposed development conflicts with policy CSR1 of the Core Strategy as it does not meet the definition of infill. The development plan therefore suggests development should be restricted in this location. However, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), decision makers should also have regard to material considerations when reaching a conclusion.
- 7.2 In this instance, I consider the conflict with the development plan to be narrow, since the Core Strategy supports the development of 5-6 homes in smaller villages such as South Stoke. The question is then in principle, whether the benefits of new housing in the context of a lack of five-year housing land supply outweighs the development being on the edge of the village rather than infill. In my opinion, and subject to the matters of detail and quality being addressed through reserved matters, this is a sufficient consideration to recommend approval.
- 7.3 I have identified that landscape and arboriculture are key interlinking issues, that also bear significantly upon the principle of the development in this location. As this is an outline application, I have suggested that conditions are attached requiring further information on these matters for reserved matters. These are necessary and proportionate in my opinion given the site's edge of settlement location in the AONB, where the NPPF attaches significant weight to protection.
- 7.4 Other technical matters such as drainage, biodiversity, highways, amenity, design, and housing mix can all be addressed through the reserved matters process.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **That planning permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Commencement – outline with reserved matters.**
- 2. Approved plans.**
- 3. Maximum number of dwellings.**
- 4. Market housing mix.**
- 5. Landscaping strategy as part of reserved matters.**
- 6. Tree protection.**
- 7. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy.**
- 8. Surface water drainage works (details required).**
- 9. New vehicular access.**
- 10. Vision splay protection.**

11. Construction traffic management plan.
12. No surface water drainage to the highway.
13. Refuse and recycling storage (details required).
14. Fire hydrants.
15. Hours of operation.
16. Construction method statement.

Author: Tom Rice
Contact No: 01235 422600
Email: planning@southoxon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank