
APPLICATION NO.	P17/S3609/O
APPLICATION TYPE	OUTLINE
REGISTERED	11.10.2017
PARISH	EAST HAGBOURNE
WARD MEMBER(S)	Pat Dawe Jane Murphy
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs Nigel Deaney
SITE	Land adjoining 6 Great Mead, East Hagbourne, OX11 9BN
PROPOSAL	Outline application for Planning Permission for new dwelling with Garaging using the existing access point, including vehicular access to a rear paddock. (As amended by drawing 17002:001 Rev C showing visibility splays and amplified by e-mail from agent received 24 October 2017)
OFFICER	Paul Bowers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is referred to planning committee because the views of the East Hagbourne Parish Council differ from the officer's recommendation.
- 1.2 The application site comprises an open paddock on the eastern side of the village. To the north is the recreation ground and to the west a single detached dwelling. An existing vehicular gated access is located in the northern western corner of the site.
- The site is not located in a designated area and is in Flood Zone 1.
- 1.3 A plan identifying the site can be found at **Appendix 1** to this report.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The applications seeks outline planning permission for a single dwelling with garaging.
- Access, landscaping and scale are to be considered as part of this application. All other matters such as appearance and layout are reserved matters for later consideration.
- In respect of scale the development description refers to the dwelling as being of 1.5 stories high.
- In terms of access the existing access on to Great Mead will be utilised for the new dwelling and for access to the retained portion of the paddock to the rear of the site.
- 2.2 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application can be found at **Appendix 2** to this report. All the plans and representations can be viewed on the council's website www.southoxon.gov.uk under the planning application reference number.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 **East Hagbourne Parish Council** – Recommend that the application is refused for the following reasons;
- The site is outside of the settlement.
 - The proposal is not infill development.
 - The development would pre-empt the neighbourhood plan.

Neighbour Responses – 1 x letter of objection.

- Loss of greenspace reducing the village character and heritage.
- Impact on flooding.
- Disruption from construction traffic.

Highways Liaison Officer – No objection subject to conditions.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 [P81/W0047/O](#) - Refused (16/03/1981) - Appeal dismissed (23/02/1982)
DETACHED BUNGALOW FOR RESIDENTIAL USE. (OUTLINE).

[P74/W0438/O](#) - Refused (09/04/1975)

ERECTION OF BUNGALOW WITH LIVESTOCK SHEDS AND OUTBUILDINGS FOR
USE AS A SMALLHOLDING.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) Policies

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
CSQ3 - Design
CSR1 - Housing in villages
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies;

C4 - Landscape setting of settlements
D1 - Principles of good design
D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
D3 - Outdoor amenity area
D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
G2 - Protect district from adverse development
H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt
T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

Emerging East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan –

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies within the NPPF.

As the Neighbourhood Plan is at the plan preparation stage it can only be given limited weight in the determination of this application.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The issues to consider in relation to this proposal are;

- **The principle of development.**
- **Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4.**
- **Plot coverage and garden size.**
- **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**

- **Impact on highway safety.**
- **Community Infrastructure Levy.**

6.2 The principle of development.

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. 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.

Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPG).

The Development Plan –

In the case of this application, the most relevant parts of the Development Plan are the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) which was adopted in December 2012 and the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP).

As a larger village East Hagbourne is identified as a sustainable location for housing within the core strategy Policy CSS1. The policy sets out an overall strategy for the District, which seeks, among other things, to support and enhance the larger villages as local service centres, while focusing 'major new development' at Didcot and supporting the roles of Henley, Thame and Wallingford.

Policy CSR1 of the SOCS permits infill development within settlements. Infill is defined as the filling of a small gap on an otherwise built up frontage and on sites that are closely surrounded by buildings.

- 6.3 Whilst East Hagbourne is a larger village where infill development is acceptable I do not believe the site constitutes an infill plot because it is not a gap on an otherwise built up frontage. There is open land to the south and the east and the building would extend the built form of development on this side of the road.

- 6.4 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF.

The emerging Local Plan for South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2032 is at an early stage and cannot be given any material weight.

6.5 The Neighbourhood Plan –

The East Hagbourne Neighbourhood Plan Area was designated in October 2015. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently at the plan preparation stage of development. At this stage limited weight can be afforded to it in the determination of this planning application.

- 6.6 The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. The consequence of this, as set out in paragraph 49 of the NPPF, is that housing

applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out at paragraph 14 of the NPPF if the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.

- 6.7 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF advises that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: –

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

- 6.8 Although the development conflict with Policy CSR1 of SOCS the material planning consideration to weigh this against is the lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The issue therefore is to consider whether this proposal is a sustainable form of development.

- 6.9 At paragraph 7, the NPPF identifies three dimensions to sustainable development which include **economic, social and environmental** considerations. It states that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation as they are mutually dependent.

- 6.10 *Economic Dimension –*

The proposal will provide an additional house where there is an identified requirement to increase housing targets and boost housing supply.

The Government has made clear its view that house building plays an important role in promoting economic growth. The associated construction jobs and local investment during its build out as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy from the residents will be of some benefit to the local area.

The proposal will also help meet the requirements under Policy CSS1 for larger villages by facilitating growth which supports the provision and retention of local services. The proposal therefore has some economic benefit. I consider that moderate weight should be afforded to this benefit.

- 6.11 *Social Dimension –*

East Hagbourne is a sustainable location and clearly suitable to sustain some development. The village includes a school, public house, church and a community shop. Furthermore, the site is located where there are realistic transport alternatives to the car with unimpeded pedestrian links from the site to bus services to Didcot and access to the rail network via the Didcot station.

- 6.12 *Environmental Dimension –*

The site itself is not subject to any statutory environmental designations. The proposal will create an opportunity for further landscaping and the associate environmental and ecological benefits this will bring I consider limited weight should be given to the environmental benefits.

In your officers view the location of the site, the proximity to adjoining properties and buildings and to the existing services within the village and availability and access to

public transport to the wider county and region in conjunction with the social, environmental and economic benefits I conclude that this proposal does constitute a sustainable form of development.

Therefore, unless there are significant and demonstrable adverse impacts from the development that outweigh its benefits the presumption is in favour of granting permission for the development. The principle of housing on this site is acceptable.

The remaining sections of this report consider the proposal in detail in terms of whether there are adverse impacts generated from the development that would outweigh the benefits that it would bring.

6.13 Whether the proposal accords with the criteria of Policy H4 of SOLP.

If a proposed housing development is acceptable in principle then the detail of the proposal must be assessed against the criteria of Policy H4 which deals with new housing.

Provision (i) of Policy H4 states ***‘an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important view spoilt.’***

Provision (ii) states ***‘the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings.’***

The site does not comprise an important public open space. Whilst it is open it is currently used as a paddock and contains fenced off areas and buildings along the northern boundary. Views to the south are of domestic properties. Overall I conclude that the development of this site will not conflict with provision (i)

The second provision relates to the overall appearance of the building and how it will impact on the character of the area. At this outline stage the detail and appearance of the building is not fixed and will be considered at the reserved matters stage.

6.14 Provision (iii) states that the *‘character of the area is not adversely affected.’*

Beyond the fact that the development will result in the creation of a dwelling on this piece of land it is not possible to comment in detail as to whether it will have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

The main impact will however come by erecting a dwelling that in effect extends the village. Views of the building will be possible but it will be seen in the context of the development to the west and when looking south in to the site it will be seen in the context of the housing to the south.

The extension of the village by a single dwelling on this site, when having regard to the position of the dwelling to the west and the recreation ground to the north, will not in my view result in significant harm based on what the council can consider as part of this application.

6.15 Provision iv) of Policy H4 states that there should be no overriding amenity or environmental or highway objections.

In terms of amenity this refers to both the amenity space being provided for the occupants of the existing and new property and also the amenity of occupants of nearby properties. These issues are also covered by other policies within SOLP such

as Policy D3 and T1 and they are considered separately as they are fundamental issues to this proposal.

In respect of the element of provision iv) that relates to the environment there are no environmental issues that would justify resisting the proposal.

6.16 Plot coverage and garden size.

Policy D3 of SOCS seeks to ensure that new dwellings should provide adequate private outdoor space. The amount of land to be used for garden or amenity space will be determined by the size of the dwelling and the character of surrounding development.

The South Oxfordshire Design Guide sets out the minimum amount of private amenity for 1 bedroom units at 35 square metres, 2 bedroom units at 50 square metres and 100 square metres for three bedroom properties and above.

The inability to provide these minimum standards would be an indicator that a proposal amounts to an overdevelopment.

In this case given the size of the site it is clear that however the layout may come forward at the reserved matters stage there will be sufficient space to accommodate more than adequate, levels of private amenity space.

6.17 Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

Impact on residential amenity is normally considered in terms of whether a development results in material harm by way of overlooking, loss of sunlight or being so large and close that it is considered oppressive and overbearing.

In the case of this outline application given that the layout or appearance is not fixed it is not possible to conclude that the eventual development would be unneighbourly. However it is clear from the size of the site that a building could be erected in such a way that it would not necessarily be unneighbourly the most affected property to the west of the site.

6.18 Impact on highway safety.

With respect to highway safety matters the advice from Central Government set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is as follows:

Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are severe.

The term severe is locally interpreted as situations, which have a high impact, likely to result in loss of life, or a higher possibility of occurrence with a lower impact.

- 6.19 The application was amended at the request of the Highway Officer to provide a plan that demonstrated the vision splays at the access looking in both directions. This plan along with the adequate space available on the site to provide parking and the limited speeds of vehicles along this extent of Great Mead mean that the development will not result in severe harm the safety of the users of the public highway.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The development is considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Having regard to the position of the dwelling relative to the

services provided in East Hagbourne and the links afforded to the wider county and region the proposal does constitute a sustainable form of development. Given what can be considered as part of this outline application it is concluded that any harm that would be caused by the development is not significant and does not outweigh the benefits the development will bring.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 That outline planning permisison is granted subject to the following conditions:

- 8.2**
- 1. Commencement - outline planning permission.**
 - 2. Approved plans.**
 - 3. Existing vehicular access.**
 - 4. Vision splay protection.**
 - 5. Parking and manoeuvring areas retained**

Author: Paul Bowers
E-mail : paul.bowers@southandvale.gov.uk
Contact No: 01235 422600

This page is intentionally left blank