

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P18/S0465/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	15.2.2018
<b>PARISH</b>	CHOLSEY
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Pat Dawe Jane Murphy
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Ian Gibson
<b>SITE</b>	Blue Bonnets, 31 West End, Cholsey, OX10 9LP
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Construction of three detached houses on land to rear of 31 West End. (As amended by plans and arboricultural report dated May 2018 accompanying e-mail form agent received 2 May 2018)
<b>OFFICER</b>	Luke Veillet

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 The application is referred to planning committee because the views of the Cholsey Parish Council differ from the officer's recommendation.

1.2 The application site forms part of an unusually large rear residential garden of 31 West End. This site forms part of the western edge of the built-up limits of the settlement. Agricultural land is situated adjacent to the north of the site and residential/amenity garden land to the south west and north east. There is an existing access from the main highway and the site lies approximately 120m east from the edge of the North Wessex Downs AONB.

1.3 A plan identifying the site can be found at **Appendix 1** to this report

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks planning permission to erect 3 dwellings on the site with associated detached double garages and landscaping. The built form for each dwelling varies in terms of scale and design.

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](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk) under the planning application reference number

**3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Full comments can be found on the council's website under the application reference number. However, the key issues have been summarised below;

**Cholsey Parish Council – Object**

- Developer has not engaged with Parish during NDP drafting
- Issues vehicle turning on site
- Access too narrow for refuse and emergency vehicles
- Poor vision splay
- Overlooking into no.29 annexe
- Backland development out of character with soft edge of village
- Impact on current school route to the recreation ground and school

**Countryside Access – Unknown**

No response

**North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – Unknown**

No response

**Forestry Officer - No strong views**

**Countryside Officer - No strong views**

- The site consists mainly of tightly mown amenity grassland interspersed with a number of trees, some of which has been felled recently. The habitats on site are not of any particular ecological value and are widespread. The proposed scheme would involve the erection of three dwellings on site, resulting in the partial loss of the habitats on site. There is no evidence to suggest that any protected species will be impacted.
- Considering the number of units and the existing habitats on site, I am satisfied that, subject to the use of a landscaping condition to ensure compensatory native planting, the proposal will not result in a significant adverse impact on ecology. Wild bird informative to be added.

**Waste Management Officer (District Council) - No strong views**

- Each property will be provided with: - 1 x 240lt wheeled bin for recycling - 1 x 180lt wheeled bin for refuse - 1 x 23lt food bin for storage outside the property - 1 x 7lt food bin for storage inside the property Residents can also opt into our garden waste service which uses 240lt wheeled bins. Properties should be planned so bins can be stored within the property boundary and be moved to the presentation point without the need to go up or down steps or through the property. Garden gates need to be wide enough to accommodate a standard 240lt wheeled bin. Bins will need to be presented for collection on West End

**Drainage Engineer- No strong views**

- Sustainable drainage details should be submitted and approved prior to development commencing. The watercourse along the western boundary of the site should be referred to in such details.

**OCC (Highways)- No strong views**

- The proposal seeks the construction of three residential units to the rear of no.31. The proposal was the subject of pre-application advice and the Highway issues raised at this point have been addressed.
- Whilst the garage accommodation does not appear to meet current minimum internal dimensional standards for a double occupancy garage, given the space available this increase in terms of the size can be accommodated within the site.
- The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network. After investigation and reviewing the supplied documents, the Highway Authority has no objection subject to condition(s) being applied to any permission which may be granted on the basis of highway safety.

**Neighbour - Approve (1)**

- Access will be improved
- Design more sympathetic than a higher density scheme
- Construction traffic will be retained in the site.

**Neighbour - Object (9)**

- West End is a narrow road and cannot support further traffic
- The access is not wide enough for vehicles to enter and exit

- During development, construction vehicles will cause issues
- Soft rural edge of village should be retained
- Contrary to Neighbourhood Plan
- Impact on local wildlife
- Backland development extending built-up limits
- Design not in keeping with surrounding area
- Sets precedent for further houses on adjacent land
- Road used by children going to recreation ground and primary school
- Inadequate site parking
- Issues for emergency and waste vehicles to enter site
- Access road is unneighbourly
- SODC have a 5.4 year housing land supply so should be refused
- Impact on residential annex in garden of no.29
- Existing parking opposite the entrance will cause issues.
- Impact on AONB
- Plans do not show scale eg. A3

**Neighbour - No Strong Views (2)**

- Would prefer not to have housing on the site, but No objection to 3 detached dwellings. Would object to more than 3 houses if the land was sold.

**4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

**4.1 [P17/S1515/PEM](#) - Response (17/05/2017)**

Development of three detached houses to the rear of No. 31 West End

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

**5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) 2032 Policies**

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

CSH1 - Housing allocation

CSH2 - Density

CSB1 - Conservation and improvement of biodiversity

CSQ3 - Design

CSR1 - Housing in villages

CSEN1 - Landscape protection

**5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) policies;**

C4 - Landscape setting of settlements

C6 - Maintain & enhance biodiversity

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

EP4 - Impact on water resources

EP6 - Sustainable drainage

G2 - Protect district from adverse development

G4 - Protection of Countryside

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

5.3 **Neighbourhood Plan policies;**

The Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan concluded its second round on pre-submission consultation on 31 March 2018. The publication of the plan prior to examination runs from 31 May 2018 until 12 July 2018. The relevant policies are:

Map 4 – Cholsey Built Up Area Boundary.

Policy CNP H2 allows for infill on sites within the built-up area boundary provided certain criteria are met.

Policy CNP H3 seeks a range and mix of new homes.

Policy CNP H4 required Affordable Housing and Starter Homes.

Policy CNP H5 requires an appropriate scale and context of development.

Policy CNP H7 sets out parking requirements.

Policy CNP E1 sets out landscape impact considerations.

Policy CNP I1 refers to the provision of facilities.

Policy CNP I3 requires water and waste water impact assessments.

Policy CNP I1 refers to surface and groundwater drainage.

Policy CNP T1 requires new development to connect to walking and cycling networks.

5.4 Emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2033:

The Council is preparing a new Local Plan, which will set out how development will be planned and delivered across South Oxfordshire to 2033. The overall strategy in draft policy STRAT1 is to focus major new development in the Science Vale, including Didcot Garden Town and Culham; provide for major development at Chalgrove and Berinsfield; support and enhance the economic and social dependencies between towns and villages; support the roles of Henley-on Thames, Thame and Wallingford; support and enhance the roles of the larger villages (including Cholsey); allow limited housing and employment development at smaller and other villages; protect and enhance the countryside by ensuring that any change relates to very specific needs; and support and enhance the historic environment.

Policy H4 refers to Housing in the Larger Villages and indicates that 175 homes will be delivered in Cholsey through a Neighbourhood Plan or through Local Plan site allocations.

The Council is currently considering whether to pursue the allocation of Chalgrove Airfield, together with the possibility of alternative or reserve sites, which may delay submission of the draft Local Plan for examination.

5.5 **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

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

**National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)**

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning considerations in this case are;

- **The principle of development**
  - Housing supply
- **Layout, scale, design and landscape impact**
- **Impact on neighbouring dwellings**
- **Highways and access impact**
- **Parking and occupant amenity**

- **Environmental Impact (Trees, Wildlife and Drainage)**
- **Neighbourhood Plan**
- **Planning Balance**

- 6.2 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. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires where regard is to be had to the Development Plan, applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.3 In the case of this proposal, the most relevant parts of the Development Plan are the Core Strategy which was adopted in December 2012 and the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011. The draft Cholsey Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been submitted for consultation, but at this stage it carries limited weight.
- 6.4 Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is the ‘golden thread’ running through decision taking.

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.

- 6.5 SOCS Policy CS1 reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The spatial strategy in Policy CSS1 establishes a settlement hierarchy where the amount and location of new housing is related to the availability of facilities and services in order to achieve a sustainable pattern of development.
- 6.6 SOCS policy CSR1 relates to housing strategy in the districts villages. Cholsey is designated a ‘larger’ village, as such, allows some additional housing via allocated sites, ‘infill’ plots and rural exception sites. ‘Infill’ is defined as, *“the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage or on other sites within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings”*
- 6.7 Whilst it is acknowledged that the application site does not strictly meet this definition, it is officers view that given the sites unusual and unique character, the proposed development is in the spirit of what policy CSR1 envisaged, as such, this conflict will need to be balanced with the council’s housing supply position and presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the NPPF (detailed further in paragraph 6.7). Such spirit includes providing some limited housing within the built limits of sustainable ‘larger’ villages (provided there is no significant planning harm in other material respects). In this particular case, the land is already in residential use, forming part of the rear garden of an existing dwelling, thus it can be reasonably concluded that it is within the settlement, albeit on the edge. Whilst it may extend the envelope of built

form, it would not extend the settlement into open countryside. It also has to be acknowledged that some of the land adjacent to the site consists of what appears to be informal garden land (blue outline), particularly to the north east, where there are small buildings and structures. These are beyond the site and it is felt that developing the application site (red outline), nestled in between these apparent informal garden areas is strikingly different from, for example, developing the field adjacent to the edge of the site or this informal garden that transitions the settlement into the countryside (see pictures below). As such, in officers view, whilst the development does not strictly accord with policy CSR1, it would generally comply with the council's generally overall strategy in supporting and enhancing a larger village and providing appropriate housing growth in the settlement.



6.8 Housing Supply

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

6.9 The core strategy housing requirement figures in relation to the amount of growth for housing are out of date. However, the Council have been using updated figures for a number of years. 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 committed economic growth housing forecast is 775 homes per annum. This is a sizable uplift from the requirement for 547 homes per annum set out in the SOCS.

6.10 The council has recently published its 'Housing Land Supply Statement for South Oxfordshire District Council 2017-2018'. The council's current position is 5.4 years housing land supply. In context of paragraph 49 of the NPPF which details where 5 years worth of housing cannot be demonstrated, housing policies should be considered out of date, the council's Development Plan is not out of date because the council can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply based on the revised SMHA figures and the hierarchy of growth in the settlements has been found to be sound. However, in relation to Policy CSR1, a high court decision in respect of an appeal in Chinnor found that the Core Strategy is silent on allocations in the 'larger villages' (as no allocation DPD was

progressed); until such time as a neighbourhood plan is made or a local plan or site allocations DPD is adopted. Given this issue, policy CSR1 carries less weight in larger villages and guidance is sought in context of paragraph 14 in the NPPF.

- 6.11 On this basis, even though the Council can now demonstrate a five-year housing land supply of 5.4 years, the ‘tilted balance’ set out in paragraph 14 applies because the Development Plan is currently silent on allocations for Cholsey. It is therefore appropriate to consider the proposal in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 6.12 Notwithstanding the above, SOLP policy H4 gives detailed requirements relating to the acceptability of new dwellings within settlements. The H4 criteria will be broadly covered in following sections.
- 6.13 **Layout, scale, design and landscape impact**  
SOCS CSEN1 gives high priority to AONB landscapes, seeking to protect their character and key features. Where possible, landscape character and features will be enhanced and where development is acceptable in principle, measures will be sought to integrate it into the landscape. SOCS policy CSQ3 seeks to ensure that all new development is of a high quality and inclusive design, responds positively to its site and surroundings; and is of a scale, type and density appropriate to the site and its setting. SOLP policy D1 further supports good design principles. Policy H4 also requires the character of the area is not adversely affected and design details are appropriate.
- 6.14 In terms of the impact on the landscape, officers are of the opinion it will be fairly limited. The land being developed is a garden and part of a residential unit. The western boundary is afforded significant screening via a row of very large conifers and a number of trees and hedges that run along the northern boundary. Beyond the northern boundary is an agricultural field, which is again largely enclosed by trees and hedges. This gives the feeling that the site is relatively enclosed as opposed to being in an open landscape.
- In addition, the edge of the AONB is some 120m away from the application site to the north, separated by tree lines. The closest footpath that may have offered long distant views from the countryside to the site from the AONB runs along the edge of the AONB to the north and 35m to the east. Again, boundary vegetation would not allow for any long distance views to the site from these locations. As such the setting or views to or from the AONB are unlikely to be materially impacted. A landscape scheme will be secured by condition to ensure that additional planting is secured where appropriate to further integrate the scheme into the site.
- 6.15 In terms of the sites layout, officers are of the opinion that the low-density arrangement is most appropriate given the back land context of the site. The plots are arranged so that the front elevations face inwards around a landscaped driveway. Two thirds of the built form is concentrated to the west where the site is most screened which appears to be a sensible approach having regard to the setting. Whilst the layout is not entirely consistent with the broadly linear building lines of the settlement, examples of more unique plots can be seen at both the northern and southern ends West End, as well as to the north east of the site and Papist Way to the south east of the settlement. These buildings are set further back from the highway and beyond building lines of surrounding streets. As such, considering this character the character of the area, context of the site and constraints, the layout appears appropriate.
- 6.16 In terms of the scale, massing and design it is acknowledged there is quite a wide mix of dwellings along West End of various age and design. Along the northern side of the

road, older and larger detached units set in large gardens are dominant, whilst newer and smaller dwellings run along the south. The larger dwellings have a mix of design, some with hipped gable roofs and pitched dormer windows. This helps give the edge of the settlement a rural character as it transitions into countryside. As such, it is important for the proposed dwellings to broadly correspond with this character.

- 6.17 Initially officers raised concerns over the design and scale of the scheme. Plots 1 and 2 are larger, two storey, 5 bedroom units. The height of these dwellings has been reduced by approximately 1m. the ridge is now set at approximately 8.1m from ground level. For context, 2 storey dwellings in the vicinity to the south west (no. 29 & 27) have ridge heights ranging from approximately 6 to 8m. Hipped roof gables have been added to reduce the overall massing and chimney stacks included on both plots to respond more positively to the rural setting and character of the area. In addition, small pitched dormers have been added into the roof slope, in keeping with some of the neighbouring dwellings. Overall, given the amendments, officers the view the scale and design of plots 1 and 2 is acceptable.
- 6.18 Plot 3 has been designed differently to take into account the neighbouring single storey dwelling to the south (no.33). It is an 'L' shaped 4-bedroom, 1.5 storey unit (approx 6.8m to the ridge). It is of a slightly simpler design, but adds interest via some small pitched roof dormers. Given this is the more 'open' end of the site, this will correspond well. Materials for the dwellings have not been specified on the plans (brick and render in the application), but a condition could be secured to finalise external materials. I would suggest the finish should largely be brick with clay tiled roofs to be in keeping with the vernacular of the larger houses along west end. It is also recommended that permitted development rights for extensions are withdrawn so that the council can carefully consider any additions due to the sensitivity of the backland site.
- 6.19 In terms of the garages, they are a fairly standard 2-bay design with a ridge height of approximately 5.1m. They are set to the side of the dwellings and set back from the frontage. They have pyramid hipped roofs, consistent with the dwellings they serve. In officers view their scale and design is acceptable.

Overall, officers view is the scheme is sensitively designed with a layout, scale and density that is appropriate in context of the site and surroundings complying with the mentioned policy.

6.20 **Impact on neighbouring dwellings**

SOLP policy H4 criterion (iv) requires there are no overriding amenity objections and criterion (v), where the development constitutes backland development, it does not cause issues of privacy, access or extend the built limits of the settlement. However, the policy does qualify that there may be some opportunity to develop suitable back gardens in districts larger settlements. SOLP Policy D4 details that new dwellings should be laid out to secure a reasonable level of privacy for occupants and the amenities and privacy of neighbouring properties should not be harmed.

- 6.21 The main neighbouring properties that are likely to be affected by the proposed development are the existing dwelling, and no. 25, 27, 29, 33 and 35 West End who all bound the site to some extent. Officers have considered neighbours comments and concerns and whilst acknowledge there will clearly be some impact by virtue of erecting dwellings to the rear of their properties, the design of the scheme has accounted for this and impact is unlikely to be so significant to warrant refusal. It is likely to be limited.
- 6.22 Plot 2 is likely to have the least impact on any neighbours as it located at the rear of the site behind Plot 1. Plot 1's dwelling is located some 31m from no.29 and 27 with a side



to back relationship. Separating the neighbours is a tall mature hedge along the site boundary and the rear gardens of no.29, 27. Given the distance and relationship, the impact of built form is likely to be limited. There is one window at first floor level on Plot 1 which faces the rear gardens of no.29 and 27 but serves a bathroom, and will be obscure glazed. As a result, there is no overlooking into private spaces. It is acknowledged the garage is close the site boundary and near to an ancillary annex in the garden of no.29. However, given the scale and use of the garage, as well as the boundary hedge to be retained, the impact will not be significant. No. 25 rear garden bounds the west of site, but is separated by the large conifers, as such, their amenity is unlikely to be materially harmed.

- 6.23 On the east of the site Plot 3 is 1.5 storey and designed so that its main openings face into the site, away from neighbours' properties no.33 to the south and no.35 garden to the east. The closest dwelling (no.33) is single storey and at a higher ground level than the site. It is some 28m away from the dwelling at plot 3 and again separated by a mature boundary hedge. A rear dormer on plot 3 has now been omitted to remove any views towards no.33 that may impact on privacy. There are two roof lights which serve bathrooms and given the size and distance between any neighbouring habitable rooms, are unlikely to impact on privacy. There is one gable first floor window proposed on the east elevation however it faces towards the very end of no.35's long garden and views will largely be obscured by existing trees and vegetation. It is also some 50m away from the dwelling itself. As such, impact on privacy will be limited, particularly on any private seating areas.
- 6.24 The aspect of the scheme which is most likely to impact on neighbouring amenity (predominantly no.29 and the existing dwelling) is the new access. This will run along the boundary of No.29. Concerns regarding the noise of vehicles driving past have been raised and the fact there is only a thin wooden fence separating the land. In officers' view, three dwellings are unlikely to generate a level of traffic or vehicle movements that would significantly impact on neighbouring amenity as they use their access. In officers' view, the boundary treatment could be improved by providing a brick treatment which will help give better separation and limit noise of vehicles passing and the glare of headlights. Boundary treatments for the entire site can be secured via a condition, to which the applicant has agreed. In your officer's view, the scheme accords with the mentioned policy subject to appropriate conditions in terms of obscured glazing and boundary treatments where appropriate.
- 6.25 **Highways and access impact**  
Policy T1 and T2 require that all new development provides safe and convenient access to the highway and sufficient turning and parking areas where required. It is clear from the comments received that this impact has been of most concern to local residents. Officers have considered this matter very carefully and the county council's Highways Liaison officer was consulted. In their view, the scheme was acceptable and the access arrangement sufficient to afford safe access. They noted there would be no significant adverse impact on the highway network, subject to conditions, including securing the vision splay demonstrated on the plans is maintained.
- 6.26 Following receipt of amended to remove the separation landscaping in the front access, I agree with the Highways Officers comments. The main road finishes at a dead end to the north approximately 120m away, as such vehicle traffic and vehicle speeds will likely be low. It is acknowledged that the highway is relatively narrow and cars park on the highway against the kerb opposite the access. However, this arrangement is to some extent long standing. With the removal of the central landscaping, it will actually improve the ability of vehicles to enter and exit with a wider arch. It is also the responsibility of the road users to park safely on un-restricted highways with any

obstruction being a matter for the police. Notwithstanding, I am of the view even with vehicles parked opposite, there will be enough space to enter and exit safely (now the plans have been amended). Other concerns from objectors have been noted, such as emergency vehicle access. This is matter controlled under building regulations, however, it has been considered. A distance of 3.7m is required between kerbs for fire engines to be able to access if required. The new road width running past the existing dwelling ranges from 4.6m at it's widest and approximately 4.2m adjacent to the house, as such this would generally be acceptable for emergency vehicles (with the same principle applying to refuse lorries). It is noted it is unlikely that two vehicles could pass each other at the pinch point by the existing dwelling, however, this will likely be a benefit by slowing vehicles down as the exit or enter the site. On balance, I am of the view no overriding harm is caused by the access or to the highway network, as such, the development accords with the mentioned policies.

**6.27 Parking and occupant amenity**

SOLP policy D3 details that all new dwellings shall provide adequate outdoor garden and amenity space for occupants. Policy D2 states planning permission will not be granted for developments that fail to incorporate adequate, safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles.

6.28 In terms of occupant amenity space, each dwelling provides well over the 100m<sup>2</sup> SODG guidance for private space. The existing also retains approximately 200m<sup>2</sup> of their own. Parking is provided by via double garages and parking spaces in front of the garages. Whilst it is noted the internal dimensions of the each garage are just below the 6m general width standard (approx. 5.75), this is really a personal preference and still sufficient to accommodate vehicles. The scheme accords with the mentioned policies.

**6.29 Environmental Impact (Trees, Wildlife, Drainage and Waste)**

Trees

SOLP policy C9 states that development that causes loss of landscape features (such as trees) will not be permitted. It is clear there are a number of trees in and bounding the site. Most contribute positively to character of the site and area. An arboricultural report was submitted after being requested by the council's Forestry Officer. The majority of trees are shown to be retained, particularly along the boundaries which provide important screening. Subject to a detailed tree protection scheme and landscaping scheme to provide additional planting where necessary (via condition) the tree impact is limited.

**6.30 Wildlife**

SOLP policy CSB1 seeks to prevent the net loss of biodiversity on a proposed site, which is supported SOLP policy C6 and in addition policy C8 which notes development will not be permitted where it has an adverse impact on protected species. It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised on how developing the site may impact on existing wildlife. As such, the council's ecologist was consulted. They have raised no objections, subject to landscaping being secured. Officers agree with their comments. This is no specific evidence to demonstrate that the garden is a source of significant wildlife or protected species that would be adversely impacted. As such, the scheme accords with mentioned policy.

**6.31 Drainage**

SOLP Policy EP6 seeks, wherever practicable, to demonstrate that the surface water management system on any development accords with sustainable drainage principles. The site is not in Flood Zones 2 or 3, however, it is noted some form of irrigation ditch is located to the north boundary of the site. No water was in it when the site was visited. The council's drainage engineer was consulted and noted whilst the watercourse was

not likely to be constraint on the development, sustainable drainage details should be agreed to minimise the impact of the additional built form on the site. Subject to an appropriate condition, the development is acceptable in this context

6.32 **Neighbourhood Plan**

It is noted that the Cholsey NDP has been drafted and submitted for consultation. It has defined a boundary around the settlement and drafted policies, which may preclude the application from being considered within the settlement if adopted in the future. However, due to the current stage in its preparation, it carries no legal weight and limited weight should be afforded to this consideration at this time. Plans often change before consultation and after examination on recommendation of an examiner, as such, it cannot be relied upon that this boundary would be carried forward in the future. This would be matter for consideration during the examination process. As, the application should be assessed against adopted Development Plan polices and policy guidance contained in the NPPF.

6.33 **The Planning Balance**

The proposed development presents some conflict with the Council's adopted spatial strategy in that it does not comprise infill development. However, given the unique characteristics of the site, it can reasonably be concluded it is within the settlement, albeit right on the edge. As such, the development is in the spirit of CSR1 envisaged.

Whilst the Council can demonstrate a five year housing supply of deliverable housing sites at the present time, the Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan as not yet been made and the development plan is silent on allocations for Cholsey. On this basis, the tilted balance set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF applies. In this context, where the proposed development is sustainable development, it must be approved without delay unless any harm identified significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits.

6.34 The NPPF notes that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In order to assess whether a proposal constitutes sustainable development it must satisfy the three dimensions, which include the economic, social and environmental planning roles. It makes it clear these three roles are mutually dependent and should not be taken in isolation

In respect of the economic dimension, the Government has made clear its view that house building plays an important role in promoting economic growth. In economic terms, the proposal would provide construction jobs and local investment during construction, as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy. Whilst three dwellings is not a huge contribution, it is a positive step forward, as such I am therefore of the view that moderate weight should be afforded to these benefits.

6.35 In terms of the social role, the development would contribute towards achieving high quality housing development in vibrant community. It is located amongst other established dwellings and within easy, safe walking distances to local facilities and amenities. Whilst the small scheme does not provide any affordable housing (there is no requirement to do so), it would provide attractive market housing for large growing families in the settlement on a site where a higher density scheme would likely not be as appropriate. It will also result in a significant CIL contribution which will aid the local community via the parish council to spend on local projects. In this context, some weight can be applied to these benefits.

6.36 With regard to the environmental dimension, the proposed development would cause limited harm to the local landscape character of the village or to the setting of nearby Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The design and layout is generally of high quality

and responds to the character of the area and site. No harm to wildlife, watercourse or protected species is suspect.

Taking all these matters and issues analysed above in the balance, in context of the Framework as whole, the development is considered sustainable and are no adverse impacts identified that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the scheme.

6.37 Community Infrastructure Levy

The council's CIL charging schedule has been adopted and will apply to relevant proposals from 1 April 2016. 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.

In this case the amount of residential floor space chargeable is 874m<sup>2</sup>. This results in a CIL charge of £149,215.64. A liability notice will be sent if the development is approved.

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 The proposed scheme is considered to be a sustainable form of development, meeting the environmental, social and economic dimensions identified in the Framework and council's spatial strategy. Where some harm or conflict has been identified, it is considered to be limited and would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. The proposed dwellings, whilst located on a back-land residential plot on the edge of the settlement, is suitably located for ease of access to local facilities and services in a sustainable 'larger' village. It has been designed to respond positively to the site and surroundings, with no overriding amenity, environmental or highways harm being identified when assessed against the council's policies of Framework as a whole. Subject to the attached conditions, officers consider the proposal accords with Development Plan policies and recommends the application is approved.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Commencement three years - full planning permission.**
2. **Approved plans.**
3. **Surface water drainage works (details required).**
4. **Schedule of materials.**
5. **Boundary walls and fences.**
6. **Tree protection (detailed).**
7. **Construction traffic management.**
8. **Landscaping (including access road and hard standings).**
9. **New vehicular access.**
10. **Parking and manoeuvring areas retained.**
11. **Obscure glazing.**
12. **Vision splay protection.**
13. **No garage conversion into accommodation.**
14. **Withdrawal of permitted development (Part 1 Class A) - no extensions etc.**

**Wild Bird Informative**

**Author:** Luke Veillet  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)