

APPLICATION NO.	P19/S0171/RM
APPLICATION TYPE	RESERVED MATTERS
REGISTERED	23.1.2019
PARISH	SOUTH STOKE
WARD MEMBER(S)	Maggie Filipova-Rivers
APPLICANT	Annington Development Limited
SITE	Land at Woodcote Road South Stoke, RG8 0JJ
PROPOSAL	Reserved matters application (for the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) following Outline approval P17/S3206/O for a residential development of up to 5 dwellings, and associated works, including access.
	 In addition to discharge conditions 5- landscaping, 6- tree protection, 7- biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy, 11- construction traffic management, 13- refuse and recycling storage and 16- construction method statement.
OFFICER	David Millinship

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been referred to planning committee due to conflict between the Officer's recommendation and the views of the parish council (objections due to the housing mix, design and landscape impact).
- 1.2 The site is to the south of Woodcote Road on the edge of South Stoke. **Appendices 1 and 2** 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.
- 1.3 Outline planning permission was granted by Planning Committee in January 2018 for the erection of up to 5 dwellings. All matters were kept in reserve except for details of the site access that were approved through the outline planning permission.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal seeks to secure approval of the remaining reserved matters for appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale. Details have also been submitted to partially discharge several conditions of the outline permission.
- 2.2 The reserved matters details have been submitted for the construction of 5 detached and semi-detached dwellings comprising:
- Plot 1 – 3 bedroom detached with integral double garage (north-west area of the site);
 - Plot 2 – 2 bedroom semi-detached (north-east area of the site);
 - Plot 3 – 3 bedroom semi-detached (north-east area of the site);
 - Plot 4 – 4 bedroom detached with integral double garage (south-west area of the site); and

- Plot 5 – 5 bedroom detached with integral double garage (south-east area of the site).

2.3 The houses would be of varied design generally finished with contemporary architectural features using predominantly facing brick and timber cladding for the walls with a mixture of clay and slate tile roofs. Windows and doors would be installed in a grey composite with some timber framing in a modern design. The external parking and turning areas would be a mixture of gravel, block paving and flagstones. The site would be enclosed along the northern, eastern and southern intervening boundaries by a mixture of retained mature trees, new native hedging and post and 1.2 metre high post and rail fences. The western intervening boundary (shared with neighbouring residential properties) would comprise a 1.8 metre high timber close board fence with native tree and hedge planting within the site.

2.4 Details have also been submitted to discharge the following conditions:

- 5- landscaping (details of hard-surfacing and planting);
- 6- tree protection;
- 7- biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy;
- 11- construction traffic management;
- 13- refuse and recycling storage;
- 14- fire hydrants; and
- 16- construction method statement.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **South Stoke Parish Council – Objection.**

- The dwellings to the front of the site are so close to the tree line that full root protection measure cannot be utilised.
- Plot 4 is closer and more overbearing on Clogwyn Mawr than previously shown as a result of the larger footprint houses, blocking out all sun for significant parts of the year. Inspection of the plans submitted for this application show Glazed door to garage of Plot 4 and inconsistencies between plan and elevations on plot 4 facing bungalow Clogwyn Mawr and a window overlooking the bungalow.
- The proposal requires the removal of the tree at the entrance. This was raised by the forestry officer at the time of the outline application but was assured that the tree would not be further impacted than at present. The tree in question has been removed, prior to any approval of planning application. TPOs must be put on the tree screen protect the future of the AONB.
- The houses are shown as circa 9m high which will have an unnecessary impact on the view from the AONB, 7m would be sufficient for 1.5 storey houses which would be more in keeping with the surrounding houses in South Stoke Village
- This building footprint does not reflect a rural layout of houses on this edge of village location within the AONB, the revised footprint is greatly increased over and above the plans in P17/S3206/O.
- Housing need over-provides 4-plus bedroom homes. Reduction in size of homes would ease building footprint issues. SSPC conducted a Housing Needs Survey in Summer 2017, this showed a need for 2 and 3 bedroom homes, with no need for 4 or 5 bedroom homes. A subsequent Housing Needs survey is currently being conducted, the results of which are being analysed at the time of submission.
- This area has glow worms, no mitigation has been provided for the protection of these in the current application.

3.2 **OCC Archaeological Services – No objection.**

- There are currently no known archaeological constraints to this development.

3.3 **Countryside Officer** – No objection.

- The habitats on site are not considered to be a constraint to development and boundary trees are to be retained, with additional planting proposed.
- The ecological surveys found no evidence of any protected species on site, and recommendations are made for working methods and faunal enhancements to the site.
- As such, on balance and subject to the recommended condition below, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not adversely impact any priority
- habitats or any protected species, and would not result in a net loss of biodiversity resource.
- Monitoring condition is recommended.

3.4 **Drainage** – Holding objection.

- Additional information originally requested to satisfy outline condition no. 8 but, discharge of drainage details subsequently withdrawn by the applicant as further investigation is required.

3.5 **Forestry Officer** – No Objection.

- Some initial concern was raised over the tree data in the original survey being inaccurate. A revised tree survey was submitted, and it was accepted that the proposed layout would allow sufficient space for the existing trees to be protected and retained and to accommodate their future growth potential.
- The proposed landscaping scheme will help to secure the long-term tree cover around the perimeters of the site. The amount of hard surfacing proposed internally within the development seems excessive, but the amount of proposed planting will go some way to soften it. If the extent of hard surfacing could be reduced an improved landscaping scheme could be achieved.
- For any changes in the layout, amended tree protection information will be needed.

3.6 **OCC Highways Liaison Officer**– No response.

3.7 **Neighbour responses** – four letters of objection have been received from third parties living in proximity to the site. Objections raised are summarised as follows:

- Plot 4 adjacent to the neighbouring house at Clogwyn Mawr would be too close to the neighbouring boundary and would cause a loss of light, loss of outlook and loss of privacy. It would be overbearing and the house should be moved further away from the boundary, be screened by a more natural boundary enclosure and be a bungalow (or one and a half storey building). Any windows facing the neighbouring property should be obscured;
- The outline planning approval does not mean that there has to be 5 homes. At outline stage it was indicated that a lesser number of homes may need to be considered if the proposed plans materially impact the amenity of neighbouring properties. There is a strong case for this when considering the impact on Clogwyn Mawr.
- The housing mix has changed since the outline planning stage with the developer pressing for larger homes than was previously proposed. The Parish Council has identified an urgent need for two bedroom homes. There is no evidence that the developer has consulted with the Parish Council or local community in this regard and the proposal does not reflect village needs.
- Several prominent and healthy trees have been felled (in breach of the outline planning permission) and greater protection needs to be given to the remaining tree line in order to protect the wider AONB. This is especially important as there is only limited protection of the trees beyond the development phase. There is nothing at present to stop a subsequent purchaser of a property from removing

trees to improve views or to increase the amount of sunlight into that property. Preservation of the treeline was a material consideration of the South Stoke Parish Council during the outline planning stage.

- The proposed designs do not reflect the small rural village character of the surroundings. The design appears to be based on similar sized sites in larger villages and urban areas rather than small villages. Design cues would be better taken from recent developments within the village and single level or 1.5 level dwellings would be more in keeping with the adjacent homes and wider village.
- No regard has been had to key requirements of the Chilterns Building Design Guide, which should be a material consideration for developments on AONB sites such as this.
- The site would be an extension of the village into the AONB.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P17/S3206/O](#) - Approved (18/01/2018)

Residential development (up to 5 dwellings), and associated works, including access.(as amplified & amended by information received 13 November 2017).

[P86/W0322/O](#) - Refused (07/07/1986)

Single dwelling with garage; access.

[P72/H0133](#) - Refused (16/10/1972)

Site for dwellinghouse to be used in conjunction with the land as an agricultural holding.

[P56/H0351](#) - Approved (27/07/1956)

Site for dwellinghouse to be used in conjunction with the land as an agricultural holding.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Development Plan:**

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. The council's adopted development plan comprises the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) and the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP).

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) policies:

- CS1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- CSS1 – Overall strategy;
- CSEN1 – Landscape;
- CSH4 – Meeting housing needs;
- CSR1 – Housing in villages;
- CSQ3 – Quality of design;
- CSB1 – Conservation and improvement of biodiversity.

South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) policies:

- C4 – The landscape setting of settlements;
- C6 – Biodiversity conservation;
- C8 – Protected species;
- C9 – Landscape features;
- D1 – Quality of design;
- D2 – Vehicle and cycle parking;
- D3 – Plot coverage and garden areas;

- D4 – Privacy and daylight;
- D10 – Waste management;
- EP1 – Polluting emissions;
- EP2 – Noise and vibrations;
- EP3 – Light pollution;
- EP6 – Surface water management;
- G2 - Protection and enhancement of the environment;
- G4 – Development in the countryside and on the edge of settlements;
- H4 – Housing in villages;
- T1 and T2 – Transport requirements for new developments.

5.2 **Neighbourhood Plan:**

- South Stoke Parish Council are currently not preparing a neighbourhood plan.

5.3 **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:**

- South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016).

5.4 **National Planning Policy:**

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

5.5 **Third party guidance:**

- *South Stoke Housing Developments - Development Survey Analysis & Implications;*
- *South Stoke Housing Survey – July/August 2017;*
- *Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2014-2019;*
- *Chilterns Building Design Guide* (February 2010);
- *Landscape Character Assessment for the Local Plan 2033* (November 2017).

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The outline planning permission granted in January 2018 (ref: P17/S3206/O) has established both the principle of the residential development (for up to five dwellings) and the location and design of the site access. As such, there is no requirement for me to re-assess the principle of the development. The main issues to take into account are as follows:

- **Whether the reserved matters details comply with the parameters of the development established at outline stage;**
- **Assessment of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale with regards to:**
 - The impact on the special character of the AONB;
 - The character and appearance of the site and street scene;
 - Provision of parking and turning areas;
 - Impact on neighbouring amenities.
- **Assessment of the details submitted to partially discharge the relevant conditions (not assessed in line with the reserved matters):**
 - Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy;
 - Construction management;
 - Refuse and recycling storage.

Compliance with outline planning permission

6.2 The reserved matters are for the construction of 5 dwellings (three detached and a pair of semi-detached buildings). Conditions 3 and 4 of the outline planning permission sought to restrict the maximum number of dwellings to be constructed to five and also sought to secure an appropriate market housing mix. The detailed scheme is for five

dwellings with a mixture of 1 no. 2-bedroom dwelling, 2 no. 3-bedroom dwellings, 1 no. 4-bedroom dwelling and 1 no. 5-bedroom dwelling.

- 6.3 The scheme is not considered to be of a large enough scale to be required (by policy) to provide dedicated affordable units (and as such no conditions or legal agreements were sought at outline planning stage). At outline planning stage an indicative housing mix was put forward (2 2-beds, 1 3-bed and 2 4+ bedroom dwellings). The proposed housing mix differs from the indicative mix given at outline stage and I note a number of objections to this (particularly with regards to the lack of dedicated affordable units). Condition 4 attached to the outline permission sought to secure only an ‘appropriate market housing mix’, with no links to local needs, district wide needs or specific numbers of house types. SOCS policy CSH4 defines a broad approach to housing mix but, does not place specific requirements on small-scale developments. Therefore I must rely on other evidence available to me.
- 6.4 I have had regards to the *Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)*, the *South Stoke Housing Developments - Development Survey Analysis & Implications (SSHD)* and the *South Stoke Housing Survey – July/August 2017 (SSHS)* as the latest evidence of housing need in the area. Whilst I note the Parish Council’s objection, the evidence within the SSHD and SSHS does not entirely support the need for solely smaller units in the village. The 2017 SSHS suggests there are local residents who would be interested in upsizing and downsizing. The earlier SSHD also illustrates greater support for smaller/starter homes and family homes with less local support for larger houses to be provided but, the definitions of what constitute ‘family homes’ or ‘larger homes’ are not clear. The proposal does present a mixture of housing types that would appear to suit the broad needs of the area. Given the small-scale of the scheme I consider the current proposal represents an appropriate market housing mix and I have no strong evidence to reach an alternative conclusion.
- 6.5 Overall, I consider the proposal is within the parameters established at outline planning permission stage and does not conflict with current planning policy relating to housing mix.

Impact on the special character of the AONB

- 6.6 The site is within the Chilterns AONB which, in planning policy terms, secures the highest level of landscape protection (NPPF para.172). The AONB is a predominantly rural area defined by its high level of scenic beauty and tranquil rural character. New development is strictly controlled, particularly where there would be adverse impacts on the landscape and character of the area. SOCS policy CSEN1(ii) states that high priority will be given to conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and planning decisions will have regard to their setting
- 6.7 Within the South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (2017) (LCA) the village of South Stoke is defined as being within the *River Thames Corridor (Flat floodplain pasture character sub-area)* with the open countryside to the east of the village as within the *Central Vale Fringes (Open rolling downs sub-area)*. The site is currently open field although bounded by mature trees and shrubs. The countryside to the east and north is very open with sparse field boundaries. At outline planning stage the officer’s view was that the proposal would not result in significant landscape harm, subject to appropriate conditions, as the proposal made use of an existing well-screened parcel of land. It was also stated that future reserved matters submissions should follow the broad recommendations of the draft LCA.

6.8 For the *River Thames Corridor* character area, the LCA recommends the following:

- *Minimise the visual impact of intrusive land uses at the fringes of towns, villages and farms with the judicious planting of tree and shrub species characteristic of the area. This will help to screen the development and integrate it more successfully with its surrounding countryside;*
- *Maintain the nucleated pattern of settlements, and promote the use of building materials to maintain vernacular style and a scale of development and that are appropriate to River Thames Corridor (see also the South Oxfordshire Design Guide, November 2016);*
- *Protect the sparsely settled character of the landscape and the integrity and vernacular character of the estate villages.*

The LCA recommends the following for the *Central Vale Fringes* character area:

- *Minimise the visual impact of intrusive land uses at the fringes of towns and villages with the judicious planting of tree and shrub species characteristic of the area. This will help to screen the development and integrate it more successfully with its surrounding countryside;*
- *Maintain the nucleated pattern of settlements, and promote the use of building materials to maintain vernacular style and a scale of development and that are appropriate to Central Vale Fringes.*

6.9 In this case, the site is already bounded by an established mature tree line and the applicant proposes to add to this through the implementation of a site planting scheme. The district council's Forestry Officer has confirmed that the proposed planting scheme will help to secure the long-term tree cover around the perimeters of the site but, raised some initial concerns with regards to conflicting tree survey data and the proposed site layout (particularly trees T27 and T28 and the location of plot 1). The applicant has confirmed the tree canopy locations through a revised tree survey and no further objections have been raised providing the tree protection measures are secured prior to commencement of the development. I also consider that householder permitted development rights should be removed as this would prevent future uncontrolled development (potentially rear and side extensions and outbuildings) being constructed within the RPAs of trees to be retained (this would also prevent potential increased impacts on neighbours and future occupiers of the scheme).

6.10 Several objections have been made with regards to the premature removal of trees adjacent to the main site access and there is concern that further tree protection (through a tree protection order) is required to preserve the mature tree-lined boundaries and the visual screening they secure. As stated above, tree protection measures have been proposed to ensure that existing trees are protected during the construction period and it has been confirmed by the district council's Forestry Officer that the details are acceptable. As such, it would seem unreasonable to attempt to secure further formal protection (and in any case the retention of the mature trees would be linked to the site landscaping scheme condition). Some concern has also been raised that there will be pressure for trees to be felled by future occupiers of the site in order to secure improvements to daylight and outlook. The proposed site layout suggests to me that occupiers of the new dwellings would have sufficient access to daylight and open garden areas that would not be overshadowed. I acknowledge that some overshadowing of the rear gardens of plots 4 and 5 may occur during the earlier hours of the day but this is unlikely to be severe and I am satisfied future pressure to feel the trees would not be significant.

- 6.11 The proposed buildings would be partially visible within the local street scape and possibly within the wider landscape (particularly during winter months). The new dwellings would be predominantly two storey buildings with some single storey projections. Some objections have been made due to the relationship the proposed two storey buildings would have with the adjacent bungalows at Clogwyn Mawr and Summerfield to the west (it is suggested the dwellings should be single storey). I acknowledge that the proposed dwellings would be taller than the directly adjacent dwellings but, in terms of the general scale of buildings in the street scene I consider the existing bungalows are not prominent buildings (they are screened in most views along Woodcote Road) and do not represent the predominant type of dwelling in the wider village. The majority of (much more visible) buildings in the street scene are two-storey and I do not consider there is justification on visual impact grounds to secure single storey (to one-and-a-half storey) buildings at this site. No restrictions to the overall heights of buildings were imposed at outline planning stage to justify such a requirement.
- 6.12 The proposed materials palette and design approach, that incorporates some architectural features common to rural buildings in an overall contemporary development, would minimise potential harm to the wider AONB and impact on the street scene in the locality. The buildings would be laid out in a courtyard development echoing modern barn conversion developments commonly seen at edge-of-village locations. Some concern has been raised over the amount of hard-surfaced areas but, in my view subject to securing appropriate natural materials (where possible) I do not consider this would be harmful. I also consider that details of any external lighting should be secured in order to ensure light spillage into the AONB is kept to a minimum. There are some larger windows facing east and south (outwards into the AONB). The adjacent trees to be retained would screen much of the light spill from internal living areas but, external lighting could have a more severe effect so should be controlled.
- 6.13 Boundary enclosures would be comprised of post and rail fencing infilled with native hedge planting along the north, east and southern intervening boundaries (shared with open countryside). A feather-edged timber fence would be installed along the eastern intervening boundary shared with the more suburban built-up area of the village. Generally, I consider the proposed boundary enclosures would help to preserve the setting of the site and wider village within the rural landscape whilst securing some privacy between the site and adjacent dwellings. The use of feather-edged timber fencing along the eastern boundary is considered to be acceptable in visual impact terms as the character of the village to the east is more suburban and feather-edged fencing is not an uncommon feature within the village.
- 6.14 At this edge of village location, I consider the design approach is acceptable and subject to the recommended conditions no harm would be caused to the special landscape characteristics of the AONB. I therefore consider the details relating to landscaping, appearance, scale and layout are acceptable and would conserve the special landscape character of the AONB, the setting of the village within the rural landscape and the character and appearance of the site within the street scene in line with the aims of SOCS CSEN1 and SOLP policies C4, C9, D1, G2 and G4.

Parking and turning areas

- 6.15 The proposed layout incorporates off-road parking areas in excess of those required under the county council's guidance (including the garage spaces proposed). Further to this each plot would have off-road turning areas with a larger shared turning area forming the central area of the courtyard layout. I am satisfied sufficient parking and turning areas can be provided and no further planning control is required (over and above that secured through the outline planning permission).

Impact on neighbours

- 6.16 The site is currently an open field. Some tree screening exists along the site boundaries this is currently limited along the eastern boundary shared with the closest neighbouring properties. The neighbouring dwelling at Clogwyn Mawr is a bungalow with several east facing windows that currently overlook the south-western area of the site (where plot 4 would be constructed). The construction of the dwellings, particularly plot 4, will result in impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of Clogwyn Mawr (and to a lesser extent the occupiers of Summerfield to the north-west). For this impact to be acceptable it must be considered the development would not give rise to any unacceptable harm.
- 6.17 The district council's adopted design guidance SODG 2016 sets out certain separation distances that should be achieved if good levels of residential amenities are to be secured/preserved between occupiers of adjacent buildings. For the most part these separation distances are important to prevent harmful overlooking being created between adjacent buildings with secondary issues being the preservation of daylight and preventing an overbearing impact on neighbouring outlook. Separation distances between plot 1, plot 4 and the neighbouring bungalow at Summerfield are sufficient and any views created would not be direct due to the layout of the respective buildings. However, in this case, it would appear the east facing elevation of the closest neighbouring dwelling at Clogwyn Mawr is possibly the rear elevation (although it may be a side elevation as the internal layout and fenestration layouts of the elevations make this unclear). Assuming a rear-to-side relationship would be created the between Clogwyn Mawr and plot 4 the separation distances would be marginally substandard. This suggests to me that some harm to the outlook from the neighbouring property would be caused.
- 6.18 The main house at plot 4 would be constructed in a split-level design with a hipped side gable and two storey front elevation dropping to a 1.5 storey elevation (with small projecting dormers) at the rear. The garage that would project to the front of plot 4 would also be single storey with a dual-pitched roof sloping away from the neighbouring boundary. Due to the location of the dwelling at plot 4 to the north-east of Clogwyn Mawr I am satisfied that day light would generally be preserved. Clogwyn Mawr would receive the same levels of day light during the earlier hours of the day as the current situation allows and there would be no overshadowing during the later hours of the day (in any case the existing trees to be retained will cast a much larger shadow over the neighbouring dwelling, particularly during summer months).
- 6.19 Privacy would also be preserved as no first-floor windows are proposed that would directly overlook the neighbouring dwelling and one window at ground floor level would be obscured, serving a WC, and would be screened by boundary fencing. Views from rear facing windows of plot 4 may cause some overlooking of the garden at Clogwyn Mawr but, these views would be over very obtuse angles and would be screened by existing trees so would not be harmful. I am mindful of the currently very private and open outlook that is enjoyed by the occupiers of Clogwyn Mawr but, I consider on balance that the cumulative impact of the construction of plot 4 on the residential amenities available to the neighbouring occupiers would not be unacceptably harmful.
- 6.20 Planning conditions can restrict permitted development rights for the creation of new windows and doors to protect neighbour privacy and remove PD rights for extensions to the dwellings to limit potential future impacts on neighbouring amenities and the amenities of future occupiers of the adjacent plots. As such, I am satisfied the development would not cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenities so does not conflict with the aims of SOCS policies CSQ3 and CSR1 or SOLP policies H4, D1, D3 and D4.

Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy

- 6.21 The application is supported by a preliminary ecological appraisal (secured by condition 7 of the outline permission). The district council's Countryside Officer has assessed this document and has concluded the habitats on site are not considered to be a constraint to development. The ecological surveys found no evidence of any protected species on site, and recommendations are made for working methods, the retention of existing trees and faunal enhancements to the site. As such, subject to a condition to secure compliance with the recommendations in the ecological appraisal, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact any priority habitats or protected species and would not result in a net loss of biodiversity resource. The development therefore complies with SOCS policy CSB1 and SOLP policies C6 and C8.

Construction and traffic management

- 6.22 A construction method statement and construction traffic plan have been submitted to satisfy conditions 11 and 16 of the outline planning permission. The construction method statement details that the central area of the site (to be finished as the hard-surfaced courtyard turning area) would be the main compound area for the site with materials storage, site office and contractor parking all continued outside of the tree protection areas. A wheel wash would be provided at the site access. The document also details the various methods of controlling construction noise and dust and I am satisfied the proposed methods with offer a good level of mitigation.
- 6.23 The construction traffic management plan details that construction vehicles will approach the development site from the west, via Woodcote Road. Woodcote Road connects to the B4009 (Wallingford Road), which in turn connects to the A4130, providing a direct link to the A34, for vehicles arriving from the north and the south. The A34 provides a connection to the M4 to the south and the A40, A44 and M40 to the north. It is proposed to erect appropriate signage to instruct construction and delivery vehicles of the direction to take, to and from the development site. All signage related to the construction works will be maintained and regularly inspected. The operating hours of the site will be between 08:00 to 18:00 from Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on a Saturday. No works will be undertaken on Sundays and Bank Holidays without prior approval. Deliveries during the morning and afternoon peak traffic times will be avoided where possible.
- 6.24 On balance, I am satisfied the submitted documents detail sufficient measures to mitigate for the environmental and traffic impacts of the construction of the development. The development therefore complies with the aims of SOCS policy CSM1 and policies EP1, T1 and T2 of the SOLP.

Refuse and recycling storage

- 6.25 Information has been submitted to demonstrate that sufficient areas for the storage of domestic refuse and recycling bins can be provided within each plot. Bins may need to be moved to the fronts of the plots for collection, but the distances are relatively short. A swept path analysis has also been submitted detailing how a refuse vehicle would enter and exit the site in a forward gear. The central courtyard area would provide sufficient space for a refuse vehicle to turn. Operatives would also not be required to travel long distances to collect the refuse. As such, I am satisfied the site layout allows for sufficient refuse storage and collection arrangements to be achieved.

Fire hydrants and drainage

- 6.26 Details relating to drainage and fire hydrant matters were initially submitted (to satisfy outline planning conditions 8 and 14) but, due to the requirement for further investigations and submission of additional technical information relating to surface

water drainage tests and fire hydrant specifications these details have been removed from the current application.

Other matters

- 6.27 The council's CIL charging schedule applies 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. It is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of new development. Outline planning permissions are not CIL liable but, in this case CIL is liable for the gross internal floor space that would be created in the event the reserved matters are approved.
- 6.28 NPPF Paragraph 38 details the need for Local planning authorities to approach planning decisions in a positive and creative way, using the full range of planning tools available and working proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the development plan and is considered to be a sustainable form of development.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 Officers recommend that planning permission is granted because the reserved matters details and additional details submitted to discharge conditions 5, 6, 7, 11, 13 and 16 of outline planning permission ref: P17/S3206/O would result in a development that would preserve the character and appearance of the street scene, landscape setting of the rural village and landscape character of the wider Chilterns AONB. Further to this, the development would not give rise to unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenities and sufficient mitigation can be secured to minimise impacts on protected species, the local environment and highways network during construction. The reserved matters therefore remain in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and subject to the recommended conditions it would be a sustainable form of development.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **Planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions**

- 1. Commencement reserved matters approval;**
- 2. Approved plans;**
- 3. Schedule of materials;**
- 4. Planting scheme completed prior to occupation;**
- 5. Development completed in accordance with ecology survey recommendations;**
- 6. Removal of PD for additional doors and windows in west facing elevations of plot 1 and plot 4;**
- 7. Removal of householder PD rights (Classes A-F);**
- 8. External lighting details.**

Notes:

- 1. Outline planning conditions note.**

Author: David Millinship
E-mail : david.millinship@southandvale.gov.uk
Contact No: 01235 422600

This page is intentionally left blank