

APPLICATION NO.	P18/S4261/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	8.1.2019
PARISH	CLIFTON HAMPDEN
WARD MEMBER(S)	Sam Casey-Rerhaye
APPLICANT	Mr N Mullard and Mrs F Brann
SITE	The Chapel, Burcot House Abingdon Road Burcot, OX14 3DJ
PROPOSAL	Proposed conversion of the de-consecrated chapel to create a two bedroom dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space provision.
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 inadequate access and increase in traffic in the area).

- 1.2 The application site comprises a former chapel set within the wider grounds of a property known as Burcot House within the rural village of Burcot. The site is accessed by a private road extending to the south of the A415 that also provides shared access to a number of predominantly domestic properties. The wider area comprises a suburban housing development with buildings ranging from the late C18 to late C20 origins. There is little uniformity between the scale and design of individual buildings or plot layouts in the area. The majority of buildings and plots are large, set out in irregular layouts with some pockets of tree planting that have remained undeveloped. The site and village are entirely washed over by the Oxford Green Belt.

- 1.3 Burcot House itself is now divided into several separate dwellings. The chapel is located marginally to the north of 2-3 Burcot House set within its own apparent curtilage. The northern fringe of the site and much of the western area are populated by a number of mature trees of mixed species (several Yew). A lawn area sits between the building and northern tree-lined boundary with a shared drive and parking areas (serving the units at Burcot House) running along the southern boundary. The main private road running through the estate skirts the northern and eastern site boundaries. It is raised in height from the chapel level by around 0.5 metres.

- 1.4 The chapel is thought to have once been located in the village of Dorchester-on-Thames. It was rebuilt at the current site in the early C20 linked to the occupation of Burcot House at a time when the main house was occupied by Dorchester Theological College for Missionary Students. It was de-consecrated in the 1950s, following the private purchase of Burcot House and its extensive grounds by the Mullard family. Much of the surrounding land at the time was open land or woodland but, was subsequently developed. The district council's records note several approvals in the 1950s for development of 'high class private dwellinghouses' across the wider estate.

- 1.5 Subsequent to being de-consecrated, The Chapel was used for many years for office purposes but was also used, at various times, as a collection/bagging point for Oxfam, as art exhibition space, as a prop store in connection with a theatre company with its

most recent and on-going use being for general domestic storage purposes. The chapel building has a simple rectangular plan form and is constructed in stone with brick dressings under a plain clay tile roof with a conical turret feature at its western end. The building has some local significance and has maintained a historic character and appearance, despite its many uses since the mid C20. As such, it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

1.6 Two other planning applications for residential development on sites adjacent to the chapel are also under consideration by the local planning authority. Application ref: P19/S0058/FUL has been submitted for the construction of a detached five- bedroom dwelling on land to the north of the chapel and planning application P19/S0025/FUL has been submitted for the conversion of a former storage building (originally a tennis court) into two four-bedroom dwellings on a site to the south-east of the chapel. The applications are not functionally linked (in that if all three consents were issued individual developments could take place at different times) but, the applicants are the same and several documents have been submitted to assess cumulative impacts of the three proposals.

1.5 A plan identifying the site is **attached** as Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 This application proposes the conversion of the existing building into a detached two-bedroom house, with associated parking and amenity space provision. The new dwelling would share the driveway serving Burcot House - which joins onto the private road some 60 metres to the north-west but, with a gated access onto it adjacent to the south-eastern edge of the chapel. Two off-road parking spaces would be provided.

2.2 The proposed conversion involves both internal and external works. Internally, it is proposed to create an entrance hall, utility room and WC in the existing lobby area with an open-plan kitchen, dining and living room in the remainder of the ground floor area. A new mezzanine level of accommodation above would provide two bedrooms and a bathroom. Externally, it is proposed to retain all of the existing window openings save for the removal of an existing window on the eastern side of the lobby area, which would be replaced with a new external doorway serving the proposed utility room. Additionally, a new set of glazed double doors and a new window are proposed to be inserted on the northern elevation to provide access to the garden area from the new living areas.

2.2 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application are **attached** at Appendix 2. Full copies of the plans and consultation responses are available for inspection on the Council's website at www.southoxon.gov.uk.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **Clifton Hampden Parish Council** – Objection;

The access is a single carriageway track, and is not sufficient for the proposed usage.

OCC Archaeological Services - No objection;

The proposals outlined would not appear to have an invasive impact upon any known archaeological sites or features. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this scheme.

Countryside Officer - No objection;

The building to be converted has been subject to surveys and found to support a small number of relatively common bat species in the external roof structure.

As the conversion works would not directly impact the roof, no direct impacts are predicted and suitable working methods and timings to ensure that development does not disturb roosting bats, which could require a licence, are proposed. Subject to the addition of a condition to ensure compliance with the proposed working methods, there are no objections to the proposal.

Drainage Engineer - No objection;

Advice has been given with regards to the technical requirements that would need to be met. No objection is made subject to the use of conditions to secure full drainage system details.

Forestry Officer - No objection;

No objections subject to a tree protection condition being attached, to ensure the satisfactory protection of retained trees.

OCC Highways Liaison Officer – No objection;

Subject to conditions to secure off-road parking and turning areas.

SGN Plant Protection Team - No objection;

Confirm no plant is located within application site over than a low-pressure gas main under the private road. Advice is given about safe working around these installations.

Neighbour responses:

Three letters of objection were received from neighbouring occupiers. Objections to the scheme have been summarised as follows:

- The existing private drive would not be able to support the additional traffic that would be generated by the three proposed developments;
- Increased chance of obstructions and conflicts between vehicles at the A415 junctions with the private road (Horseshoe Lane);
- Surface water flooding (caused by run-off from land to the north of the A415) has occurred and the development should not increase this flood risk;
- Concern has been raised over the removal of mature trees in advance of the submissions;
- Trees that remain should be surveyed or protected;
- Loss of privacy to occupiers of The Coach House, the neighbouring dwelling to the east;
- Increased noise over and above the existing domestic/storage use of the building.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P19/S0058/FUL](#) – Awaiting decision (see current committee agenda)

Proposed erection of a detached five-bedroom dwelling and a detached double garage.

[P19/S0025/FUL](#) – Awaiting decision (see current committee agenda)

Proposed conversion of the existing B8 storage building to create 2 x four-bedroom dwellings with associated parking and amenity space provision (as amended by additional Flood Risk Information received on 24-04-2019 and revised plan received on 21-06-2019). (Revised Flood Risk Assessment received 4 July 2019).

[P54/M0663](#) - Approved (08/12/1954)

Site and layout for erection of high class private dwelling houses.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 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). The relevant policies and supporting guidance are listed below.

5.2 **Development Plan:**

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) policies:

- CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- CSS1 – The Overall Strategy;
- CSR1 – Housing in Villages;
- CSEN1 – Landscape;
- CSEN2 – Green Belt;
- CSEN3 – Historic Environment;
- CSQ3 – Design;
- CSB1 – Conservation and improvement of biodiversity.

South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) policies:

- H4 – Housing in villages;
- H11 – Subdivision of dwellings;
- C6 – Biodiversity;
- C8 – Protected species;
- C9 – Landscape features;
- D1 – Good design and local distinctiveness;
- D2 – Vehicle and bicycle parking;
- D3 – Outdoor amenity space;
- D4 – Neighbouring amenities;
- E8 – Conversion of rural buildings;
- G2 – Protecting the district from adverse development;
- GB4 – Green belt (visual amenity);
- T1 – Safe access;
- T2 – Parking and turning.

5.3 **Neighbourhood Plan:**

- The Parish of Clifton Hampden are currently preparing a neighbourhood plan. The neighbourhood area was formally designated in September 2014. The parish council has started the process of gathering evidence and engaging with the local community. As the plan remains at an early pre-draft stage it possesses only very limited weight in the assessment of this application.

5.4 **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:**

- *South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016* (SODG 2016).

5.5 **National Planning Policy:**

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

5.6 **Third Party Guidance:**

- Historic England – *Conservation Principles*;

- Historic England – *GPA2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment*;
- Historic England – *GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition)*.

5.7 Emerging local plan

Paragraph 48 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.

Emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034.

The council has submitted the Local Plan 2034 to the Planning Inspector for an independent examination following public consultation.

On 10 October 2019 the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government issued a Holding Direction on the Council in relation to the emerging Local Plan 2034. The holding direction has been made under the provisions of Section 21A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This means that the emerging plan has 'no effect whilst the direction is in force', this is set out in section 21A(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The emerging Local Plan has no weight at this stage.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The application site is located within a rural village that is washed over by the Oxford Green Belt. The site also includes a non-designated heritage asset and shares intervening boundaries with domestic properties. The proposal would mainly comprise the conversion of the building to create a new detached dwelling. Therefore, the main issues to consider are as follows:

- **The principle of the development having regards to the housing delivery and Green Belt policies of the development plan;**
- **The heritage impacts of the development:**
- **Impact on neighbouring properties;**
- **Highways impacts;**
- **Biodiversity;**
- **Drainage and flood risk.**

Principle of development – new housing

6.2 Policy CSS1 of the SOCS details the spatial strategy for new development across the district during the plan period. It sets out a settlement hierarchy that seeks to direct major new development to the growth point of Didcot, with smaller developments supported in the main towns and various sizes of village across the district, specifically:

(iv) supporting other villages in the rest of the district by allowing for limited amounts of housing and employment and by the provision and retention of services; and

(v) outside the towns and villages, and other major developed sites, any change will need to relate to very specific needs such as those of the agricultural industry or enhancement of the environment...

So, the general principle of new residential development is supported if the site is within the built-up limits (BuL) of a village. The site is considered to be within the built-up limits of Burcot which is defined as a 'smaller village' within the SOCS so the broad principle of new housing development is supported by the overall development strategy.

6.3 SOCS policy CSR1 states that redevelopment proposals (to provide new housing) in all categories of settlement may be acceptable but, will be considered on a case by case basis through the development management process in line with other policies in the Development Plan. SOLP policy H4 states that proposal for new housing within the built-up areas of villages will be permitted providing:

- i. *an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost, nor an important public view spoilt;*
- ii. *the design, height, scale and materials of the proposed development are in keeping with its surroundings;*
- iii. *the character of the area is not adversely affected;*
- iv. *there are no overriding amenity, environmental or highway objections; and*
- v. *if the proposal constitutes backland development, it would not create problems of privacy and access and would not extend the built limits of the settlement.*

I do not consider the proposal would conflict with points i or v and generally I consider it would be possible for the development to comply with the other criteria (although this will be assessed in greater detail below). I also have regard to the requirements of SOLP policies E8 and H11 that respectively relate to the conversion of rural buildings and subdivision of existing dwellings. Whilst the lawful use of the chapel is unclear, it is clearly not in an agricultural or rural business use so E8 does not strictly apply in terms of the principle. The applicant states that the building has most recently been used as domestic storage, so it potentially has an ancillary use to the main dwellings at Burcot House. However, based on my recent site visit I do not consider the building to be in an ancillary use. It sits within its own curtilage and is of a much larger scale than an ancillary outbuilding is reasonably expected to be. The former use also suggests a B1 or B8 use may have been established at some point. Therefore, I do not consider the proposal conflicts with the principle aims of these policies, but in assessing the wider impacts of the proposal the criteria of E8 and H11 are likely to be relevant to my planning judgement. As such, I am satisfied that the general principle of the change of use into a dwelling in this location is supported by SOCS CSR1 and SOLP policy H4

Principle of development – Green Belt

6.4 The site (and wider village) is within the Oxford Green Belt, where new development is strictly controlled. Policy CSEN2 defers to the NPPF for most types of development. NPPF Paragraphs 145 and 146 define various types of development that are considered to be not inappropriate. In this case, the proposal has potential to be included within para. 145(f) as a form of partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL) or para. 146(d) as the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction. In any case, the proposal does not involve any significant extensions to the existing building and would result in the creation of a new dwelling within a settlement (so would not be a form of urban encroachment in my view). As such, I accept the proposal is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt and is supported in general principle by the housing delivery and Green Belt policies of the development plan.

Heritage impacts

6.5 The building in question is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. It would clearly be affected by the proposal, mainly due to the internal works that would be required to convert the building into a dwelling. The development plan generally seeks to avoid harm to heritage assets. The NPPF (presenting the most up-to-date policy) states that:

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing

applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

- 6.6 Historic England's guidance within *GPA2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment* defines the significance of a heritage asset as being derived from the cumulative considerations of the historic interest, architectural character and contribution of its setting. There is little evidence relating to the history of the chapel other than the applicant's submission. It is thought that certain features of the building were at one time part of a chapel located in nearby Dorchester-on-Thames. It was constructed at the current site in the late 1920s/early 1930s, though it possesses many features of the earlier building.
- 6.7 The district council's Conservation Officer has informally reviewed the scheme and agrees the building possesses significance due to its local historic interest and architectural character. The broad view was taken that the conversion works would not result in a substantial level of intervention with the original fabric. The exception would be the new doorway accessing the garden area and new window to be installed into the north facing elevation. This would involve removal of some of the building's fabric but, would be in the least visible location and would help to secure the optimum viable use of the building. The use of the non-designated heritage asset as a dwelling would be appropriate and would secure preservation of the building for future generations. I consider securing a viable future use for the building outweighs the minor harm that would be caused by the new external door opening.
- 6.8 In order to ensure the architectural character of the building is protected, planning conditions can be used to require the development and any repairs to the building to be undertaken in materials to match those of the existing building. Full details of any replacement or new doors and windows can also be secured. As the building is not listed it would benefit from permitted development (PD) rights once it was occupied as a dwelling. The protection of the significance of the building and prevention of extensions that could result in disproportionate additions to the building within the Green Belt present exceptional circumstances to support the removal of householder PD rights. Both matters are given significant weight by the NPPF so I consider, in this case, PD rights should be removed by a restrictive condition.
- 6.9 Taking into account the above, I am satisfied there would be no conflict with the aims of SOCS policy CSEN3 or the provisions of Section 16 of the NPPF and subject to the recommended conditions the significance of the building would be preserved.

Impact on neighbours

- 6.10 There is potential for the neighbouring dwellings at The Coach House (to the east) and 2-3 Burcot House to the south to experience some impact from the permanent occupation of the chapel as a dwelling. The current use of the building appears mostly akin to a domestic outbuilding (storage and some ancillary leisure use). As such, it is reasonable to expect some increase in noise from comings and goings and potentially impact on neighbouring privacy.
- 6.11 Some third-party concern has been raised over the first-floor east-facing window. This window would face towards the neighbouring dwelling at The Coach House as several windows serving habitable rooms are located in the west facing elevation of that neighbouring dwelling. The east facing window would serve the open plan living area, which would be a room with a double ceiling height. The first-floor mezzanine would not cover the living area within the western area of the so direct overlooking from the first-floor window would not be caused. There would also be a separation distance of

approximately 17 metres (rear-to-side) with vegetative screening from existing tall trees and an established hedgerow. A planning condition can be used to prevent extension of the first-floor mezzanine. Subject to the condition, I am satisfied privacy to the occupiers of The Coach House would not be harmed.

- 6.12 Some overlooking could be created towards 2 and 3 Burcot House. This would be in a side-to-front relationship over a separation distance of approximately 16 metres, window-to-window. The intervening land is comprised of the shared drive and parking areas serving 2 and 3 Burcot House. These are semi-private areas of the site so a degree of mutual overlooking from them is reasonably expected and would not be harmful. The most private areas of both 2 and 3 Burcot House and the chapel would not be overlooked and I consider no harm would be caused to neighbouring amenities or the amenities of future occupiers of the chapel.
- 6.13 On balance, I am satisfied that subject to the recommended conditions the development would not conflict with the aims of SOCS policy CSQ3 or SOLP policies D1, D4, E8, G2, H4 or H11.

Highways impacts

- 6.14 SOLP policies E8, H4, H11 all seek to prevent development that would result in adverse impacts to the safety and operation of the public highway. SOLP policies D2, T1 and T2 together seek to ensure that all new development has safe access and sufficient off-road parking and turning areas. As stated above, the site is accessed from the public highway (A415) by stretch of private road over a distance of approximately 140 metres to the shared driveway of Burcot House. Within the shared driveway of Burcot House there are already large areas of hard-surfacing that would provide sufficient space for parking and turning to allow vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear (from the private road). Two off-road parking spaces, with a large shared turning area, would be given over to use by the chapel. As such, I am satisfied the provisions of SOLP policies D2 and T2 would be met. The County Council Highways Liaison Officer has assessed the expected impacts of the development on the existing access points with the public highway and has offered no objection.
- 6.15 However, the existing private road (referred to locally as the ‘Horseshoe Lane’) is not well-surfaced, has no pedestrian footway and lacks sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass along much of its length. The Horseshoe Lane has two access points with the A415. Both are considered to possess good visibility and are set back from the carriageway by approximately one car length. Both accesses are bell-mouth designed wide enough to allow a car to enter and exit at the same time. However, at both the eastern and western access points the private road narrows to a single width in close proximity to the access so there would be some potential for conflict between vehicles (travelling in opposing directions) at these points.
- 6.16 The applicant has submitted a transport assessment to attempt to demonstrate that the combined impacts of the two residential developments at the Tennis Court and Plot 3 sites would not be harmful in comparison to the fall-back position. The vehicle movements of the lawful fall-back use(s) of the sites are assessed against the expected traffic movements associated with the residential developments and it has been concluded the fall-back use has a greater potential to be harmful. The chapel conversion has not been included within the transport assessment but, the applicant has concluded that its conversion would not be harmful in addition to the greater impacts of the other developments.
- 6.17 I agree with the applicant’s assessment that the chapel conversion has the least potential to generate significant vehicle movements once converted. The fall-back use

should be considered but, it is difficult to conclusively determine from the district council's records. In all probabilities, it has been used for several years in an informal domestic use. At my recent site visit the building appeared to be used mainly for domestic storage but, it was explained that it has also been used informally for art exhibitions, for the storage of theatre props and as an office. Therefore, I accept there may be some form of domestic use established (most likely linked to the occupiers of Burcot House) but, I do not consider the use of the chapel is as an ancillary outbuilding. Therefore, it has the potential to generate traffic movements if it were used for a more commercial purpose (it appears likely a commercial B8 or B1 use could take place without planning permission).

- 6.18 The TRICS data provided by the applicant suggests a 2-3 bedroom dwelling can generate up to 8 movements per day (considered as a maximum). Individually, I do not consider this level of traffic increase would have the potential to be harmful and, given that I accept a fall-back use exists, the residential conversion of the chapel would prevent future increase in traffic linked to a commercial use. The County Council Highways Liaison Officer has reviewed the Transport Statement and has offered no objection in terms of the impact of the development on users of the public highway, over and above the fall-back position. It was informally agreed that the maximum vehicle movements (assumed to be generated by the fall-back uses) are unlikely to be reached given the location and condition of the private road. However, commercial storage and business uses are not uncommon in rural village locations, so some level of commercial vehicle use is accepted. The proposed residential conversions would prevent more intensive commercial uses being established which is considered to be to the merit of the proposals in terms of highway impacts.
- 6.19 I note the strong objections from several neighbouring occupiers that share the Horseshoe Lane for access (particularly those of the western side). In terms of this proposal, I do not consider there is sufficient impact to justify mitigation in the form of upgrades to the Horseshoe Lane. In any case, the Horseshoe Lane is also a private road and does not appear to have been well maintained by landowners over the years. Whilst I acknowledge that improvements to the surface of the lane and increased passing place opportunities are desirable, I consider these are works that could take place at any time and would be for the private benefits of the residents living along the Horseshoe Lane, rather than public benefits of users of the highway. It is also possible that individual (or collective) landowners of the lane could take civil action against the developer to require future upgrades to the private road. I do not conclude that upgrades to the lane are required to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 6.20 In my view, there is an argument that mitigation can be sought to minimise potential damage to the lane during the construction period of the development. If damage is caused it appears reasonable to require the private road is reinstated to its condition prior to the construction works taking place. However, construction linked to the chapel conversion would not be of a large enough scale to warrant further control through planning conditions (the other associated developments would be in my view).
- 6.21 On balance, I am satisfied the chapel conversion would not cause harm to the safety and operation of the public highway in the locality and it therefore complies with the aims of SOLP policies D1, D2, E8, H4, H11, T1 and T2.

Biodiversity impacts

- 6.22 The building has been in place for almost 100 years and is located in proximity to mature trees, hedgerows and approximately 110 metres to the north of the River Thames. As such, the conditions in the area suggest protected species may be present. The applicant has undertaken an ecological appraisal and the building has been found

to support a small number of relatively common bat species in the external roof structure. The conversion works would not directly impact the roof and no direct impacts on the bats using the building are predicted. The ecological appraisal recommends suitable working methods and timings to ensure the development does not disturb roosting bats, which could require a licence. The district's Countryside Officer has offered no objection to the scheme subject to the imposition of a condition to secure compliance with the recommendations of the ecological appraisal. Subject to this condition the development would not conflict with the aims of SOCS policy CSB1 or SOLP policies C6 and C8.

Drainage and flood risk

- 6.23 The chapel is located in Flood Zone 1 and not within an area at risk of surface water flooding. (as defined by the Environment Agency flood maps). Flood Zones 2 and 3 are located approximately 45 metres to the south. As the chapel is not within Flood Zone 1 the NPPF advises that no Flood Risk Assessment is required. However, third party comments have raised concerns over surface water flooding that has occurred in the wider area (the Horseshoe Lane, part of the Plot 3 site and properties at Creek End and Burr Woods to the north). It has been stated that floodwater has run-off from farmland to the north and has failed to be captured by highway drainage serving the A415. Photos were submitted showing part of the Plot 3 site and Horseshoe Lane flooded by surface water.
- 6.24 I acknowledge that surface water flooding has occurred in the vicinity of the site but, this does not appear to be a commonly occurring issue and is not reflected in the EA's surface water flood maps. The site is further to the south than the area previously mentioned as being susceptible to flooding and it is an existing building with at least, some form of drainage connection. It is also unreasonable to expect a development of the proposed scale and location to be able to increase flood risk. The district council's Drainage Engineer has acknowledged the groundwater flood risk in the area but has offered no objection to the scheme. Conditions to secure full foul and surface water drainage details are requested (along with the use of permeable hard-surfacing materials that can be controlled by a separate condition). I consider these to be reasonable details to secure as there may be a need to upgrade the existing drainage systems to meet the NPPF para. 163 requirements for the use of sustainable drainage and flood resilience measures.

Other matters

- 6.25 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, and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. In this case CIL would be liable as the proposal is for the change of use to a dwelling. The internal mezzanine would also increase floor space over that of the existing building.
- 6.26 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. Subject to some minor revisions and clarifications the proposal is now considered to be in accordance with the development plan and is a sustainable form of development.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 It is recommended that members grant planning permission as the proposed development would help to secure the optimum viable use of a non-designated heritage asset through the conversion of an existing building within the built-up limits of a

'smaller village' where some small-scale provision of new housing is supported through the spatial development strategy of the development plan. The recommended conditions would safeguard future harm to neighbouring residential amenities, highway safety and the biodiversity value of the site. The proposed development therefore complies with the development plan and is a sustainable development.

8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. **Three-year time limit;**
2. **Approved plans;**
3. **Submission of new window and door details (prior to installation);**
Prior to the installation of any of the new doors and windows hereby approved full details (to include as a minimum, scale drawings illustrating the window/door designs, materials details, details of stone surrounds and sill/lintel details), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the new windows and doors shall only be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is preserved and in the interests of the character and appearance of the site in accordance with the aims of policies CSEN3 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies D1 and G2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. **Provision of porous hard-surfaced off-road parking and turning areas (prior to occupation);**
Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, the off-road parking and turning areas shall be constructed in full and made available for use in accordance with site layout drawing no.S1/P/07 and in accordance with a written materials specification that shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The written details shall include (as a minimum) a photographic example of each material, the material name, manufacturer/supplier name and details of the permeability/porousness of the material (or details of proposed drainage measures). Thereafter the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and the parking and turning areas shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking of vehicles associated with the development at all times.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenities, flood risk and to ensure the provision of sufficient off-road car parking areas in accordance with policies CSQ3 and CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 and policies D1, D2, T1 and T2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

5. **Connection to foul and surface water drainage details (prior to occupation);**
The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied or brought into use until it has been connected to drainage systems for both foul and surface water disposal, the details of which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details submitted shall demonstrate how the proposed drainage systems will be compliant with sustainable drainage (SuDS) principles and how surface water flood risk in the locality shall be managed within the development site.

Reason: To prevent pollution and to ensure adequate drainage infrastructure is provided in accordance with Policies EP1 and EP6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

- 6. Ecological mitigation (compliance with recommendations of eco appraisal);**
- 7. Removal of house holder permitted development rights; Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no development as described in Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A to F of the Order shall be undertaken without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To ensure the significance of the non-designated heritage asset is preserved and in the interests of the character and appearance of the site in accordance with the aims of policies CSEN3 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies D1, D4 and G2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Author: David Millinship
Contact No: 01235 422600
Email: planning@southoxon.gov.uk