

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P20/S0762/FUL</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION
<b>REGISTERED</b>	25.2.2020
<b>PARISH</b>	CHOLSEY
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Anne-Marie Simpson Jane Murphy
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Deanfield Homes Ltd
<b>SITE</b>	Boshers (Cholsey) Ltd 6 Reading Road Cholsey, OX10 9HN
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of two new build detached houses following demolition of an existing redundant office building.
<b>OFFICER</b>	(As clarified by additional Contamination Information Received 16 April 2020, Heritage statement received 17 April 2020 and Agent's email and plan received 6 May 2020 addressing drainage issues). Sharon Crawford

1.0 **INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 This application is referred to Planning Committee at the Planning Manager's discretion because the application was registered before 23 March 2020 and the recommendation that planning permission is granted conflicts with the Parish Council's views. This report sets out my justification for the recommendation
- 1.2 The site is part of the former Boshers builder's yard. Boshers ceased trading in January 2017 when they went into administration. The site is some 0.06 hectares in size and fronts onto Reading Road. 6 Reading Road was originally a dwelling constructed in the Victorian era but is has been used most recently as an office. It has been vacant since 2017. The site lies within flood zone 1 and is within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- 1.3 The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.
- 1.4 Planning permission was granted in Sept 2019 under application ref P18/S2125/FUL for the residential redevelopment of the wider Boshers site. This permission retained the existing building at 6 Reading Road but involved its change of use to a four bed dwelling with private garden, a new double garage and parking. Access to the approved dwelling was off Reading Road. A legal agreement attached to the planning permission secures affordable housing (6 units) and contributions to public transport.
- 1.5 Planning permission was granted under application ref P19/S3284/FUL for the variation of Conditions 2 and 17 on application P18/S2125/FUL. This application varied the approved plans and changed the layout of the parking and turning areas. Most significantly it removed a new two way road access onto Reading Road that had been part of the original planning permission.
- 1.6 A non-material minor amendment has been granted under application P20/S0759/NM to vary condition 13 of P19/S3284/FUL to remove the requirement to provide solar panels on the dwellings. The scheme will still provide electric charging points for vehicles for each dwelling.

- 1.7 Four discharge of condition applications have been submitted on the larger site to address the following conditions;
- P20/S0345/DIS) – condition 5 (landscaping)
  - P20/S0246/DIS - conditions 3 - Sample Materials, 6 - Surface Water Drainage Works and 16 - Roads and Footpaths
  - P19/S3330/DIS - conditions 4 (method statement for the control of dust) & 7 (CTMP) of application P18/S2125/FUL
  - P19/S3240/DIS – Condition 8 (contaminated land) and 10 (Wildlife protection)
- Conditions 3 (Sample Materials), conditions 4 (method statement for the control of dust), 5 (landscaping), 6 – (Surface Water Drainage), & 7 (CTMP) have all been discharged. Only condition 16 in respect of the road and footpaths remains outstanding pending a decision by the County Council in respect of the S278 agreement.
- 1.8 This application seeks full planning permission on plot 15 (6 Reading Road) of the larger site. The extant planning permission allows for the conversion of the former offices back to the original use as a four-bed dwelling. This application seeks to demolish the building and replace it with two detached, four bed dwellings on three floors. The dwellings would be served off a single, centrally located, shared access point and would both have two allocated parking spaces and shared manoeuvring space. Private garden areas, a shed and bin storage would be provided for each dwelling.
- 1.9 The Royal Mail post box in the brick pier of the boundary wall to 4 Reading Road is to remain. The brick and flint wall along the frontage will be removed to achieve the vision splay for the access.
- 1.10 Reduced copies of the plans and documents 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](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk)
- 2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**
- 2.1 Full responses can be found on the Council's website

**Cholsey Parish Council** - The Parish Council object to the proposal to demolish the existing house and wall because of their contribution to the street scene. The house is a substantial Victorian dwelling with most of its original characteristics intact and as such should remain as part of our ancient village.

The wall, similarly is distinctive and unusual with its inlaid flint panels. A Victorian Post Box (VR) is also incorporated at one end of the wall and it is still in daily use.

We are exploring the possibility of having these features listed.

The proposal is also contrary to Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan policy H2 which states that development will be supported for infill sites 'which maintains the general character and appearance of the area'.

**Conservation Officer** - I have carefully reviewed the application plans and supporting documents and agree with the assessment and conclusions made in the heritage statement provided. The building proposed for demolition is not a designated heritage asset (listed) or within the setting of, nor is it a non-designated heritage asset (locally listed) and it is also not situated within a designated Conservation Area.

Loss of this building would be regrettable in heritage terms but I do not consider this to be a material planning consideration in this case.

The building holds limited architectural interest in heritage terms but this is not sufficient to engage local or national heritage policies. I do not consider Historic England would consider the building or boundary features for national designation

either.

Ideally the embodied energy held within the building would have been put to better use as I consider reuse of any historic building is sustainable development but current local and national planning policies do not support this approach.

No objection.

**Countryside Officer** - The wider site has previously been subject to bat surveys and no evidence of bat roosting is attributed to the building to be demolished as part of this application. It is noted that swift boxes are present on the north eastern elevation of the building. I am satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant ecological impacts, but I consider it expedient to ensure that compensatory roosting and nesting provision is included on site - in accordance with Policy CSB1 of the SOCS.

**Drainage – original comments** – Holding objection. A drainage strategy to demonstrate that infiltration SUDS mechanisms will work is required.

**Following additional drainage info:** I am now aware of the wider development at Boshers and therefore, because the pluvial flow route is shown to traverse the site from north east to south west and not from east to west from the A329, any pluvial flow route would not impact this application site because of fences, green space and other buildings. Therefore, I would have no objections to planning permission being granted subject to the inclusion of a surface water drainage condition:

**OCC Highways Liaison Officer** – No objection subject to conditions and Informatives. The proposal seeks the construction of two residential dwellings following the demolition of the existing office building.

The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant intensification of transport activity at the property, in addition the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network.

**SGN Plant Protection Team** – Standard advice on utilities

**Contaminated Land** – The additional report submitted outlines a proposal for a clean cover system for landscaped areas and then explains a number of areas of concern for land contamination which require further action/ investigation.

Given the information presented in this report I am in agreement that further intrusive investigations are required. In respect of the clean cover system proposed I will comment further on this once all intrusive investigations and risk assessments are complete and the remedial requirements are then presented in a remediation method statement. No objection subject to a condition to investigate further and mitigate if required.

**Neighbour objections (2)** - I wholeheartedly object to the current building being demolished. I believe it dates back to at least 1890 as it has the same rose brick detailing which is a feature of my property, which dates back to this era. The brick and flint boundary wall and Victorian post box is also a wonderful feature and it would be a travesty to see it all destroyed.

It would be a great loss to the fabric of the street scene and to the village community as a whole. Buildings of this age and architectural interest are a rarity in this day and age & I feel it is vital to preserve it's important historical value for future generations to admire & enjoy.

I'm also very concerned how close one of the proposed new dwellings is to the boundary line of our neighbouring property. Although this doesn't directly affect our property I believe it will feel like the proposed new dwellings have been squeezed in on too small a plot.

I object to this application on the following grounds:

1. The proposal would involve the demolition of an attractive Victorian brick wall with unusual and distinctive inlaid flint panels. The wall also incorporates a Victorian post box. The wall and post box merit being listed
2. The wall and post box together with the former office building contribute to the prevailing street scene which is predominately Victorian/ Edwardian in nature and which would be adversely affected by the proposal
3. Instead the current planning permission which provides for the office building to be converted back to a dwelling house and the wall to be renovated should be implemented

### 3.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

#### 3.1 [P20/S0759/NM](#) - Approved (24/03/2020)

Non-Material amendment to application P19/S3284/FUL to amend the wording to condition 13 remove the requirement to provide solar panels to all the market units to be replaced with a requirement to provide electric charging points for cars to all the market and shared ownership units.

#### [P20/S0345/DIS](#) - Approved (21/02/2020)

Discharge of condition 5 - landscaping on application ref. P19/S3284/FUL

#### [P19/S3284/FUL](#) - Approved (09/01/2020)

Variations of Conditions 2 and 17 on application P18/S2125/FUL to vary approved plans and change the layout of the parking and turning areas.

#### [P19/S3240/DIS](#) - Approved (11/12/2019)

Discharge of conditions 8 - Contaminated Land (preliminary risk assessment) and 10 - Wildlife Protection to application P18/S2125/FUL.

#### [P19/S3330/DIS](#) - Approved (09/12/2019)

Discharge of conditions 4 (method statement for the control of dust) & 7 (CTMP) of application P18/S2125/FUL

#### [P18/S2125/FUL](#) - Approved (19/09/2019)

The redevelopment of a redundant builders' yard including the demolition of storage and workshop buildings and the change of use of a former office building in order to create one 4-bed, seven 3-bed, three 2-bed and four 1-bed residential units.

#### [P19/S1617/PEJ](#) – Response (01/07/2019)

Residential scheme of 15 dwellings, comprising a mixture of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom houses and flats and the conversion of 6 Reading Road back into a 4 bedroom house. 40% will be affordable homes (6 in total).

#### [P17/S4073/PEJ](#) – Response (03/01/2018)

Change of use former builders' yard to residential, comprising the conversion of former offices to provide a 4 bed house and the construction of 7no. 3bed houses, 3no. 2bed houses and 4no. 1bed flats

### 4.0 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

- #### 4.1
- The site is within a 'sensitive area' for the purposes of the EIA regulations 2017 but the scale and nature of the proposed development does not require an Environmental Statement.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Development Plan Policies**

**South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS) Policies:**

- CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CSB1 - Conservation and improvement of biodiversity
- CSH1 - Amount and distribution of housing
- CSH2 - Housing density
- CSH3 - Affordable housing
- CSH4 - Meeting housing needs
- CSI1 - Infrastructure provision
- CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction
- CSQ3 - Design
- CSR1 - Housing in villages

**South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP 2011) Policies:**

- C6 - Maintain & enhance biodiversity
- D1 - Principles of good design
- D12 - Public art
- D2 - Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles
- D3 - Outdoor amenity area
- D4 - Reasonable level of privacy for occupiers
- D7 - Access for all
- EP1 - Adverse affect on people and environment
- EP2 - Adverse affect by noise or vibration
- EP3 - Adverse affect by external lighting
- G2 - Protect district from adverse development
- T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
- T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

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

**South Oxfordshire Emerging Local Plan 2034 Policies**

The council is currently progressing the emerging local plan through the examination stage. The plan currently carries **limited weight**. Relevant policies include;

- DES1E - Delivering high quality development
- DES2E - Enhancing local character
- DES5E - Outdoor amenity space
- DES6E - Residential amenity
- DES8E - Efficient use of resources
- DES9E - Promoting sustainable design
- ENV11E - Pollution - Impact from existing and/or previous land uses on new development (potential receptors of pollution)
- ENV1E - Landscape and countryside
- ENV3E - Biodiversity Non designated sites, habitats and species
- ENV6E - Historic environment
- H16E - Infill development
- H4E - Housing in the larger villages
- STRAT1E - The overall strategy

5.2 **Neighbourhood Plan.**

The Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) was made on 11 April 2019 and now forms part of the Development Plan. The relevant policies are:

Policy CNP H1 - Housing allocations in Cholsey

Policy CNP H1b - Density on development more than 10 shall be 25dph

Policy CNP H2 – Infill development

Policy CNP H3 - Range and mix of new homes.

Policy CNP H4 - Affordable Housing and Starter Homes.

Policy CNP H5 - Scale and context of development.

Policy CNP H6 - Parking provision

Policy CNP E1 - Landscape impact considerations.

Policy CNP I1 - Provision of facilities.

Policy CNP I3 - Drainage.

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

5.3 **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG 2016)

Developer Contributions SPD

5.4 **National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance**

5.5 **Other Relevant Legislation**

Human Rights Act 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

Equality Act 2010

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

The NWD AONB Management Plan 2014-2019

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 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.

Where development conflicts with the Development Plan planning permission should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where the development plan is silent on a particular matter or specifically directs assessment in line with national planning policy the development will be assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In the case of this application, the most relevant parts of the Development Plan are the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) which was adopted in December 2012, the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP) and the Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan (2019).

**The relevant planning considerations in the case of this application are the following:**

- Current policy
- H4 criteria
- Provision of gardens
- Affordable housing
- Impact on AONB
- Drainage
- Ecology
- Contamination
- Other material planning considerations
- Pre-commencement conditions
- CIL

6.2 **Current Policy.** SOCS Policy CS1 reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF. For housing growth, 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. Within the district's settlement hierarchy Cholsey is classified as a 'larger village' where in principle there is no upper limit to the size of site capable of accommodating infill residential development or the redevelopment of sites for new housing having regard to Policy CSR1 of the SOLP. Within the context of Policy CSR1 infill development 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'.

This strategy for housing growth is reflected in emerging policy STRAT1 and H16 from ESOLP but these policies carry limited weight at this stage.

In addition, Policy H1 of the CNP allocates the whole of the Boshers site (of which this site is part) for around 10 dwellings (CHOL9). Infill development is also supported within the built-up areas of the village by policy CNPH2 – it mirrors the criteria set out in Policy H4 of SOLP.

The application site is located within the main built up area of Cholsey and is surrounded on all sides by existing residential development or where planning permission has been granted for new housing. The site meets the definition of infill development and therefore the principle of redeveloping the site to provide additional dwellings is acceptable. The proposal accords with Policies CS1, CSS1 and CSR1 of the SOCS and policies CNPH1 and CNPH2 of the development plan in my view.

6.3 **H4. Criteria.** If a proposed housing development is acceptable in principle, then the detail of the proposal must be assessed against the criteria of saved Policy H4 of the SOLP and CNPH2 and CNPH5 of the CNP.

**H4 criteria issues.**

- i **That an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost;**

**Open space.** The site currently appears as a single dwelling with an attractive area of front and side garden. I do not consider the site to be public open space. The site assessment document supporting the CNP makes no reference to the need to retain any of the existing structures on the site and the cultural heritage and landscape impacts of development are defined as negligible.

**Ecology.** See paragraphs 6.15 and 6.16

6.4 ii **Design, height and bulk in keeping with the surroundings;**

The site is surrounded by residential development. Most of the surrounding houses are two storey and there are examples of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. 8, 10, 12 and 14 Reading Road are three-storey terrace properties with the second floor lit by dormer windows in the roof space. There is a range of materials either brick and render for walls and plain clay tiles or slate for roofs.



The application proposes two, three-storey brick-built dwellings with the second floor lit by dormers in the roof space similar in character to 8 to 14 Reading Road. The eaves and ridges of the dwellings is somewhat higher than the buildings to either side but there is such a range of character in the area that I do not consider the additional height is harmful to that character.

6.5 iii **That the character of the area is not adversely affected;**

The site is prominent as it sits on Reading Road. Terracing is the predominant form of housing on Reading Road with few gaps between the terrace lines. In my view the proposal allows for some gaps between 4 and 10 Reading Road and the character of the area will not be adversely affected.

6.6 iv **Amenity, environmental or highway/ parking objections;**

**Highway issues.**

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

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

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

Policies T1 and T2 require that all new development provides safe and convenient access to the highway and sufficient turning and parking areas where required.

Emerging Policy TRANS5 of ESOLP echoes these provisions

The application proposes a new centrally positioned access point with vision splays.



The OCC highways officer has considered the application carefully and has no objection to the new access point. The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant intensification of transport activity at the property, in addition the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network. Two conditions are however proposed; The first requires that the existing access to the former builders' yard is closed up and the second that the vision splay is to be provided in accordance with the plan. The development accords with the transport policies in the development plan in my view.

- 6.7 It should be noted that the scheme originally proposed for the housing development on the larger Boshers site (ref P18/S2125/FUL) included a new, two-way access road to serve the development and a new access to the retained no 6 Reading Road – see below. The approved layout had a significantly greater impact on traffic generation and movements than now proposed. The developer has chosen not to implement the original approval and has gained a further planning permission for a change to the layout to omit the new access road onto Reading Road (ref P19/S3284/FUL).



Detail of approved access to the Boshers site from application P18/S2125/FUL

- 6.8 **Parking.** Appendix 5 of SOLP sets out the council's maximum parking standards based on the number of bedrooms within a development. For 1 bedroom units the maximum requirement is 1 space. For 2/3 bedroom units 2 spaces and for 4+ bedrooms 2+ spaces on merit.

Policy CNPH6 of the CNP goes further than the SOLP policy as it seeks to ensure that all new dwellings provide adequate parking provision based on the number of bedrooms per dwelling. 4 bed dwellings, as in this case, are required to provide 3 parking spaces (only 2 need to be allocated).

In this case two allocated spaces are provided for each dwelling and there is space for a further one car and manoeuvring area behind the allocated spaces. As such the parking provision accords with the development plan policies.

- 6.9 **Neighbour impact.** Policies H4 and D4 of the SOLP and Policy CNP H5 of the CNP seek to protect the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties

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

In this case the two nearest dwellings are 4 and 8 Reading Road. 4 Reading Road has a clear glazed window in the first floor of the side elevation which would look out onto the flank elevation of the new dwelling on plot 1 at a distance of just over 5 metres. I am satisfied that at this distance the new dwelling would not be oppressive. There are no new windows proposed in either side elevation of the proposed dwellings and 8 Reading Road has no windows in its side elevation. Overlooking would only occur from windows in the rear elevations of the dwellings and this is to be expected in any street arrangement.



The proposed dwellings maintain a similar building line to 4 and 8 and would have a traditional side to side relationship. I am satisfied that this relationship is acceptable, and the development would accord with the development plan policies in this respect.

6.10 **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.** In this case the site has a frontage to a road and is not backland development.

6.11 **Provision of gardens.** Minimum standards for new residential development are recommended in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide and in Policy D3 of the Local Plan.

Emerging Policy DES5 of ESOLP recognises the importance of outdoor amenity space and states that new development should demonstrate that the size, location and character of the gardens have been considered as an integral part of the design.

In this case a minimum of 100 square metres of private garden area would be required for 3, 4 or 5 bed dwellings; 2 and 1 bed units would need a garden area of 50 and 35 square metres respectively.

The inability to provide these minimum standards can be an indication that what is being proposed is an overdevelopment of the site. In this case both gardens are 100 sqm in size. As such, the development accords with Policy D3 in my view.

6.12 **Affordable housing.**

Policy CSH3 of the Core Strategy seeks to achieve 40% of affordable housing on sites where there is a net gain of 3 houses. The original planning permission provides for 6 affordable units and these have been secured via a S106 agreement. The current application changes the proportion of dwellings on the site and a further 0.4 of a unit as a financial contribution should be provided to meet policy CSH3.

In this case the agent has offered a payment of £19,602 to meet the additional affordable housing contribution. This has been calculated taking into account the vacant building credit of the existing buildings. The agent has provided a unilateral undertaking with the application covering the financial contribution. As such, the development accords with Policy CSH3 in my view.

6.13 **Impact on the AONB.** Paragraph 172 of the NPPF (2018) confirms that "great weight" should be given to conserving and enhancing the character and qualities of the AONB "*which have the highest status of protection*". This reinforces the statutory duty placed on the council under S85 of the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000.

An over-riding principle of the NPPF is that any development within the Chilterns or North Wessex Downs should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and in so doing not result in harm to the special qualities of the AONB (para 11, 171, 172). Major development should not take place in the AONB, except in exceptional circumstances (para 172).

In this case, the site is previously developed land and because the site is entirely enclosed within the built-up limits of Cholsey and it is part of an existing built frontage, the impact on the AONB will be very limited. For the reasons identified in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 the development accords with the Development plan policies in this respect.

6.14 **Drainage.** Policy EP6 of SOCS requires that wherever practicable developers should demonstrate that the surface water management systems on any development accords with sustainable drainage principles and should effectively mitigate any adverse effects from surface water runoff.

Emerging Policy INF4 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that there is or will be adequate water supply, surface water, foul drainage and sewerage treatment capacity to serve the whole development

Following the receipt of additional information in respect of drainage the council's drainage officer has no objection to the application subject to a condition requiring surface water drainage details. As such, the proposal accords with Policy EP1 and EP6.

- 6.15 **Impact on ecology.** Policy CSB1 of SOCS aims to avoid a net loss of biodiversity, it encourages opportunities to achieve a net gain of biodiversity.

Policy C8 of SOLP goes on to state that development that would have an adverse effect on a site supporting a specially protected species will not be permitted unless damage to the ecological interest can be prevented through the use of planning conditions or obligations.

- 6.16 The wider site has previously been subject to bat surveys and no evidence of bat roosting is attributed to the building to be demolished as part of this application. It is noted that swift boxes are present on the north eastern elevation of the building. The countryside officer is satisfied that the proposed development is unlikely to have any significant ecological impacts, but has recommended a condition to secure compensatory roosting and nesting provision. Subject to the inclusion of a condition I am satisfied that the proposal accords with Policy CSB1 of the SOCS, C8 of SOLP.

- 6.17 **Contamination.** Policy EP8 of SOLP states that development will not be permitted unless contamination is effectively treated by the developer.

Additional information has been submitted in respect of contamination. The additional report outlines a proposal for a clean cover system for landscaped areas and then explains a number of areas of concern for land contamination which require further action/ investigation.

The contaminated land officer has considered the information and has no objection to the proposal subject to a condition to investigate further and mitigate if required. As such I am satisfied that the development will accord with Policy EP8 of SOLP.

- 6.18 **Other material planning considerations.**

The Parish Council and neighbours have objected to the loss of the existing building and front boundary wall because of their contribution to the street scene. The house is a substantial Victorian dwelling and they consider that it should remain as part of our ancient village. The wall, similarly is distinctive with its inlaid flint panels. A Victorian Post Box (VR) is also incorporated at one end of the wall and it is still in daily use. The parish council are exploring the possibility of having these features listed.

Whilst the value of the building and wall are noted, the site is allocated for residential development in the CNP under policy CNPH1. The site assessment document supporting the CNP makes no reference to the need to retain any of the existing structures on the site and the cultural heritage and landscape impacts of development are defined as negligible. In addition, the approved scheme for the site has already given consent for the removal of much of the front boundary wall to create an access.

The conservation officer has considered the loss of these features. The building proposed for demolition is not a designated heritage asset (listed) or within the setting of, nor is it a non-designated heritage asset (locally listed) and it is also not situated within a designated Conservation Area.

She considers that the building holds limited architectural interest in heritage terms and the loss is not sufficient to engage local or national heritage policies. She does not consider Historic England would consider the building or boundary features for national designation either. As such a refusal of planning permission on these grounds would be difficult to sustain.

It is worth noting at that the Royal Mail post box in the brick pier of the wall is to be retained.

6.19 **Pre-commencement conditions.** In accordance with S.100ZA of the TCPA 1990, agreement with the applicant has been sought for all pre-commencement conditions (2 conditions). These have been all agreed in writing.

6.20 **Community Infrastructure Levy.** The council's CIL charging schedule has been adopted and 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 is liable because it involves the creation of new dwellings. 25% of the CIL payment will go directly to Cholsey Parish Council for spending towards local projects.

## 7.0 **CONCLUSION**

7.1 I recommend that planning permission is granted because Cholsey is a sustainable location where infill development and redevelopment of existing sites is permitted in principle. The new dwellings would replace an existing building that whilst is attractive it is not of such heritage importance that it should be retained.

The design of the new dwellings reflects the local vernacular and building materials and does not detract from the wider character of the area. The site affords for an acceptable amount of amenity space and does not result in a materially harmful unneighbourly impact to adjacent properties. Conditions are proposed relating to highway matters, drainage, materials, contamination and ecology.

The development accords with the relevant development plan policies in the SOCS, SOLP and CNP.

## 8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **That Planning Permission is granted subject to the following conditions.**

### **Standard Conditions**

- 1 : Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission**
- 2 : Approved plans**

### **Pre commencement conditions**

- 3: Surface water drainage scheme**
- 4: Investigate for contamination**

**Compliance conditions**

- 5: Materials as specified**
- 6: Remediate for any contamination**
- 7: Bird and bat boxes required**
- 8: Provide new access**
- 9: Close existing access**
- 10: Provide vision splay**
- 11: Provide parking and manoeuvring areas**

**Author:** Sharon Crawford  
**Contact No:** 01235 540546  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

---

Delegated Authority Sign-Off Officer