

---

SUBJECT            **DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REPORTS**

REPORT OF        Head of Planning and Building Control

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P13/S2184/O</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE
<b>REGISTERED</b>	25.7.2013
<b>PARISH</b>	HARPSDEN
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Mr Malcolm Leonard Mr Robert Simister
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mrs Claire Engbers
<b>SITE</b>	Thames Farm Reading Road Shiplake, RG9 3PH
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline application for up to 110 dwellings (access not reserved).
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	476843/179925
<b>OFFICER</b>	Mrs N Ireland

---

1.0    **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1    This application has been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Jennifer Wood – Ward Member for Henley South.
- 1.2    The application site falls within the parish of Harpsden. The southern boundary of the red line site area for the application follows the Harpsden and Shiplake parish boundary.
- 1.3    The site area extends to 5.65 hectares and is broadly rectangular in shape. The site excludes the former agricultural building which now has the benefit of a planning permission for conversion to residential which was allowed on appeal (P10/E1755 relates). The site is gently sloping in an east to west direction and its lawful use is considered to be agricultural. There is an existing vehicular access off the A4155 which has the benefit of a planning permission granted in January 2005 (P04/E0938 relates).
- 1.4    A Tree Preservation Order (TPO) was served on 14 October 2013 concerning the belt of trees located along the northern and eastern boundaries of the application site. The site is contained by an established hedge/ tree belt, otherwise, the site has no features of particular visual interest.
- 1.5    The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.

**2.0 PROPOSAL**

2.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 110 dwellings on land at Thames Farm, Reading Road, Shiplake. The means of access is not a reserved matter and is therefore sought as part of the outline application; all other matters are reserved for determination at a later date.

2.2 The application has been accompanied by an illustrative masterplan to demonstrate how the proposed residential development could be accommodated on the site, However, the masterplan does not form part of the application, it is for indicative purposes only. The application indicates a proposed a mix of dwelling sizes, again this is indicative only:

- 1-bed = 9 units
- 2-bed = 30 units
- 3-bed = 43 units
- 4-bed = 20 units
- 5-bed = 8 units.

A copy of the site masterplan is **attached** at Appendix 3.

2.3 The application includes the following supporting information:

- Planning Statement (Volumes I-III incl appendices)
- Design and Access Statement incorporating a Design Brief
- Transport Assessment
- Travel Plan
- Ecological Appraisal
- Arboricultural Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Foul Sewerage and Utilities (Infrastructure) Report
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Contaminates Land Questionnaire
- CSH Pre-Assessment
- Sustainability Appraisal

**3.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Comments from consultees are summarised below. The detailed comments can be viewed on the webiste under the planning application reference number.

**Harpden Parish Council – Object:**

- The application is in conflict with the SODC Core Strategy
- The application has been submitted in advance of the Neighbourhood Plan and will therefore undermine the process.
- It is a greenfield site outside the village boundaries
- Such high density housing is in conflict with the rural character of the area
- It would represent a 20% increase in the size of the village
- There are no school places available and this would generate significant extra traffic as pupils would have to travel to distant schools
- Crossing the A4155 to access Shiplake village is very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists
- There are no robust plans for sustainable travel

- Proper consideration has not been given to the provision of utilities and services to the site.
- It would be a major step towards amalgamating Shiplake and Harpsden into Henley.

**Shiplake Parish Council** – Object. The detailed comments are **attached** at Appendix 2. A summary of key points is set out below:

- The site is excluded as an allocated housing site in the SODC Core Strategy and is outside village settlement limits.
- As an application for housing adjacent to a smaller village it would be contrary to policy CSR1 of the Core Strategy
- It is a Greenfield site and any building development would unacceptably erode the rural character of this corner of the village landscape
- It would present major infrastructure issues – the primary school is already over-subscribed. Traffic generation and safety would be adversely affected.
- There is no demonstrable need for more housing arising directly from Shiplake villages.
- The application fails significantly to justify development of this site in advance of the consideration of alternatives in meeting any shortfall in housing supply.
- The local plan is the correct vehicle for identifying strategic housing allocations and setting the framework within which housing sites should come forward.

**Henley on Thames Town Council** – Object

- The joint Neighbourhood Plan for Henley and Harpsden is well under way
- The Localism Act was passed to give residents a say. A development of this size is clearly within that remit.
- The committee is disappointed that this application has been made outside of the NP consideration. The site is clearly within the Neighbourhood Plan area and as such should be debated by the residents.

**CPRE (Henley and Mapledurham District)** – Object:

- This is a greenfield site outside village boundaries
- The proposed development would amalgamate the settlements of Harpsden and Shiplake
- The development would be harmful to the beauty of this open and agricultural part of the Thames Valley bringing with it increased traffic, light pollution and suburbanisation.
- The Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been completed.

**Crime Prevention Design Adviser** - No strong views subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of detailed measures demonstrating that 'Secured by Design' accreditation will be achieved in the planning layout.

**Oxfordshire County Council:**

Transport & Planning Strategy

Legal Agreement required to secure:

- Contribution towards enhancing local bus services
- Improvements to bus stop facilities – connecting footpaths, hardstanding areas and road crossing facility & bus shelter provision

Transport Development Control

**Holding objection:**

- There are outstanding details regarding the location emergency access arrangement onto Bolney Lane.
- Further detail and agreement needed with the Rights of Way team regarding the upgrade of an existing public footpath between Reading Road and Northfield Avenue – surfaced and lit
- Construction Management Plan will be required.
- All roads within the site should be designed and constructed to SUDS standards.
- Details of the proposed access layout have yet to be agreed.
- It has not been demonstrated that a refuse vehicle can safely access the site.

OCC Drainage

No objection – the main carriageways within the development could be permeable paved to reduce the need for/ size of ponds.

Archaeology

No objection subject to the imposition of a condition requiring a staged archaeological investigation to be undertaken.

Education

The primary school serving the area is full and cannot be acceptably expanded to meet the needs of this development. Additional school capacity is planned in Henley to meet population growth including that expected through local housing development during the plan period. The nearest primary schools which could be expanded are more than 2 miles away and they don't offer a safe walking route and there are not appropriate sustainable options for this development. Should the development occur, it would be expected to contribute towards the cost of expanding Henley school capacity and this has been calculated from figures in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be in the region of £289,550 (index linked). Contributions would also be sought to fully fund the transport costs for children to attend the school but this is not considered a sufficient solution and this would be in the region of £30-£38,000 per annum. Additional education funds would be sought for secondary education and SEN.

Property

No objections subject to infrastructure provision being secured through a legal agreement, namely contributions towards; education, libraries, museum resource, waste management and social and health care

**Thames Water Development Control** - No objections subject to conditions requiring the completion of impact studies of the existing water supply and infrastructure and the submission of a drainage strategy detailing on and off site drainage works. Details of surface water drainage to be submitted to and approved in writing.

**Environment Agency** – Objection - There is a lack of adequate information to demonstrate that the risks of pollution posed to the Harpsden public water supply

abstraction can be safely managed.

**The Henley Society (Planning) – Objection.**

- The area concerned is not in Shiplake but Harpsden parish and is therefore within the boundary agreed for the Henley/ Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan.
- No decision on the future of Thames Farm should be taken while the Neighbourhood Plan is still in the process of preparation.
- A strong objection to this proposal in Local Plan policy terms relating to villages, the policy to maintain open countryside between Henley and Caversham, the lack of local facilities, the impact of additional traffic on the A4155.

**Health & Housing - Env. Protection Team** – No strong views subject to the imposition of conditions restricting construction times and details to minimise impact upon neighbouring properties from noise, vibration, dust and traffic.

**Housing Development** - No strong views provided the affordable housing provision meets the requirements of policy CSH3 of the approved Core Strategy.

**Drainage Engineer - MONSON** – Foul and surface water drainage details should be submitted to and approved in writing (condition).

**Urban Design Officer** – Comments relate to the illustrative plan:

- Housing is set back from the Bolney Byway, it would be preferable to pull the building line forward to improve passive surveillance of the route.
- The amenity value of the POS is reduced by being used in part as balancing ponds for the drainage system. The open space should be calculated to exclude this area.
- The rear car parking court to the south west is not sufficiently overlooked and consequently is unlikely to be used by residents.

**Corporate Strategy** - No strong views subject to the provision of benches and litter bins in the open space areas. If there is a play area, this should be subject to local consultation to ensure it meets the needs of young people.

**Leisure & Economic Development** - No strong views subject to financial contributions for £81,555 for indoor recreation and £81,555 for outdoor recreation totally £163,110 for sports contributions (based on the mix set out in the application.

**Health & Housing - Air Quality** – No objections to the proposal  
 Equalities Officer ( Shared ) - No strong views, measures should incorporate wheelie bin storage, mix of property sizes, provision of seating within greenspace areas.

**Countryside Officer** – Objection. An Ecological Appraisal has been submitted which identifies that additional surveys are required. The site contains habitats which have the potential to be used by a number of protected species – Bats, Dormouse and Great Crested Newts and the impacts of the proposals on these species are not yet known. Additional survey work is therefore necessary and only once this information is available will it be possible to determine this application.

**Forestry Officer** - Objection. The trees along the frontage of the site are now the subject of a Tree Preservation Order due to their amenity value. The proposed new access, sight line requirements and carriageway widening will cause significant damage to the woodland belt that forms the frontage of the site. To achieve these works will

require the removal of 16 individual trees and 2 groups of trees – 8 of these have been categorised as A and B trees which are trees suitable for retention due to their arboricultural values. The proposed works will also see the removal of Veteran Oak which has the potential to provide bat roosting habitat. There is a lack of detail over the impact upon the Upper Bolney Lane tree belt through the creation of the emergency access.

**Health & Housing - Contaminated Land** – No objection subject to the imposition of conditions requiring a land contamination survey and any remedial works necessary.

**Local Residents – Object (91)**

- Flies in the face of local housing policy (CSR1) and will destroy a beautiful green field between Shiplake and Harpsden
- There is a joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan in production.
- The proposal must be judged in isolation; it is not engaging with the local community and contravenes NPPF guidelines.
- Access to the local village is via new footpaths which lead to a single muddy, unlit track that leads through gates across a field which is water logged in winter months.
- Increased pressure on already overstretched local amenities and will cause major infrastructure problems.
- There are limited resources in the area, it is more appropriate for development of this scale to take place in the towns.
- The local primary school is already over-subscribed and is not considered suitable for expansion by Oxfordshire County Council.
- There is no doctor's surgery in the village.
- There are no pavements or cycle route from the site.
- This is a rural setting and the proposal is completely out of character with the surroundings.
- The development will lead to disturbances in local water drainage
- There will be issues of light pollution for neighbouring properties.
- There is a range of wildlife in the immediate area that needs looking after and protecting.
- The density is out of character with the area.
- Plans show many old character trees to be removed.
- Main road requires widening and pavements which are not continued elsewhere.
- It is a rural location – walkways, pedestrian islands, bus stops, extra signage and traffic will destroy the essential rural nature of the location.
- Proposal will dramatically add to the existing traffic congestion on the A4115 and create local issues on a road with a dreadful record for safety.
- It would increase the size of the settlement by 20%.
- The hourly bus service is inadequate.

**Local Residents – Support (2)**

- Houses need to be built somewhere
- This site should be considered as part of Henley's growth – this has a better road network than Gillots Lane.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P08/E1357](#) - Approved (06/02/2009)

Change of use from agricultural building to employment use (B1).

[P05/E0831](#) - Refused (22/11/2005) - Refused on appeal (25/08/2006)

Change of use from agricultural building to farm shop with new front porch.

[P04/E0938](#) - Approved (26/01/2005)

Closure of existing access and provision of new access onto the Reading Road (as amplified by Draft Business Plan and Road Safety Audit accompanying letter from Agent dated 6 December 2004 and agent's letter dated 10 January 2005).

[P03/S0082](#) - Approved (18/06/2003)

Erection of a polytunnel.

[P03/S0316](#) - Refused (12/06/2003)

New access on to Reading Road and closure of existing access.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy policies:

CSB1 - Conservation and improvement of biodiversity  
CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development  
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy  
CSEN1 - Landscape protection  
CSG1 - Green infrastructure  
CSH2 - Housing density  
CSH3 - Affordable housing  
CSH4 - Meeting housing needs  
CSEN1 - The Strategy for Henley-on-Thames  
CS11 - Infrastructure provision  
CSM1 - Transport  
CSM2 - Transport Assessments and Travel Plans  
CSR1 - Housing in villages  
CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction  
CSQ3 - Design  
CSQ4 - Design Briefs

5.2 South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;

C4 - Landscape setting of settlements  
C6 - Maintain & enhance biodiversity  
C8 - Adverse affect on protected species  
C9 - Loss of landscape features  
CON12 - Archaeology  
D1 - Principles of good design  
D12 - Public art  
D6 - Community safety  
EP1 - Adverse affect on people and environment  
EP4 - Impact on water resources  
EP6 - Sustainable drainage  
EP7 - Impact on ground water resources  
G2 - Protect district from adverse development  
G4 - Protection of Countryside

- H4 - Housing sites in towns and larger villages outside Green Belt
- R1 - Outdoor sport or play areas
- R2 - Provision of play areas on new housing development
- R6 - Public open space in new residential development
- T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users
- T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment - SOLA

### 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework

## 6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 I consider that the following represent the principal planning issues:

- The principal of residential development on this site
- Whether there are any highway safety issues
- Whether the proposed development would impact upon trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order
- Whether there are any ecological constraints on the site
- Whether there are any drainage and ground water resource issues
- Whether the proposal provides adequate levels of affordable housing and housing mix to meet the Districts housing needs
- Whether the proposal makes adequate provision to meet the infrastructure needs generated by the development
- Whether the application site can provide the quantum of development in an acceptable manner.
- Whether there is an impact on the amenity levels of existing residential properties

### **Principal of Residential Development**

#### Core Strategy

- 6.2 Policy CSS1 of the approved Core Strategy sets out the overall development strategy for the District and advises that proposals should be consistent with the overall strategy of focusing major new development in Didcot; supporting the roles of Henley, Thame and Wallingford by regenerating town centres and providing new housing, services & infrastructure; supporting the 12 larger settlements of the district as local service centres; supporting the other villages by allowing for limited amounts of housing; and outside of the above areas, any changes will need to relate to very specific needs.
- 6.3 The application site falls within the Parish of Harpsden although the site is located in closer proximity to the built-up confines of Lower Shiplake rather than Harpsden. Lower Shiplake is classified within the Core Strategy as being a smaller village and the application site measures a distance of approximately 2.9km from Henley Market Place.



- 6.4 Policy CSR1 deals with housing in the villages across the district and stipulates that within the smaller villages infill development on sites of up to 0.2ha will be permitted. 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.
- 6.5 Given the location of the site outside of a smaller village and having regard to the scale of development proposed – up to 110 dwellings, the proposal is contrary to the Core Strategy’s overall development distribution strategy which is set out in policy CSS1 (referred to at paragraph 6.2 above).
- 6.6 The application site extends some 5.56 ha which takes it outside of consideration under policy CSR1. Furthermore, the site is not considered to fall within the definition of infill since it lies on the edge of the settlement.
- 6.7 For the reasons set out above, the principal of development on this site for residential development is contrary to Development Plan policies CSS1 and CSR1.

#### Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan

- 6.8 Henley Town Council and Harpsden Parish Council are working together on a Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan. A neighbourhood area has been designated by SODC and work is progressing on preparing the plan, which will include making land allocations for 400 additional homes. The application site falls within the designated neighbourhood area. The timescales for the Neighbourhood Plan are anticipated at being ready for a draft document out for consultation in February/ March 2014, working towards examination in the summer of 2014. This speculative application, coming before the emerging neighbourhood plan has made its allocations, does not respect the core principle of planning set out in NPPF paragraph 17 that planning should: “be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area”.

#### 5 Year Land Supply

- 6.9 The Development Plan is up to date and the council is meeting its responsibilities in terms of maintaining a five year supply of housing land in the Rest of the District. The recent Assessment of the 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites (April 2013) indicates that in the Rest of the District there is a healthy supply of 6.4 years. There is therefore no need to consider this application against paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

#### **Highway Safety**

- 6.10 The application proposes the creation of a new vehicular access to be taken directly off the Reading Road. The access point is proposed less than 10.0 metres to the south of the existing access point. The proposal would see the closures of the existing access and planted up to fill the existing gap in the tree belt.
- 6.11 The access would be provided with a 2.4m x 90m visibility splay, all of which is contained on land within the ownership of the applicant or the local highway authority. A ghost island right hand lane is also proposed to allow for the free-flow of traffic on either side of the carriageway.

- 6.12 The application further proposes for the provision of a footway to and from Upper Bolney Lane on the western side of the A4155 and provision of a pedestrian route on the eastern side of the A4115 to link up with the existing right of way together with the provision of a pedestrian refuge.
- 6.13 The application was accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) and a residential Travel Plan to address all the transport and access issues within the context of the adopted development plan policies and the wider guidance set out within the NPPF.
- 6.14 The conclusions set out within the TA indicate that:
- The site has convenient access to the highway network, with direct access onto the A4155;
  - The proposal is compliant with national and local plan policies;
  - The site has good accessibility by means of transport other than the private car;
  - The new access arrangement onto Reading Road complies with adopted highway standards;
  - The proposal would have an insignificant impact on highway safety and the accident record; and
  - The proposal would have an insignificant impact on the operation and capacity of the local highway network.
- 6.15 The application has been the subject of detailed consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and there are no objections raised in respect of highway safety or capacity issues. There are a number of outstanding matters that need resolution and as such a holding objection has been raised by the County Council. The concerns relate to:
- The upgrade of the existing unmade public footpath between Reading Road and Northfield Avenue to a surfaced and lit Right of Way and how this will be achieved;
  - The provision of an Emergency only access off Bolney Lane together with a separate footway connection. It is proposed to bollard the emergency access. Bolney Lane is a Public Right of Way and part of this is a Bridleway. Further discussion and confirmation is required to demonstrate that the applicant has the permissive rights for vehicles to pass over the bridleway. In addition to this further information is required on the location of the emergency access and how it will operate and be managed;
  - The final details of the main site access, emergency and pedestrian access have not been agreed with the Local Highway Authority;
  - The TA includes a drawing illustrating the swept path of a refuse vehicle; this drawing does not demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can safely access the site and as such, confirmation is required to demonstrate that this manoeuvre can be achieved.
- 6.16 The Local Highway Authority is seeking financial contributions towards public transport provision and associated infrastructure although the level of contribution sought is unknown at this stage.
- 6.17 It is your officer's view that the outstanding matters need addressing and resolution in accordance with policy T1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 before a planning permission can be granted.

**Forestry Issues**

- 6.18 The site is bound on the northern and eastern boundaries by substantial woodland belts with the eastern boundary falling adjacent to the A4155 Reading Road and the northern boundary borders the public right of way - Upper Bolney Lane. Both woodland belts were considered to be of sufficient amenity value that a Tree Preservation Order was issued on 14 October covering the extent of these woodland belts. A plan illustrating the extent of the area covered by the TPO is **attached** at Appendix 4.
- 6.19 The woodland belt adjacent to the Reading Road is considered to be a significant landscape feature which consists of a mix of evergreen and broadleaved trees of differing ages and species, all of which are considered essential elements to securing on-going tree cover for the area and consequently providing valuable habitat features and a continuing important landscape feature.
- 6.20 The application proposal involves the provision of a new access with sight line requirements together with widening of the existing carriageway. All of these elements will cause significant damage to this woodland belt. To achieve the necessary sightlines and to clear a route for the new roadway/ expansion will require the removal of 16 individual trees and 2 groups of trees. 8 of these trees are categorised by the applicants' arborist as being category A and B trees. BS5837 2012 entitled "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction" states that category A & B trees are suitable for retention due to their arboricultural values and are therefore likely to be considered as a constraint to development.
- 6.21 The collective impact of this removal will impact on the woodlands landscape value, its future screening value, habitat value and the woodlands overall structural integrity.
- 6.22 Tree T15 has been identified for removal and has been assessed by the applicant as a veteran Oak with the potential to provide a bat roosting habitat. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states:
- "planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland".*
- 6.23 The proposal's new footpaths pass through the root protection areas of multiple woodland trees and trees. The submitted arboricultural report states that some of the path will be constructed using No Dig methods; however, due to the existing topography of the sections of the land it is unlikely that an above ground level construction method will be able to provide a suitable footpath that meets the County Council standards. It is considered that any of the standard construction paths shown to be within the woodland and the adjacent verge will cause significant root damage, thereby causing further tree decline and loss.
- 6.24 Having regard to the above factors, it is considered that the proposals contravene policies CSEN1 of the approved Core Strategy and C9 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan and advice contained within the NPPF, in particular paragraph 118.

### Ecology

- 6.25 The application scheme was submitted with an Ecological Appraisal. The report identified six trees which are considered to have a moderate to high potential to support roosting bats. The proposal will involve the removal of four of these trees. Bat surveys have not been conducted for the site and as such the impact of the proposal is not yet known.
- 6.26 The woodland belts around the site are also considered to have the potential to support a population of Dormouse; again, surveys have not been conducted to assess any potential impact of this proposal.
- 6.27 There are also several water bodies surrounding the site which have the potential to support amphibians including great crested newts (GCN). These ponds have not been surveyed and there is no indication of any proposals to prevent harm to this species in the form of a method statement. As a result there is the potential that reptiles including GCN could be harmed as a result of these proposals.

- 6.28 Guidance contained within the NPPF and the accompanying Circular (ODPM 06/2005) states that:

*“The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal...”*

it goes on to state:

*“it is essential that the presence or otherwise of a protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted”.*

- 6.29 The site contains habitats which have the potential to be used by a number of protected species. The impacts of the proposals on these species are unknown at this stage. Granting a planning permission for this proposal in the absence of the above detail could result in an offence being committed under both British and European Legislation.
- 6.30 For the reasons advanced above it is considered that the proposals contravene policies C6 and C9 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan and policy CSB1 of the approved Core Strategy and further advice contained within Section 11 of the NPPF and accompanying Circular.

### Drainage and Groundwater Protection

- 6.31 It is understood through consultation with the Environment Agency that the application site area is within the inner source protection zone for the public water supply abstraction at Harpsden - the abstraction point is located within 200m of the application site area.
- 6.32 The proposal will generate large quantities of foul sewage and as yet, details for the means of disposal have not been provided. The NPPF advises at paragraph 109 that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.

- 6.33 The application has not been accompanied by a drainage strategy to assist in the assessment of waste water infrastructure and surface water drainage.
- 6.34 It would normally be acceptable to determine this application (in the event of a permission being granted) and attach a Grampian Style condition requiring the submission and approval of drainage strategies prior to the commencement of development. However, the objection raised by the Environment Agency casts doubt on what scale of works would be required to facilitate this development. It is therefore officer's opinion that there is insufficient information to hand to satisfactorily determine the drainage impact of the proposal as required by policy EP4 and EP7 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.

**Affordable Housing and Housing Mix**

Affordable Housing

- 6.35 The application is submitted in outline with all matters reserved. The supporting documentation gives a clear indication in the submission detail of the mix of development, with regard to property size and suggests that a provision of 40% affordable housing in accordance with policy CSH3 could be provided. There has been no agreement reached on how the provision of affordable housing could be met and the illustrative layout plan does not indicate the location of the affordable housing, i.e. the pepper-pot arrangement required in the council's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (saved SPG 2004). The proposal in its current form fails to comply with policy CSH3 of the approved Core Strategy as there is nothing in place, in the form of a S.106 agreement or unilateral undertaking to secure the affordable housing provision.
- 6.36 Notwithstanding this objection, it is acknowledged that the matter could be overcome through negotiation and the completion of a suitably worded agreement.

Housing Mix

- 6.37 The Planning Statement sets out a suggested housing mix but this is only in overall terms and does not differentiate between open market and affordable housing.
- 6.38 Policy CSH4 of the Core Strategy requires residential developments to meet the needs of current and future households. The latest Housing Needs Assessment (2011) sets out the following mix:

Tenure	1-bed	2-bed	3-bed	4-bed+
Social Rented	60%		40%	
Intermediate	20%	70%	10%	0%
Market Sector	50%		50%	

- 6.39 From the information submitted, it is apparent that the housing mix set in the application fails to meet the requirement set out within the Housing Needs Assessment and supported through policy CSH4 in that the provision of larger units (3-bed plus) far exceeds the mix set out in the above table. The council’s Housing Development Officer sets out a mix that meets the requirements of the Housing Needs Assessment in relation to the affordable housing provision. Using these figures against the suggested mix for the site in its entirety, it is clear that there is an over provision of larger units.

The table below illustrates the proposed mix, against the affordable housing requirement and what policy CSH3 requires for market housing.

Dwelling Size	Mix Proposed	Affordable Housing requirement (HNA)	Market Housing available based on proposed mix	Market Housing mix compliant with HNA
1-bed	9	7	2	2
2-bed	30	23	7	31
3-bed	43	9	34	33 (total mix of 3,4 & 5 bed)
4-bed	20	5	15	
5-bed	8		8	

The proposed scheme over provides for larger units in the market sector which clearly fails to comply with policy CSH3 of the approved Core Strategy and to advice contained within paragraph 50 of the NPPF.

- 6.40 Whilst the proposal is considered to conflict with policy requirements, it must be acknowledged that the application has been submitted in outline with all matters reserved other than access. In the event of an outline planning permission being granted, the objection to the proposal on this basis could be overcome through the submission of any further Reserved Matters proposals.

**Infrastructure**

- 6.41 The proposed development of up to 110 dwellings will place an inevitable strain on existing infrastructure. Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy advises that all new development must be served and supported by appropriate on and off-site infrastructure and services and that planning permission will only be granted when infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the new development are agreed, in place or will be provided within an agreed timescale. The policy goes on to advise that infrastructure and services required as a consequence of development will be sought from developers and secured by the completion of a legal agreement. To date there is no agreement in place to mitigate this impact. A refusal reason relating to the lack of infrastructure provision as required by policy CS11 is therefore recommended although it is acknowledged that this could be overcome through the negotiation and completion of appropriate legal agreements.

### Site Layout

- 6.42 The application has been submitted with the internal site layout reserved for later consideration. The proposal's documentation includes an 'illustrative' layout for information purposes only and to demonstrate that a layout of 110 dwellings can be achieved on the site.
- 6.43 The illustrative layout, although appearing as a stand alone development has good permeability and articulation. There is a clear hierarchy of roads with a central spine route through the development with secondary streets taken from the spine road and a number of private drives. There is limited on-street parking which helps to minimise street clutter and adds to the creation of an attractive and well-defined layout.
- 6.44 The suggested density and layout of the site gives the opportunity to create a central focus for the public open space. The saved local plan policy R6 requires developers to provide public open space for informal recreation and this is calculated at 10% of the site area. The Design and Access Statement which accompanies the application suggests that the landscaped area and balancing ponds to the front (adjacent to the eastern boundary) of the site add to the Public Open Space, it is your officers view that this area does not serve as open space; it forms a landscape buffer which incorporates the ponds – the land has not been designed for informal recreational purposes. Notwithstanding this comment, your officers are of the opinion that the proposed development could meet the requirements of policy R6 in the event of an outline planning permission being granted.
- 6.45 The Police Architectural Liaison Officer has commented that the Design and Access Statement is silent on the matter of crime and disorder. Guidance produced on how to write, read and use Design & Access Statements states that DAS' should
- 'Demonstrate how development can create accessible and safe environments, including addressing crime and disorder and fear of crime'.*
- 6.46 Whilst the outline application and accompanying DAS fails to adequately deal with the crime and disorder, this is a matter that can be addressed in any subsequent Reserved Matters application.
- 6.47 In respect of the illustrative site layout and design, there have been no objections raised by the Urban Design Officer. It is your officer's opinion that a development of this scale on the site proposed could successfully be achieved in design terms.

### Impact on the amenity levels of existing residential properties

- 6.48 There are a number of residential properties in proximity to the application site. Although the proposal would result in a change of environment and bring built development in proximity to these residences, they benefit from large, spacious plots which allow for an adequate distance between existing dwellinghouses and those proposed. It is not considered the existing residential properties would be demonstrably affected by the proposed development.

### 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The report describes the proposals in full and assesses the proposal against the relevant material planning considerations. In assessing the application, officers have had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of 'The Framework' which requires Local Planning Authorities to approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery

of sustainable development where possible. In respect of this application, the scheme proposes a significant development on an unallocated greenfield site which will, in turn, affect the landscape setting of Shiplake. There is no shortfall in the 5 year supply of housing land in the Rest of the District (as set out in the Council's published documents) and there are other constraints with the site which militate against the development at this time, namely the impact upon protected trees, outstanding ecological, drainage and highway issues and no mechanism in place to secure affordable housing and other necessary infrastructure requirements. Furthermore, the decision on where large scale housing development should take place should be properly planned through the plan-making process.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**8.1 It is recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. The application site lies on the edge of the settlement of Shiplake, it is not a site allocated for development in a Development Plan, including a Neighbourhood Plan and is not considered an infill site within the built up limits of the settlement. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies CSS1 and CSR1 of the adopted Core Strategy. The development would extend into and encroach upon the adjacent countryside contrary to policies G2, G4 and C4 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**
- 2. Insufficient information accompanies the application to demonstrate that matters of highway safety and access meet the required standards, namely the provision of an adequate swept path route for a refuse vehicle and the provision of an emergency vehicular access onto Bolney Lane. Furthermore, the Harpsden 2 public Right of Way upgrade measures have not been agreed in principal and remain an outstanding matter. The proposal therefore contravenes policy T1 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.**
- 3. The proposed new vehicular access and associated carriageway widening will result in the loss of and a future threat to a number of trees that are considered to have high amenity value and as such are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The proposal conflicts with policy C9 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and to guidance contained within paragraph 118 of the NPPF.**
- 4. Inadequate information accompanies the application to demonstrate that the proposed development will not adversely impact upon habitats that have the potential to be used by a number of protected species as such, the proposal contravenes policies C6, C8 and C9 of the adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, policy CSB1 of the adopted Core Strategy and guidance contained within the NPPF and accompanying Circular (ODPM 06/2005).**
- 5. Inadequate information accompanies the application to demonstrate that the proposed development will have adequate waste water infrastructure to serve the development and will not adversely impact upon the Harpsden public water supply abstraction. The development is therefore contrary to policies EP4, EP6 and EP7 and to advice contained within paragraph 109 of the NPPF.**
- 6. That the proposal fails to secure affordable housing and provide a housing mix to meet the needs of the District contrary to policies CSH3 and CSH4 of the adopted Core Strategy and wider guidance contained within the NPPF.**



- 7. The proposal fails to provide adequate services and facilities to meet the needs of the development contrary to policies C6, R2, R3, R6 and D12 of the saved policies of the adopted South Oxfordshire Plan 2011 and policies CSG1, CSI1 of the adopted Core Strategy.**

**Author:** Natasha Ireland  
**Contact No:** 01491 823279  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank