

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P14/S3524/O</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE
<b>REGISTERED</b>	5.11.2014
<b>PARISH</b>	TETSWORTH
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Dorothy Brown
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr M Holland
<b>SITE</b>	Mount Hill Farm, High Street, Tetsworth, Oxon, OX9 7AD
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Erection of 39 dwellings with associated parking, new vehicular access and estate roads and a new school building and associated outdoor space. As amended by covering letter dated 10 March 2015, Mount Hill Farm_Noise Mitigation Report_ 4th March 2015, SBS Statement on Revised Schematic Layout 1-250 March 2015 Site Layout Plan 1:500 Constraints Plan March 2015, 849 Coloured site layout plan March 2015, March 2015 Support Letter from Red Rose Travel.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Additional information and amended layout 10 March 2015 and amended description 25 March 2015
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	468916/201616
<b>OFFICER</b>	Cathie Scotting

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The site is within Tetsworth, a small village within the rural part of the district. The site area is 1.87 ha and comprises utilitarian farm buildings and open pasture. The site is part of Mount Farm, with an overall area of some 101 hectares which also includes stables and equestrian use which are intended to remain in part. The site is elevated above the main road A40 where there is an existing field access next to the telephone exchange. Another existing access incorporating a bridleway is from Judd's Lane bounding the site to the north. Tetsworth primary school is also situated off Judd's Lane on the northern side. There is a hedgerow fronting the main road but little else in terms of trees and vegetation on the site. A rising foul sewer pipe runs through the middle of the site east / west. The site location plan is **attached** (Appendix A).
- 1.2 The scheme has been subject to additional information and amendments following the preparation of a noise report and discussions between the developer agents and the local primary school governors.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The application involves the demolition of existing farm buildings 3,091 sq. m (33,259 sq. ft) in area. The proposals are in outline accompanied by an illustrated layout incorporating 39 dwellings and parking. Vehicular access for the residential dwellings is taken from the A40 at the south west corner of the site immediately adjacent to the telephone exchange. Pedestrian access is proposed through the site between the A40 and Judd's Lane. A mix of dwelling sizes and types is proposed including 40% affordable housing. A noise impact assessment has been submitted as additional information and an amended illustrative layout has been prepared to take account of noise emissions from the M40 which is situated just over 200m from the site frontage.

The amended scheme (submitted 10 March 2015) now incorporates land for a school building adjacent to and accessed from Judd's Lane and the application was re-advertised to refer to the change in description.

- 2.2 The agent did forward a further revised layout on 26 March to attempt to address concerns made by planning officers in respect of the layout. However the application was not formally amended as further information was awaited on the pre-school proposals, which could in turn affect the layout.

### **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

- 3.0 The full comments of consultees can be viewed on the website [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk) under the Planning reference number P14/S3524/O.

#### **Tetsworth Parish Council – Approve**

- 3.1 Original scheme The comments of the parish council are **attached** (Appendix B): In summary the parish council consider the proposed outline development would be acceptable in principle, it would not detract from the living conditions of adjoining residents and the concerns of highway safety have been addressed by the developer in consultation with the OCC highways department.

#### **Neighbours**

- 3.2 There are a total of 63 responses, 7 of which have concerns, 12 are general comments and 44 are objections. A summary of the comments made by the residents is **attached** (Appendix C). The main areas of objection relate to:

- Contrary to Policy
- Highways and traffic
- Access and safety
- Lack of bus services
- Parking
- Overdevelopment and Density
- Design
- Drainage and Sewage issues
- Inadequate infrastructure including school capacity
- Environment and Wildlife
- Parish councils views do not represent the community

- 3.3 Comments received by local residents in relation to the amended scheme refer again to objections in respect of overdevelopment, access, traffic, inadequate bus services and that the parish views do not represent the views of the majority of the community. The following comments are also made:

- Attention is drawn to the Tetsworth Community Led Plan 2015 -2023 which indicates that the majority (3/4) of those who took part (almost 50% of the village) do not want to see more 20 dwellings built in this period and 14% do not want any development. This differs from the representations made by the parish council.
- The layout has improved so that it is not inward facing
- The proposed parking is inadequate and not improved. Five spaces for the pre – school is inadequate.
- The site for a pre-school is supported.
- The site for a pre-school would segregate the school buildings and free flow of pupils.

**Oxfordshire County Council**

- 3.4 **Highway Authority:** Maintains its concerns over the transport sustainability of the site. Poor accessibility to essential shops and services will result in residents being highly dependent upon the private car and therefore, from a transport perspective, the proposal is considered unsustainable. To provide a credible bus service, one every hour in this area for example this would likely require a significant contribution. Furthermore, the long-term viability of an improved service would be questionable. The parking provision for the site is acceptable in terms of meeting the required standards. If the LPA are minded to grant permission conditions and a legal agreement are necessary to secure a footpath to the primary school and S38 agreement (for adoption). Contributions towards bus services (£c. £400,000) and a cycling path were requested (in original response).
- 3.5 **Archaeologist:** No objection subject to conditions
- 3.6 **Education:** Original application – request developer contributions towards education. Awaiting comments on revised scheme.
- 3.7 **Property:** requests developer contributions in respect of libraries, waste management, museum, social and health care.
- 3.8 **Environment Agency** – No objection subject to conditions. Comments are made in respect of foul drainage, contamination and flooding.
- 3.9 **Thames Water** – Recommends Conditions  
Following initial investigation, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application, Thames Water would like a condition imposed. Thames Water request that an impact study be undertaken to ascertain, with a greater degree of certainty, whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing infrastructure, and, if required, recommend network upgrades.
- 3.10 **Drainage Engineer** (South Oxfordshire - MONSON)  
Original scheme: A public sewer runs across the site and should be shown on the drawings. Detailed drainage design will need to be approved and implemented.
- 3.11 **Countryside Officer** – Recommends Condition  
Original scheme: The site does not support any habitats of ecological value and there are no other significant ecological constraints on the site. The potential for harm to protected species (particularly great crested newts) has been discounted through surveys of all ponds within the range of great crested newts.  
The proposed plans allow for a reasonably large central greenspace which has the potential to provide ecological benefits. The Ecological Appraisal contains appropriate recommendations for small scale works which would also help to offset any negative impacts on biodiversity.  
Amended scheme: The amended proposals do not alter my comments
- 3.12 **Forestry Officer** - Recommends Condition  
Original scheme: The suggested site layout plans show a significant amount of new planting in prominent positions, which is positive. It's crucial all landscape planting is

designed in unison with all other service and drainage provision for the site, demonstrating it can be practically implemented without conflict. Any future planting scheme needs to include a variety of large canopied, long lived tree species to secure long term tree cover throughout the development.

**3.13 Conservation Officer – Objection**

Original scheme: I am concerned that housing of the scale and number as proposed would alter the small character of the village and its rural and agricultural setting. Although the area has no overarching heritage designation, there are a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets within the village which are enhanced by their setting. I consider that aside from the in principle objection to development of this site, this outline application should be refused because development would harm the agricultural setting of the settlement of Tetsworth and the landscape setting of designated heritage assets.

Amended scheme: This remains an application I would recommend for refusal. There is a number of landscape and design impacts that would undermine the character and setting of Tetsworth which have not, and likely cannot, be appropriately resolved as part of this outline application.

**Environmental Health**

**3.14 Air Quality: Requests conditions**

Contaminated Land: Requests conditions

Env. Protection Team: No objection subject to conditions.

There is a potential for any properties constructed near to the M40 and A40 to be adversely affected by road traffic noise. The site layout assessed in the (additional information) SBS Acoustic Report and revised report due to the site changes accompanying the application states that a small number of properties may be adversely affected by noise, and it has identified mitigation measures which could be incorporated into the final site design to ensure that noise levels both internally and externally are within acceptable limits. These measures include appropriate glazing and ventilation specifications, room orientation, general site layout and use of close boarded acoustic timber boundary fencing where necessary. I am satisfied that provided the appropriate mitigation measures are adopted, the proposed development would not be exposed to unacceptable levels of noise arising from road traffic from the A40/M40. If permission is granted conditions are necessary in respect of noise, dust control, lighting, and odour.

At the time of writing a further noise report to include the impact on the pre-school is awaited. This will be reported to Committee.

**3.15 Housing Officer - My comments relate only to the principle of affordable housing, and not the suitability of the site for residential development. The application is for 39 residential dwellings. Policy CSH3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan applies, which requires a 40% affordable housing contribution. The Design and Access Statement accompanying the application confirms the proposed provision of 40% affordable housing on the site. Based upon 39 units, this would equate to 15.6 (with a financial contribution being payable on the 0.6 part unit). The tenure mix should comprise 75% rented and 25% shared ownership. The affordable housing should be evenly distributed throughout the site and indistinguishable from the market units.**

- 3.16 **Waste Management Officer** (District Council) - No strong views
- 3.17 **Tetsworth Primary School** - Chair of Governors  
Original Application: Object  
The school roll has increased in the last two years and is currently (53) and nearly at capacity (58 pupils). There is sufficient demand from the existing population to meet or exceed capacity and the school's improved and solid performance has reversed an earlier trend. The school occupies a site that is constrained by neighbouring premises and has limited ability to expand. Governors are concerned that the proposals would generate a demand that cannot be accommodated without jeopardising the school's ability to deliver an effective service. The provision of parking for the school is unlikely to provide a benefit and will not solve dropping off issues. The increased traffic will add to the traffic travelling through the village. The new access into the site will introduce a new road that children living to the east will have to cross.
- 3.18 Little Kites Pre school – to report
- 3.16 **Police - Crime Prevention Design Adviser:** Original layout – comments are made in respect of surveillance, open space, need for active frontages, accessibility to rear of properties and boundary treatments.
- 3.17 **Police Funding:** Request contributions towards monies for vehicles, mobile IT equipment and new build accommodation
- 3.18 **Leisure Services:** Developer contributions towards off site play and leisure provision are required.

#### 4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 [P14/S2448/SCR](#) EIA screening opinion for a residential development of 39 dwellings and school car park. EIA not required on 20th August 2014.

#### 5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

- 5.1 South Oxfordshire Core Strategy Policies

The overall strategy of the Core Strategy is to concentrate development in the four towns and larger villages. The detailed policies can be viewed on the website [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk). The following policies apply:

Policy CSS1 – The overall strategy  
Policy CSH1 – Amount and distribution of housing  
Policy CSR1 – Housing in villages  
Policy CSH3 – 40% affordable housing  
Policy CSH4 – Meeting Housing Needs  
Policy CSQ2 - Sustainable design and construction  
Policy CSQ3 – Design  
Policy CSEN3- Historic Environment  
Policy CSG1 – Green Infrastructure  
Policy CSI1- Infrastructure provision

- 5.2 Saved Policies South Oxfordshire Local 2011

Policy G2 The district's countryside, settlements and environmental resources will be protected from adverse developments  
Policy G4 Protecting the countryside f

Policy C4 Landscape setting and Historic character and appearance of settlement  
Policies CON 12,13 and 14 Archaeology  
Policy EP1 Protection from polluting emissions  
Policy EP2 Noise  
Policy EP3 Lighting  
Policy EP6 Surface water  
Policy EP8 Contaminated Land  
Policy D1 Good design  
Policy D2 Vehicle and cycle parking  
Policy D3 Amenity area  
Policy D4 Privacy  
Policy D6 Design out crime  
Policy D7 Access  
Policy D10 Waste  
Policy D12 Public art (on sites over 1 hectare)  
Policy R2 Outdoor playing space  
Policy R3 Indoor sport  
Policy R6 Informal open space

### 5.3 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of development and planning law requires that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Core planning principles (para 17) advise that planning should be genuinely plan led and be kept up to date.

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF advises that Local Plans should meet their objectively assessed need for the area and identify key sites, and identify and update a five years supply of housing. The NPPF (para 49) states that applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in a favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing.

### 5.4 Letter by Department for Communities and Local Government 19 Dec 2014

Guidance issued 14 December 2014 in the form of a Ministerial Statement to the Planning Inspectorate (**attached** as Appendix D) states that the outcome of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is untested and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement in Local Plans. Councils should actively consider new evidence but the new evidence does not immediately or in itself invalidate housing numbers in existing Local Plans. It goes on to say that Councils will need to consider SHMA evidence and take time to consider whether there are environmental and policy constraints such as Green Belt.

### 5.5 South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

### 5.6 CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended): Reinforces that S106 agreements should be (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, (ii) directly related to the development (iii) fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development. As from April 2015 no more than 5 contributions can be pooled towards the same type of infrastructure or project.

### 5.7 Local Plan 2031 (emerging): Work has begun on the new Local Plan 2031 to plan for additional growth identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (or SHMA).

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

**Principle of development**

- 6.1 Tetsworth is a smaller village in a rural part of the district and Policies CSS1 and CSR1 apply. It has little in the range of essential services and amenities and has not been identified for further growth. The approach of the Core Strategy is to focus major new development at Didcot, provide new housing and employment and infrastructure in the towns of Henley, Thame and Wallingford and to allocate sites for housing to support and enhance the larger villages. Development in other villages (such as Tetsworth) is to allow for limited amounts of housing. Policy CSR1 amplifies the approach and infill sites of up to 0.2 ha (5-6 houses) are acceptable in principle. Infill development is defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage or within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings. The proposed development is for 39 houses on a greenfield site, does not meet the definition of infill criteria and is unacceptable in principle.

**Housing supply**

- 6.2 In respect of NPPF paragraph 47, the Council's position is that it can demonstrate a five year supply of housing against the housing requirements set out in the adopted Core Strategy. This is set out in the Council's latest assessment of 5 year housing land supply (April 2014). Calculations on housing supply are based on the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (2012), until such time as the new Local Plan is adopted. This approach is supported by the government as set out in the Ministerial Statement dated 14 December 2014. In South Oxfordshire there are two housing land supply areas. The majority of the new housing is ring-fenced to Didcot so that this area, which is identified for growth and regeneration in the Core Strategy, can meet its potential. The remainder is planned across a larger area covering the Rest of the District. Whilst there are some delivery problems at Didcot (which are being addressed), the Rest of the District currently has more than a 5 year supply.
- 6.3 The applicant's in their design and access statement (pg 2) accept that these proposals for Tetsworth exceed current adopted policy and that the distribution of housing will not be decided until long after 2016. The statement goes on to say this is a 'golden opportunity' to assist in helping to meet recently revised targets set for SODC. However as cited above the Council is yet to determine the distribution of housing (beyond the allocated sites in the Core Strategy) and, as supported in national guidance, this will be determined through the plan making process. The letter issued by DCLG in December 2014 reinforces this approach.
- 6.4 In this case, the proposal is contrary to development and housing policies in the adopted Development Plan. The council are working in accordance with the due planning process to identify further sites for housing and there is a five year housing supply. The proposal is unacceptable in principle and there is no material planning reason to depart from adopted national and local planning policies. The proposal is contrary to CSS1 and CSR1 and is recommended for refusal.

**Housing Mix**

- 6.5 The Council is now using the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) work to identify housing mix. The SHMA work was completed in 2013 and uses secondary data from the 2011 census and recent demographic projections. It suggests that councils should have regard to other up to date evidence of need and the existing mix and turnover of properties at a local level.

- 6.6 The SHMA suggests that councils should increase the number for housing the councils should consider increasing the number of larger affordable homes and reducing the proportion of 1 bedroom homes to cater for families with children. The housing mix for market housing in SODC comprises 33% 1 and 2 bedroom mix and 67% 3 and 4 bedroom mix. The proposed mix meets the council's requirements for housing mix in the market and affordable sectors.

Table 1: Housing Mix and Tenure

	Market *	Affordable	AH rented	Total
1 bed		2	(2)	2
2 bed	8	8	(5)	16
3 bed	8	4	(3)	12
4 bed	8	1	(4)	9
Total	24	15		39

\*The exact mix on market is undetermined – above split is an assumption.

### **Affordable Housing**

- 6.7 Policy CSH3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan applies and seeks 40% affordable housing. The Design and Access Statement confirms the proposed provision of 40% affordable housing on the site. Based on 39 units, this would equate to 15.6 (with a financial contribution being payable on the 0.6 part unit). The tenure mix should comprise 75% rented and 25% shared ownership. The covering letter states that 16 affordable units will be provide yet the layout plan indicates 15 units. The applicants have confirmed in an email that 15 units will be provided and that they are willing to pay the commuted sum. The commuted sum (£55,860 as of April 2015) represents 0.6 % of a 2 bed unit and would be secured through a S106 agreement.
- 6.8 The council's preferred mix for affordable housing is met by the scheme and the units should also meet the following minimum sizes:
- 1 bed (min 46 m2)
  - 2 bed (min 76 m2)
  - 3 bed (min 88 m2)
  - 4 bed (min 100 m2)
- 6.9 The amended scheme does not show any flats, which are generally unsuitable for affordable housing which accommodates families in the main. The affordable housing should be evenly distributed throughout the site and indistinguishable from the market units. Under policy CSH4 the council also seek at least 10% of lifetime homes in market housing. At this stage the location of affordable housing and lifetime homes has not been identified. Whilst the applicant has agreed the council's policy requirements for affordable housing, the scheme remains unacceptable on these grounds as no provision has been made for the delivery of this housing, in a legal agreement. This has not been sought because the scheme remains unacceptable in principle.

### **Highways, Traffic and Access**

- 6.10 Many comments have been received in relation to traffic. In respect of the technical requirements of the access and degree of parking the highway officer has no objection. However there is an overall objection on the grounds of sustainability as the village does not contain many essential service and facilities, and there would be a huge reliance on the private car. There is a bus service but the current service is infrequent. The applicant has submitted a letter in support from a local bus operator Red Rose travel who state that they would be prepared to adjust their service, with particular



emphasis on providing early and late afternoon services. However buses run on a commercial (and sometimes subsidised basis) and the highway authority consider that amount of subsidy to increase the frequency of the service to an acceptable level (hourly) is large. Arguably this is disproportionate to the amount of development proposed. The development is therefore unsustainable and contrary to the NPPF and Development Plan policies.

#### **Environmental Constraints**

- 6.11 The noise report identifies that the site is affected by noise from the M40 and A40 and mitigation measures will be required in the form of mechanical ventilation to the front windows of the frontage properties and some internal properties and that some gardens will need 2m high walls. At the time of writing further information on noise in respect of the school site is awaited.
- 6.12 The environmental health officer has also raised concerns regarding odour from adjoining horsicultural uses. A riding arena and horse walker lie to the east of the site and within 100m of the proposed school site. The agent has advised that they would be prepared to remove these adjoining horsicultural uses, were development permitted. However the landowners of the proposed residential site are not the same as the owners of the horsicultural site and there is no guarantee that these uses could be removed. Notwithstanding this the existing horse uses are providing a recreational facility appropriate to the rural location of this village and their retention, as a recreational facility is supported.
- 6.13 Local residents have raised concerns about loss of wildlife. The countryside officer has confirmed that there are no habitats of interest on the site and has no objection.

#### **Landscape and Heritage**

- 6.14 The substantial modern farm buildings are prominent in the landscape from various advantage points. They do however form part of the rural agricultural setting and landscape of the village and surrounding countryside and this part of Tetsworth is characterised by open and large gaps between built developments. The proposed dwellings are not confined to the area of the buildings to be demolished and the built development will extend into the open field fronting the A40. In close proximity to the site are a number of listed buildings (No's 76 and 80 High Street and the primary school) and the non-designated asset of Mount Hill Farmhouse. The site provides an important rural landscape setting of these assets. The proposed development will alter and adversely affect the rural agricultural and historical character of the village and the surrounding landscape, contrary to Core Strategy policies CSQ3 and CSEN3, Local Plan policy C4 and NPPF paragraph 135 (in respect of non-designated assets).

#### **Design and Layout**

- 6.15 Although the layout and design are illustrative it is necessary to ascertain whether the proposed site can accommodate 39 dwellings, as proposed, considering the site constraints and design principles for development. There are a number of constraints operating including the relationship with surroundings, impact of noise, location of a public sewer (which requires a standoff of 3m either side) and the potential issue of odour. There was a design objection to the original layout and the scheme needed to be reassessed in the light of the noise information. A constraints plan and revised layout has been resubmitted and whilst illustrative, I am still of the view that the scheme would not produce an attractive environment.
- 6.16 The proposed layout is attached (Appendix E). The development now fronts the A40 buffered by a strip of landscaping which is more in keeping with the character of the built form nearby in Tetsworth village. However the need to accommodate parking

behind these dwellings impacts negatively on the public realm within the site. The area of public open space has been re-sited adjacent to the proposed pre-school site but residential properties back onto this area, which is contrary to guidance on public realm and designing out crime. In terms of generic site density (29 dwellings per hectare) it should be possible to accommodate a suitable layout. However on this site there are a number of constraints and it may be that the site cannot successfully accommodate 39 dwellings and still ensure that constraints are overcome and good design principles are met. Accordingly, based on the current layout the application is also recommended for refusal on the grounds that it has not been able to demonstrate a quality design and layout for the proposed development of 39 dwellings, contrary to policies CSQ3 of the Core Strategy and D1 of the Local Plan.

**Public open space**

- 6.17 An area of public open space is proposed to the rear of the residential properties and the proposed school land. This area is around 1000 sq. m which does not meet the planning standards for open space (1870 sq. m represents 10% of the site). Additionally it does not have a good relationship with adjoining properties as there is no natural surveillance. However it is sited next to the pre-school which could be complimentary to the use of the school. These design issues need to be considered as part of the layout and the lack of public open space is contrary to policy requirements for infrastructure.

**Infrastructure**

- 6.18 Policy CSI1 of the core strategy requires that new development must be supported by appropriate on and off-site infrastructure and services. Planning permission will only be granted when infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the new development are met. This includes requirements set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Infrastructure and services required as a consequence of development, and provision for their maintenance, will be sought from developers and secured by the negotiation of planning obligations, by conditions attached to a planning permission, and/or other agreement, levy or undertaking, all to be agreed before planning permission is granted.
- 6.19 The council does not have an IDP for Tetsworth or the villages allocated for development in the Core Strategy. This is because the planned development for the district is ongoing and until this is complete, the needs for infrastructure have not been identified. Officers will, if necessary, identify needs for infrastructure for this application in accordance with the Core Strategy Policy CSI1 and saved policies from the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011, however this could undermine infrastructure requirements that may be identified in the future, alongside the emerging Local Plan 2031. Speculative development, as opposed to planned development can adversely affect the proper and planned delivery of infrastructure. The application is unacceptable for this reason and because infrastructure requirements have not been agreed, is contrary to Policy CSI1.

**Pre-school proposal**

- 6.20 The details of the pre-school proposal have not been firmed up and this would need to be agreed through a S106 agreement. It is important that the application meets needs generated from the development and meets the tests of the CIL Regulations. Officers consider that the proposed pre-school is required to meet the needs of the development. The pre-school will provide accommodation for pre-school pupils and space within the existing school can be made available for extra primary school pupils. However the proposal does not overcome the strategic objection to the development on grounds of infrastructure. Future development has not been planned for Tetsworth and accordingly the infrastructure requirements for new growth (if any) have also not been planned. Permitting this development together with the proposed pre-school building

may undermine future plans for growth as infrastructure needs cannot be assessed holistically and delivered comprehensively.

**7.0 CONCLUSION**

7.1 Tetsworth is a smaller village in a rural part of the district and Policies CSS1 and CSR1 apply. The proposed development does not comply with the Core Strategy's approach for growth in the district. There is a 5 year supply of housing and no need to consider a presumption in favour under paragraph 47 of the NPPF. As Tetsworth is not part of the overall strategy for growth in the district no detailed assessment of the infrastructure needs have been made in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The proposed development is unsustainable and a lack of appropriate infrastructure provision could undermine the planned growth and delivery of appropriate infrastructure contrary to Policy CSI1.

7.2 The development of this site is contrary to overall strategy for growth and the incursion into open land will adversely affect the rural character of this part of the village and the historical and landscape setting of the site and surroundings, contrary to policies CSQ3, CSEN3 of the Core Strategy and Policy C4 of the adopted Local Plan. Notwithstanding the above issues of principle the proposed illustrative layout does not demonstrate that the development can provide an acceptable layout for the numbers of dwellings proposed and the application is contrary to policies CSQ3 of the Core Strategy and D1 of the Local Plan

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 **To refuse the application for the following reasons:**

1. **The application site is within Tetsworth, a smaller village in the district and not identified for development in the Development Plan. The proposal does not represent infill development as defined by the Core Strategy and it is unsustainable as it has poor access to essential services and facilities. The application does not accord with the district's strategy for growth and necessary infrastructure. The district has a 5 year housing supply in the Rest of the District and the proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, NPPG and policies CSS1, CSR1 and CSI1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy.**
2. **The proposed development will encroach into open land important for the rural agricultural, historical and landscape setting of Tetsworth, contrary to policies CSQ3, CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy contrary and saved policies G2, G4, and C4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**
3. **Notwithstanding the in principle objections to the development of the site, the application does not demonstrate that the development of 39 dwellings can be accommodated on the site in a layout of high quality design which will provide appropriate standards of living environments for future occupiers. The application is therefore contrary to policy CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies D1, D6 and R6 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan and guidance within the adopted South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008.**
4. **The application fails to secure affordable housing and housing needs contrary to policies CSH3, CSH4 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy.**
5. **The application fails to secure infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of the development, contrary to policy CSI1 of the Core Strategy and the saved policies R2, R3, R6 and D12 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.**

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