

Case Officer: James Kirkham

Recommendation: Refuse

Applicant: R2 Developments Ltd.

Proposal: Erection of 9 detached dwellings, formation of new vehicular and pedestrian access, associated landscaping, drainage and associated works

Expiry Date: 27 September 2022

1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY

- 1.1. The application site is a parcel of undeveloped land located to the east of Fringford approximately 0.8ha in size. The site is divided into 2 parcels with a hedgerow running north to south through the site which appears to have been planted around 2005 (aerial photograph). A property known as the Cottage is located to the south east of the site. The land forming the application site (i.e the existing paddock) extends immediately up to the north and west elevations of this property which has no existing gardens in these areas. To the north exists a large detached property, The Paddock, and a menage and stabling. The green which includes the pond and wider land to the south is noted as existing green space on the Local Plan Proposals maps
- 1.2. During the course of the application an Oak tree to the south east of the site, adjacent to the lane, has been subject to a Tree Preservation Order (ref:14/2022)

2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1. The current application seeks outline permission for 9 detached dwellings on the site. All matters are reserved except access. Indicative plans have been submitted that show 9 dwellings centred around a central pond. The layout shows the properties inward looking to the site and backing onto the boundary of the site including the road to the south.
- 2.2. The plans show a number of inconsistencies with the formal red line location plan showing a different redline to the proposed outline site layout plan which includes further land around The Cottage and to the east of the site (to create a pedestrian link to the unmade track to the east of the site). The transport statement plans also show a footpath connection from the site linking back towards the Green along the road to the south of the site however these are not shown on the indicative site plan with a different footpath connection shown further north. Clarification has been sought by email (see email dated 14.7 and 29.7.22) however not clarification has been provided by the applicant. The provision of a passing place is also shown to the south of the road to the south of the site (see plan 2021/5908/001 P4 in the Transport Statement).

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

07/00232/F – Erection of 1 dwelling – Withdrawn – related to south eastern part of the site

88/00371 –Erection of 1 dwelling (outline) – Refused and dismissed North east part of the site Refused due to being contrary to development plan in principle and also detrimental impact on character and appearance of area. The appeal was upheld.

4. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

4.1. The following pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal:

| <u>Application Ref.</u> | <u>Proposal</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 21/00506/PREAPP | 9 new dwellings |

4.2. In summary it was considered that a development of 9 dwellings in this location would not be sustainable development, and the current proposals are not of an acceptable design and would adversely affect highway safety.

5. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

5.1. This application has been publicised by way of a Site Notice displayed near the site, expiring **29 July 2022**, and by letters sent to properties adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The overall final date for comments was **29 July 2022**.

5.2. 61 comments have been received on the application. The comments raised by third parties are summarised as follows:

- Development is outside the built limits of the village so is in conflict with the Councils housing strategy.
- Greenfield site outside the built up limits of the village
- Fringford lacks services and facilities to meet day to day needs and is too far from other larger settlements. Unsustainable location and reliance of private car. Appeal at Fringford Cottage for 10 dwellings (App/C3105/W/18/3204920) confirms this and has many parallels with current application.
- No public transport to serve the village and residents reliant on car. Cycling and walking is unlikely due to distances.
- Too large to be considered minor development and too large for village
- New pedestrian link is not in the redline so no link is provided back to the village. The site is poorly connected to the village.
- Applicant doesn't own the relevant land to access the unmade track to the east of the site as shown on the indicative layout plans. The access is therefore unachievable.
- No pavements to access services and facilities.
- Detrimental impact on the character of this part of the village which is derived by the paddocks and open land. Out of keeping with area.
- Overly intensive form of development which fails to respond to the main linear pattern of development in the village.
- Numerous sensitive views into the site would be detrimentally impacted including from PROW and the Green.
- Removal of hedgerow would impact on visibility, character and ecology of the site.

- Removal of hedgerow and low stone walling would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the rural lane.
- Detrimental impact on listed buildings, Green Farmhouse and Meadow Barn.
- Ridge and furrow should be preserved.
- Detrimental impact on wildlife.
- Narrow lane is unacceptable in terms of highway safety and capacity. Already single track and dangerous with cars having to reverse onto main road. Also dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Not suitable for more traffic.
- Increase in traffic
- Insufficient parking to serve the development.
- Flood risk not adequately addressed. Field already floods as do other parts of the village to the east including some properties and the pond surcharging.
- Inadequate sewer capacity to accommodate the development.
- No need for more houses. No need for larger houses. If anything, the village requires smaller dwellings.
- Noise from houses.
- Precedent for further development.
- Detrimental impact on overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties including The Paddock and The Cottage.
- Details of disability and condition of occupier of adjacent property including medical letters from doctors. This property has a very close relationship with the development. Unacceptable impact on health and well being of the occupant.
- Well designed development which will add to the village and will help to sustain and support village life.
- Lack of consultation with the public
- Application solely driven by profit
- Appeal has previously been dismissed for a dwelling on part of the site on character and appearance impacts which are still relevant.
- The school is over subscribed.

5.3. The comments received can be viewed in full on the Council's website, via the online Planning Register.

6. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

6.1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council's website, via the online Planning Register.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

6.2. FRINGFORD PARISH COUNCIL: *The Parish Council strongly objects to Planning Application - 21/02553/OUT on the following planning grounds:*

1. *The proposed site is not in a sustainable location. Fringford does not have access to services such as shops, health services and transport services. Sustainability has been previously tested in the dismissed appeal at Fringford Cottage Main Street APP/C3105/W/18/3204920. Nothing has changed in this regard. Should the proposal be approved it would create significant risk of opening up unconstrained growth in an unsustainable location resulting in future planning applications for housing estates.*
2. *The proposed site is outside the village envelope as it falls within an area of open land outside the built up area of the village and it is currently used for grazing. It forms part of the open countryside which is an important part of the rural nature of the village setting. The proposal would detrimentally impact the landscape and dramatically change the village setting. The views in this part of the village would be adversely affected by the building of this relatively dense housing estate. Impact on the open countryside and rural setting has been previously tested in the dismissed appeal at Fringford Cottage Main Street APP/C3105/W/18/3204920.*
3. *The proposed development is of a relatively high density compared with the village as a whole. Nine large 4 and 5 bedroom properties with driveways and garages do not constitute in-fill or minor development that may be considered for a category A village.*
4. *The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the closest neighbouring properties, The Cottage, The Paddock and The Bakehouse as it will cause significant overlooking and loss of their current amenity. This goes as far as potentially causing harm to a vulnerable adult living at The Cottage due to his physical and mental health needs. For example, the proposal suggests erecting a 2.5m fence effectively boxing in the rear of this property. We understand that separate representation will be made with regards to this.*
5. *The proposal would have an impact on the setting of 3 listed buildings, The Bakehouse, Meadow Barn and Green Farmhouse, detrimentally changing the rural in character setting. The application does not mention these buildings. Impact on the setting of listed buildings has been previously tested in the dismissed appeal at Fringford Cottage Main Street APP/C3105/W/18/3204920.*
6. *The proposal would have a negative impact on Crow Lane, detrimentally impacting the everyday experience and safety of all road users. The current narrow rural Crow Lane and village landscape will be detrimentally impacted by large stretches of hedgerow and old stone walls being removed, destroying the distinctive rural character of this entrance to the village. Stone walls are a feature of Fringford, and local planning policies actively look to support their retention not their removal.*
7. *The proposal would have an impact on flooding and drainage risks. The site already floods, impacting the Bakehouse pond causing the property to regularly flood, along with the garage of The Cottage and sewage overflow at the pumping station at the Paddock.*

The proposal appears to be contrary to both Cherwell's Local Plan policies and national planning policy.

CONSULTEES

- 6.3. OCC HIGHWAY: **Object** on the grounds of the site being an unsustainable location.

In regard to traffic impacts they do not consider the proposal would lead to a severe highway impact. The proposed access and passing place is considered to be acceptable and would help with conflict between vehicles on the single track road. This would require a S278. They have confirmed the passing place is within the highway. Consider the provision of the new footway to the north of Crow Lane would reduce any safety risk to pedestrians from vehicle conflict.

Raise some concerns over the level of parking and need for visitor parking spaces.

- 6.4. CDC ECOLOGY: The level of the survey is appropriate and there are no issues with protected species or habitats. Has raised some concerns that the application is not accompanied by a net gain calculation or a LEMP outlining how areas will be managed and how a net gain in biodiversity will be achieved on the site.
- 6.5. CDC DRAINAGE: *The Flood Risk Assessment concludes there is no material risk of flooding at this site. I accept that conclusion and have no further comments on flood risk.*

However, the surface water management strategy is incomplete. The Assessment concludes that shallow conventional soakaways will not be suitable and proposes deep borehole soakaways instead. No detailed information is provided and the practical viability of this solution has not been investigated. Moreover, if such boreholes were feasible it is likely they would require the consent of the Environment Agency which also does not appear to have investigated. The soakage rate suggested is based on an assumption and may not be realistic.

Any exceedance flows caused by the site system being overwhelmed will naturally discharge towards the village pond to the east of the site. There have been instances of the pond surcharging in severe conditions resulting in internal flooding to an adjacent property. The need for certainty in the drainage solution is therefore paramount.

In summary, the applicant should be requested to provide more details of the proposed means of surface water disposal based on actual site conditions. This is crucial to the development and cannot be conditioned. We first need to be satisfied that an acceptable surface water drainage solution exists.

- 6.6. OCC ARCHAEOLOGY: **Object** on lack of sufficient evaluation.
- 6.7. CDC ARBORIST: **Objection.** Has confirmed a Tree Preservation Order has now been served on the Oak Tree (T18 in the submitted Arboricultural report). Objects to the application as the submitted report does not assess the impact of the new footway to the north of Crow Lane on this tree and it goes very close to it. Further information is required in this respect.

The proposal at the outline stage appears to only require facilitative removal of a category C hedge, cited as being of poor species value within the arb report. The proposal also requires the partial removal of a category B hedge of higher species diversity internal to the proposed site. At this stage it sounds feasible that this can be mitigated through replacement planting within and surrounding the site. Also raises a number of concerns over future conflict with retained trees in the indicative layout.

- 6.8. CDC ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: **No objection** to the noise report or the CEMP. Request condition regarding ground investigation.
- 6.9. CDC CONSERVATION: **No objection.** *The proposal would not harm the significance of any heritage assets through development within their setting. The site is not within a conservation area and the closest listed building is separated from the site by existing more modern dwellings. Consequently there are no objections in principle on heritage grounds.*

7. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

- 7.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 7.2. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the ‘saved’ policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District’s statutory Development Plan are set out below:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011 - 2031 PART 1 (CLP 2031 Part 1)

- PSD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- SLE4: Improved Transport and Connections
- BSC1: District Wide Housing Distribution
- BSC2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land – Brownfield land and Housing Density
- BSC4: Housing Mix
- BSC10 and BSC11: Open Space provision
- ESD1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change
- ESD6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management
- ESD7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs)
- ESD10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment
- ESD13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement
- ESD15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment
- Villages 1: Village Categorisation

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

- H18: New dwellings in the countryside
- C8: Sporadic development in the open countryside
- C28: Layout, design and external appearance of new development
- C30: Design of new residential development
- C33: Important local gaps
- ENV1: Environmental pollution
- ENV12: Potentially contaminated land

- 7.3. Other Material Planning Considerations
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 - Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
 - EU Habitats Directive
 - Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
 - Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017
 - Circular 06/2005 (Biodiversity and Geological Conservation)

8. APPRAISAL

8.1. The key issues for consideration in this case are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Highways
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology
- Heritage including archaeology
- Residential amenity
- Other matters

Principle of development

8.2. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any application for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for the District relevant to this application comprises the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 ('CLP 2015') and the saved policies of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996.

8.3. The CLP 2015 seeks to allocate sufficient land to meet District-wide housing needs. The overall housing strategy is to focus strategic housing growth at the towns of Banbury and Bicester and a small number of strategic sites outside of these towns. With regards to villages, the Local Plan notes that the intention is to protect and enhance the services, facilities, landscapes and natural and historic built environments of the villages and rural areas. It does, however, advise that there is a need within the rural areas to meet local and Cherwell-wide needs through more limited and managed growth to ensure sustainable outcomes are achieved.

8.4. Policy ESD1 of the CLP 2015 states that the Council will seek to mitigate the impact of new development within the District on climate change by "distributing growth to the most sustainable locations as defined in this Local Plan (and) delivering development that seeks to reduce the need to travel".

8.5. Policy Villages 1 of the CLP 2015 provides a framework for housing growth in the rural areas of the district and groups villages into three separate categories (A, B and C), with Category A villages being considered the most sustainable settlements in the District's rural areas which have the physical characteristics and a range of services within them to enable them to accommodate some limited extra housing growth. Fringford is a 'Category A' village, but it is one of the smallest category A villages and has limited services and facilities. Furthermore, it has had its bus service withdrawn since the adoption of the Local Plan which impacts on the sustainability credentials of the village. Many other category A villages accommodate a much wider range of services and facilities and proximity to larger settlements meaning they are more appropriate to accommodate sustainable growth. Policy Villages 1 supports conversions, infill (as defined by the Local Plan) and acceptable minor development (also defined by the Local Plan) within the built up limits of Category A Villages.

8.6. The Council does not have adopted settlement boundaries and whether a site lies within or outside of the built up limits of the village is a matter of planning judgement based on the circumstances of the case. The judgement is based on the relationship of the site with the surrounding built and natural environment. To be considered as part of the built up limits it is considered that the site needs to have a close and intimate relationship with the built form of the village and display an appearance of being part of the built form and grain of the village.

- 8.7. In this case whilst there is some development to the north and east of the site this is generally very loose knit and forms part of the periphery of the built up limits of the village which the current application site is considered to lie beyond. The land to the south and west of the site remains undeveloped and alongside the application site contributes positively to the rural setting of the village. The site clearly displays the character of an undeveloped parcel of land outside the built confines along with the fields to the south of the site. Therefore, as a matter of planning judgement the site is considered to lie outside of the built up limits of the village. The development of the site would therefore not be supported by Policy Villages 1 of the CLP 2015 which only allows for development 'within the built limits'.
- 8.8. Given the location of the site, outside of the built up limits of the settlement, it is considered to lie within open countryside for the purposes of the Development Plan. Therefore, saved Policy H18 of the CLP 1996 applies which seeks to restrict new development outside of the built up limits of settlements unless the dwelling is essential for agriculture or for an identified local affordable housing need. These do not apply in this case and therefore the proposal would conflict with saved Policy H18.
- 8.9. Policy Villages 2 of the CLP 2015 also allows for further development at Category A villages albeit it does require an assessment of a number of criteria including an assessment of the impact on landscape, built environment and access to services and facilities. However, this only relates to developments for 10 or more dwellings so is not relevant to the current proposal. This approach has been supported in a number of appeals (for example 15/01384/OUT in Adderbury). In addition it is noted that planning consent has already been granted for in excess of 1,000 dwelling under this policy indicated the delivery of new housing in the rural area is strong.
- 8.10. Overall, therefore, the development of the site would clearly conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan when read as a whole which is the starting point for decision making. It is therefore necessary to consider whether other material considerations outweigh this conflict whilst having regard to the primacy of the development plan enshrined through planning law and the NPPF.
- 8.11. Cherwell's housing land supply position is reported in the Council's 2021 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The 2021 AMR demonstrates that the District presently has a 3.5-year housing land supply for the period 2022-2027. The Council's housing land supply position means that under paragraph 11d of the NPPF the policies in the development plan relating to housing provision are to be considered out of date. This includes Policy Villages 1 and saved Policy H18, and the weight to be afforded to these policies is therefore tempered however that does not mean they are irrelevant. Where policies are out-of-date, there is a presumption within paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF of granting permission for sustainable forms of development unless:
- I. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - II. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
- 8.12. In this case the proposal would not give rise to significant conflict with protected areas or assets (as defined by the NPPF) so the relevant planning balance to consider is 11(d)(ii) which advises to grant permission unless the adverse impact of

doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

- 8.13. The applicant argues that as the village is a category A village, and the development is for 9 dwellings, it is *de-facto* acceptable in principle as Policy Villages 1 allows for minor development and Policy Villages 2 allows for a further 750 dwellings to be permitted at Category A villages over the plan period. However, this argument fails to consider that Policy Villages 1 only allows for 'acceptable minor development' within the built up limits of the village (which the application is not) and furthermore paragraph C.262 states that in assessing whether proposals constitute 'acceptable minor development' regard will be had to the size of the village and the level of service provision and whether the site is in keeping with the village (See para C.262). Therefore, an assessment of the level of service provision is required in the Local Plan in applying PV1. Furthermore, whilst not directly relevant to this case (as it is below the 10 dwelling threshold), the criteria of Policy Villages 2 include a clear requirement for decision makers to consider 'whether the site is well located to services and facilities' in considering proposals under that policy. It has been found in appeals in Fringford, Finmere and Weston on the Green that inspectors have raised significant concerns with the level of service provision in Category A settlements with appeal being dismissed where this is a key issue. Therefore, these matters are clearly considerations in assessing compliance with the Development Plan and the wider sustainability credentials of Fringford.
- 8.14. However, in this case the tilted balance under paragraph 11d(ii) is engaged and it is therefore necessary to assess the development on this basis. As noted above, Fringford is listed as a Category A village but is one of the smallest and has limited services and facilities and it is understood to have lost its regular bus service since the adoption of the Local Plan. Appeal decision ref: APP/C3105/W/18/3204920 is considered very relevant in the assessment of Fringford's service provision and related to an outline application for 10 dwellings in a different part of the village. This decision draws parallels with the current application, given that both sites are outside the built limits of the village and for a similar scale of housing provision. Of particular relevance are paragraphs 17-19.

Evidence is submitted of the facilities within the settlement. These mainly consist of the primary and pre-school, public house, church and village hall. While therefore some services are present within the village these are by no means comprehensive. Furthermore, there is mixed evidence concerning bus services to and from the village, with regular bus services only taking place on a Thursday and possibly a Friday, supplemented by a demand responsive bus. The Thursday service only appears to include 1 journey each way and the demand responsive option only runs between the hours of 10:15 and 14:30.

Aside from the school and the pub therefore I consider that the future residents of the proposal would use private transport for most of their day to day needs. I also note in the context of policy Villages 1 that the bus service as it exists today represents a downgrade on a previous service that existed at the time of the adoption of the local plan, and do not consider that the provision of a travel pack to future residents would mitigate the lack of a regular scheduled bus service. While acknowledging that sustainable transport options vary from urban to rural areas I do not consider therefore that the proposed 10 houses would be located within an area with sufficient service provision.

I am not convinced therefore that, while noting the size of the scheme compared to the size of the village overall, given the level of service provision in the village, particularly when coupled with the harm that I have identified above that the scheme would cause to the character and form of the village, that the proposal

would constitute 'minor development' in the context of Fringford and therefore consider that the scheme would be contrary to policy Villages 1.

- 8.15. This is comparable to the current scheme and demonstrates the local planning authority and appeal inspector's concerns over the sustainability of Fringford as a settlement for this level of additional growth given future residents limited access to services and facilities and also the reliance on the private car to access services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents. In this respect paragraph 105 of the NPPF states the planning system should manage patterns of growth and significant development should be focused on locations which are, or can be made, sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering genuine choice of transport modes. It goes onto state that maximising sustainable solutions will vary between urban and rural areas which should be taken into account. This however does not mean it is an irrelevant consideration in rural areas and it remains material to the consideration of the application. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF states planning decision should create places that are accessible and safe.
- 8.16. Fringford's main services and facilities comprise a primary school, a village hall with sports field and play area, and a public house. Unlike a number of other Category A settlements there is no shop, post office, healthcare facilities or regular public transport to larger settlements with a range of services and employment opportunities. Furthermore, the limited services in the village mean that occupants would not be able to meet their day to day needs without access to a private car given the absence of other basic services like a convenience shop or public transport provision. Employment opportunities in the village also appear very limited.
- 8.17. In conclusion whilst the housing policies in the Development Plan are out of date, this does not render them irrelevant and the weight to be attached to them is a matter of planning judgement. In this case the identified conflict with the Development Plan (whose policies seek to create a balance between the needs for housing growth alongside reducing environmental harms), alongside the limited access to services and facilities and reliance on private car and conflict with NPPF carries significant weight against the proposal. This is further considered in the Planning Balance.

Impact on character and appearance of area

- 8.18. The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment within the NPPF. Good design is fundamental to sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It states decision should add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and establish a strong sense of place (paragraph 130 of NPPF). Paragraph 174 goes onto state that decisions should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the open countryside.
- 8.19. These aims are also echoed within Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2015 which looks to promote and support development of a high standard which contributes positively to an area's character and identity by creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness, stating that: "New development proposals should respect the traditional pattern of routes, spaces, blocks, plots, enclosures and the form, scale and massing of buildings. Development should be designed to integrate with existing streets and public spaces, and buildings configured to create clearly designed active public frontages".

- 8.20. Policy ESD13 of the CLP 2015 states that development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character, securing appropriate mitigation where damage to local landscape character cannot be avoided. Proposals will not normally be permitted if they would cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside, cause undue harm to important natural landscape features, be inconsistent with local character, or adversely impact on the setting of settlements.
- 8.21. Saved Policy C28 of the CLP 1996 states that control will be exercised over all new development to ensure that standards of layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the context of that development. Further, saved Policy C30 of CLP 1996 states control will be exercised to ensure that all new housing development is compatible with the appearance, character, layout, scale and density of existing dwellings in the vicinity. Saved Policy C33 seeks to retain undeveloped gaps of land which are important to the character of loose knit settlement structures.
- 8.22. The application site is part of a swathe of undeveloped land to the east of the village that provides a gentle transition between the built form of the village and the wider open countryside to the west and south. The views of the site are contained to the west by the significant planting in this location which is indicated to be retained would reduce wider landscape and visual impacts to the west of the site however there would be some views of the upper parts of the dwellings from the bridleway to the side of the site given it is on rising land.
- 8.23. The site is clearly visible in the more localised views from the south and east of the site, including views from around the village green which is located on higher land and offers views over the site. In these views the undeveloped and open nature of the site are important in providing a rural setting to the village and significantly, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area and the local distinctiveness of Fringford which is in part derived from the open spaces. The land on the application site also rises from east to west (approx. 2.5 to 3m difference) which increases the sites visibility and presence in views from the east around the green. The road to the south of the site (believed to be locally referred to as Crow Lane) is also very rural in nature given its width and verdant character and is one of the more sensitive gateways to the village. Furthermore, it is utilised by walkers etc as a connection to the rights of way to the west of the site. The verdant and undeveloped nature of the site make an important contribution to the character and appearance of this route and setting of the green. During the course of the application an oak tree to the south east of the site (adjacent to the road and The Cottage) has been subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) given its amenity value to the area.
- 8.24. Whilst there is some built development to the north and east of the site the dwellings/buildings are generally widely dispersed and have a very loose knit pattern of development and are set in large plots dominated by extensive planting and greenery.
- 8.25. The introduction of built development on the site would have a significantly harmful urbanising impact on the site which, as outlined above, plays an important role in preserving the rural character and appearance of this part of the village and in views from around the village green. This open land would be replaced with dwellings (likely to be substantial massing and size) and boundary treatments which would undermine the rural and open setting of the village.
- 8.26. Whilst the proposed development would be low density (approximately 12.5 dph), this would do little to address the harmful urbanising impacts of the development and would appear out of keeping at this edge of village location. The harm and

visual impacts would be further exacerbated by the need to remove much of the frontage hedgerow and historic stone wall to the road to the south of the site to provide adequate visibility splays (as detailed in the Transport Assessment). This would open up further views into the site and the indicative layout shows rears of properties backing onto this boundary with the likely rear fences, garages and no frontage facing the road.

- 8.27. Whilst the application is made in outline with all matters reserved the illustrative layout demonstrates that the proposal would be poorly integrated into the character of this part of the village and would result in the provision of a modern housing estate which harmfully impacts on the setting of the village to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The development would appear prominent and poorly related to the surrounding built development given the provision of 9 detached dwellings accords the site.
- 8.28. Whilst the layout plans are only indicative, they show an inward looking development which turns its back on the road and village. This further reinforces the detached nature of the development and results in a very poor relationship with the character of the village where development generally provides active frontages to the roads and public spaces and in a linear manor. At the periphery of the village there are some examples of more nucleated forms of development however they are arranged in tighter courtyard forms relating to the redevelopment of farmyards and normally include the associated larger historic farmhouse. The proposed development, with large houses turning their back of the village, is poorly integrated and would appear as a modern estate of large, detached properties sprawling across the site.
- 8.29. The proposal would also be harmful to those users of the road entering and leaving the village and would appear as a bolt on and incongruous new housing development at a sensitive and open edge of the village.
- 8.30. The Transport Assessment also shows the provision of a new passing place on the road to the south (to the west of the proposed access to the site) and also a new footpath connection from within the site linking back to Fringford village (drawing number 2021/5908/001 P4 in the Transport Statement). This would result in some further urbanisation to the lane. However importantly is also unclear whether the footpath link could be accommodated without impacting on the protected oak tree to the south east of the site (T18 in the submitted Arboricultural Report). The submitted Arboricultural assessment does not include any consideration of the impact on the construction of this footpath on this tree despite it lying within the root protection area. The Councils arborist has objected to the application on this basis and lack of information, and it is considered there is insufficient information at the current time to assess whether this tree could be retained.
- 8.31. The Council's Arborist also raises several other concerns regarding the relationship between dwellings and retained tree/hedgerows however as the application is made in outline with all matters reserved except access these matters could be considered in the reserved matters application for layout etc.
- 8.32. In conclusion, having regard to the established character and appearance of the area, it is considered that the loss of this undeveloped parcel of land to a new housing development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be harmful to the locally distinctive character of Fringford and the immediately locality particularly in views from the road to the south of the site and around the village green. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the setting of the settlement and would be contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the CLP 2015, saved Policy C28, C30 and C33 of CLP 1996 and

advice in the NPPF. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in the loss of the protected oak tree to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. This is contrary to Policies ESD10, ESD13, and ESD15 of the CLP 2015.

Highways

- 8.33. Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 states that: *“New development proposals should be designed to deliver high quality safe, attractive, durable and healthy places to live and work. Development of all scales should be designed to improve the quality and appearance of an area and the way it functions.”* Policy SLE4 states that: *“All development where reasonable to do so, should facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport (and) development which is not suitable for the roads that serve the development and which have a severe traffic impact will not be supported.”* The NPPF advises that development should provide safe and suitable access for all and development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe.
- 8.34. The significant shortcomings in the general sustainability of the site are outlined elsewhere in this report and the Highway Authority object on this basis.
- 8.35. Several public objections have been received regarding the impacts of additional traffic using the single width carriageway to the south of the site and the impact on the highway network and highway and pedestrian safety.
- 8.36. The current application seeks permission for the principal means of access into the site. The plans in the Transport Statement also show the provision of a new passing place on the lane to the south of the site along with a new footpath, to the northern side of this lane, linking from the site access back to the village. Contrary to this the indicative layout plans show a new footpath to the west of the site linking the site to an unmade track (which appears to be private drive serving a few dwellings) which links back to the village. Residents have stated that the applicant does not have rights to use this unmade track for access which is private. Officers did request further clarification of this alongside clarification of the extent of the footpath to the south of the site (which is not totally clear from the plans and is not shown on the indicative site plans) however this has not been forthcoming. For the purposes of the determination of this application it has been assumed that the footpath link in the Transport Statement is the correct one and it is assessed on that basis.
- 8.37. Despite not agreeing to the trip rates that the applicant has adopted in the TA (e.g., too low) the Highway Authority consider the proposal is likely to result in 5 -6 two way trips in the am/pm peak. Whilst having regard to the limiting nature of the roads this is not considered to result in a severe highway impact which is the test outlined in the NPPF. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed vehicle passing place would mitigate any additional vehicle conflict which may occur in this area and offer a benefit to existing road users.
- 8.38. The Highway Authority also considers the layout of the new access to be acceptable in highway safety terms and officers see no reason to disagree with this. The removal of the hedge for visibility splays is covered elsewhere in this report. The access also includes the provision of a new footpath along the north of the lane which is considered to be acceptable in highway terms and would provide new residents a safe walking route along the narrow lane until the Green when wider verges and better visibility exists. Whilst it is noted that this footpath would not connect to existing footpath provision (for which there is limited availability in Fringford as a whole) it would allow residents and visitors to have a safe route from the site at the narrowest part of the lane and remain clear of conflict with vehicles in this area. On balance, this is considered to be acceptable given the character and

nature of the rest of the village, much of which doesn't benefit from footways. The concerns regarding the impact of the footpath on the protected oak tree are covered elsewhere in the report.

- 8.39. The passing place and footpath appear to be located on the adopted highway and their provision could be secured through a Grampian condition if the development were considered to be acceptable in all other respects.
- 8.40. Given the scale of the proposal, whilst it is acknowledged it will generate additional traffic on the local road, having regard to the passing place and footpath provision, the proposed development is not considered to result in any severe impacts on the operation of the highway or, on balance, highway safety concerns which are the tests laid out in the NPPF. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.
- 8.41. Matters of parking would be considered during reserved matters for layout however it is considered that the site could accommodate adequate parking for occupants and visitors given its size.

Flood risk and drainage

- 8.42. Policy ESD6 of the CLP 2015 essentially replicates national policy contained in the NPPF with respect to assessing and managing flood risk. In short, this policy resists development where it would increase the risk of flooding and seeks to guide vulnerable developments (such as residential) towards areas at lower risk of flooding. Policy ESD7 of the Local Plan requires the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to manage surface water drainage. This is all with the aim to manage and reduce flood risk in the District. Footnote 55 of the NPPF states that a Flood Risk Assessment should be provided on land that may be subject to other sources of flooding where development would introduce a more vulnerable use.
- 8.43. The current application is accompanied by a Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy. The current site is situated wholly within Flood Zone 1 which is land which has a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding which is the lowest probability of river flooding. The EA surface water maps show the site largely within an area of low surface water flooding, but lower parts of the site are located within areas of medium risk of surface water flooding.
- 8.44. As outlined above the policies require the use of SUDS. The submitted FRA indicates that following investigation traditional shallow infiltration would not be suitable given ground conditions however based on underlying geology it may be possible to discharge water to the ground via deep boreholes however this would require further testing and investigation. Discharge to a watercourse is not feasible as there are none located near the site and there are no surface water or combined sewers which are likely to be feasible. Therefore, options for surface water disposal are likely to be limited to deep borehole soakaways however this would require further on site testing. A pond is illustrated within the layout which could be used for attenuation along with other methods.

- 8.45. The Council's Drainage Officer has been consulted and has stated:

The surface water management strategy is incomplete. The Assessment concludes that shallow conventional soakaways will not be suitable and proposes deep borehole soakaways instead. No detailed information is provided and the practical viability of this solution has not been investigated. Moreover, if such boreholes were feasible it is likely they would require the consent of the Environment Agency which also does not appear to have investigated. The soakage rate suggested is based on an assumption and may not be realistic.

Any exceedance flows caused by the site system being overwhelmed will naturally discharge towards the village pond to the east of the site. There have been instances of the pond surcharging in severe conditions resulting in internal flooding to an adjacent property. The need for certainty in the drainage solution is therefore paramount.

In summary, the applicant should be requested to provide more details of the proposed means of surface water disposal based on actual site conditions. This is crucial to the development and cannot be conditioned. We first need to be satisfied that an acceptable surface water drainage solution exists.

- 8.46. Given the above it is considered that the use of deep borehole soakaways has not been adequately demonstrated to be viable and there is therefore insufficient evidence to conclude with any certainty that a suitable surface water strategy could be accommodated to serve the development. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies ESD6 and ESD7 of the CLP 2015 and advice in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.
- 8.47. The FRA includes correspondence from Anglian Water indicating that the public sewer could accommodate additional foul water from the development. Therefore, whilst noting the concerns of residents, given the evidence, this is not considered to be a constraint to the development.

Ecology

- 8.48. The NPPF states that Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by (amongst others): a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils; and d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.
- 8.49. It goes on to state that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.
- 8.50. Policy ESD10 of the CLP 2015 lists measures to ensure the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment, including a requirement for relevant habitat and species surveys and associated reports to accompany planning applications which may affect a site, habitat or species of known ecological value.
- 8.51. The Planning Practice Guidance dated 2014 post-dates the previous Government Circular on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (ODPM Circular 06/2005), although this remains extant. The PPG states that Local Planning Authorities should only require ecological surveys where clearly justified, for example if there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by development. Assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity.
- 8.52. The current application has been accompanied by an Ecological Appraisal which has been considered by the Council's Ecologist (CE). The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory designations.

- 8.53. The Council's Ecologist has advised that there are no particular issues with protected species or habitats on the site. However, some grassland and hedgerow are to be lost. Some new habitat is proposed to be provided on site, however there is no Biodiversity Impact Assessment to demonstrate a net gain will be achieved through the new development. Whilst this is an omission it is noted the application is in outline application with all matters reserved. Given the size of the site and quantum of development proposed it is considered that a biodiversity enhancement scheme and Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) could be conditioned to be submitted alongside any reserved matters for layout to demonstrate that a net gain can be achieved on the site. It is noted that this may require significant alteration to the layout and development proposed however given the size of the site and the overall level of development proposed this is considered to be achievable and whilst not ideal does not constitute a reason to refuse the application.
- 8.54. Biodiversity enhancement measures and a CEMP could also be secure by condition.
- 8.55. Overall, there are not considered to be any ecological reasons to withhold consent and the outstanding concerns of the Council's Ecologist could be conditioned and considered through reserved matters applications.

Heritage including archaeology

- 8.56. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF advises that "*Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation*".
- 8.57. The County's Archaeologist has advised:

The site lies to the west of the historic core of Fringford on a parcel of land with extant ridge and furrow. Medieval pottery was found 30m to the north during the development of a swimming pool (PRN 10974), and archaeological interventions approximately 100m to the east of the site at The Paddock, recorded late Iron Age – Roman pottery as well as late Saxon and Early Medieval features (EOX2525). There is potential for archaeological remains to survive beneath the extant ridge and furrow.

Our response to the pre-application enquiry was for the applicant to produce an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment which considers any heritage assets and the potential impact which the development may have on these. A DBA has not been submitted with this application, though this would be informed by a predetermination evaluation.

They have therefore advised that there is insufficient information to and that the applicant should be responsible for the submission of an archaeological field evaluation.

- 8.58. As this information has not been submitted, it is not possible to make an informed determination of the archaeological impacts of this proposal. The presence of ridge and furrow and other finds in the area heighten the sensitivity of the site and indicates underground heritage may be a significant constraint. Permission must therefore be refused in this regard, due to its non-compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 194 of the NPPF.

- 8.59. It is noted that an application for a single dwelling was dismissed in the locality on this basis under APP/C3105/W/21/3270400 as insufficient evidence had been provided.
- 8.60. Concerns have been raised from residents regarding the impact of the development on a number of Listed Buildings including Green Farm, Green Farm Cottage and the Barn to the west of Green Farmhouse. These are all Grade II listed. Their significance largely derives from their architectural, vernacular and historic interest. Whilst the setting of these buildings does contribute some element towards their significance, particularly those facing on The Green, given the spatial relationship and intervening buildings, the proposed development is not considered to adversely impact on their significance. The Conservation Officer has raised no objections in this respect.

Residential amenity

- 8.61. Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2015 states that new development proposals should consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, and indoor and outdoor space. Paragraph 185 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollutions (including noise) on health and living conditions. It advises that new development should avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.
- 8.62. The application is made in outline and so the layout is subject to further control through reserved matters. It is considered that the proposed quantum of development could be achieved on the site whilst providing acceptable back to back distances to neighbouring properties to ensure the development would not result in significant levels of overlooking, loss of privacy or outlook to neighbouring properties. Whilst the current layout does present some concerns in this respect, the application is made in outline and so the layout and appearance of dwellings can be subject to change. It is acknowledged that there will be some increase in overlooking and loss of outlook to the properties such as The Paddocks and The Cottage. However, this is a product of most new developments on green field sites and given the size of the site and the distance to neighbouring properties it is not considered that these would be significant and would be in excess of the Council's standards and these properties would still have a good level of amenity which is the test in planning policy. It is a long established planning principle that there is no right to a view over undeveloped land and the planning system operates in the wider public interest rather than the private interest of individual land/property owners.
- 8.63. The provision of a 2.5 metre fence around the garden of the Cottage contributes to the urbanising concerns regarding the proposal however it is only 0.5m taller than a fence that could be erected under permitted development in this location and given its distance from the house is not considered to unduly impact on the general amenity of this property.
- 8.64. In this case there are also personal circumstances to consider. The Council has been notified that the owner of The Cottage requires around the clock care as a result of a traumatic brain injury and the proposed development and associated noise, and disturbance could have potential for life threatening consequences. He has limited mobility and does not have the ability to save himself if he falls which could occur from shock of loud noises etc. He has difficulties processing what is happening around him, expressing himself and coping with changes. The occupant suffers from epilepsy and fits which can be triggered by stress, exhaustion and lack of sleep which may occur from the proposed development which can be life threatening. A letter from a consultant neurologist and a GP supports this assertion.

- 8.65. In the letter of objection made on behalf of this resident it is stated that the bedroom of the occupant and the main living room are located in the west and north of the dwelling facing over the application site. It goes onto state:

The noise associated with the construction works, which includes the main access and buildings near his property, even with the employment of best practices, will invariably result in unexpected loud noises and general disturbance, which could cause confusion and stress, triggering an epileptic fit. It is noted that even electing to move Mr McDonagh to a different location during the construction period will result in significant change to his normal routine and would cause stress. Additionally, the future occupation of the houses may have a similar impact, particularly given the proximity of the garages to his property and the dwelling closest to The Cottage,

- 8.66. Concerns have also been raised over the 2.5m fence proposed around the garden (for noise mitigation) which is argued to be harmful to the amenity of the property and not stop intermittent noise. Furthermore, no details are provided over what is planned for the land immediately adjoining the north and west elevation of The Cottage (which isn't in the Cottages ownership). The applicant's agent has stated in an email dated 28th July that it is the intention for this area to become part of the garden of the existing dwelling (The Cottage). However there is no indication of how the applicant proposes to secure this (e.g., legal agreement) or if discussions have taken place with the carers of the occupant of The Cottage regarding this.
- 8.67. The Council as a public body must have regard to the Public Sector Equality Act given the occupant of the adjacent property has protected characteristics (protected characteristics include disability (S149(7))). This requires consideration of the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
- 8.68. It is acknowledged that the proposed development would impact on the disabled resident adjacent to the site to a greater extent than under ordinary circumstances due to his disability. However, this needs to be weighed against the wider public interest that the planning system operates in the context. There are public benefits of providing additional housing to meet housing needs in the district and the temporary nature of construction activities where the main impacts are likely to occur. It is considered that, if acceptable in all other respect, certain measures could be discussed to help reduce some of these concerns (such as the consideration of the applicant providing alternative accommodation prior to commencement of the works for the duration of the construction activities and the transferring of the land immediately to the north and west of The Cottage to their ownership). Whilst acknowledging the personal circumstances of the neighbour and having great sympathy with their concerns this is not a matter which is considered to justify refusal of the scheme given the wider public benefits associated with the construction of new homes.

Other matters

- 8.69. The site is over 6 dwelling and therefore the threshold for the provision of open space in rural areas is applicable. Policy BSC10 and BSC11 require new developments to make provision of new open space to meet the needs of future residents. Table 7 of the CLP 2015 sets out the threshold for 'general green space' as 6 dwellings. Given the size of the development (9 dwellings) it is likely to require approximately 300sqm of general green space. This should be conditioned to be secured in the reserved matters application alongside details of the long term management of this space to serve the residents of the development.

- 8.70. Policy BSC4 of the CLP 2015 deals with housing mix and states that the mix of houses will be negotiated having regard to the up-to-date evidence on housing needs and creating socially mixed and inclusive communities. The current application provides an indicative housing mix of 2 x 3-bedroom and 7 x 4-bedroom dwellings. This is not ideal given the SHMA 2014 indication of mix which if adopted would require the provision of some smaller housing. However, this is a matter which would need to be conditioned and considered at reserved matters.
- 8.71. The site does not represent efficient use of land being significantly below the 30dph target of Policy BSC2. This weighs against the development however it is considered that a higher density would exacerbate other planning harms identified.

9. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 9.1. The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 requires that the three dimensions to sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) are pursued in mutually supportive ways.
- 9.2. The proposed development would result in the provision of 9 new market dwellings in the District where there is an identified and unmet need for housing district wide. This attracts significant weight in favour of the development in light of the Council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply and the NPPF's objective to significantly boost housing supply and that small sites can make a valuable contribution. The economic benefits associated with the construction of the dwellings attracts moderate weight given they are likely to be relatively limited and short lived. Any economic or social benefits to promoting thriving rural communities is only given limited weight as there is no evidence to suggest that any of the services or facilities are at risk or that the proposal would have a meaningful beneficial impact on them.
- 9.3. The wider highway impacts of the development are neutral as are the impact on ecology and neighbour amenity so do not weigh in favour or against the development.
- 9.4. Weighing against the development, the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan when read as a whole and the primacy and faith in the plan led system as advocated by the NPPF. The weight to the housing policy conflict in the Development Plan is tempered as they are considered out of date. However, the development is not located in a geographically sustainable location where access to basic services and facilities to meet day to day needs of residents can be met, and there is large reliance on private car, this environmental harm and policy conflict is therefore still considered to carry significant weight against the development. In addition to this there would be harm to the environment through a poorly related scheme which does not respect or enhance the established character and appearance of the area or the built form of the village and would result in a harmful impact to the setting of the village to the detriment of the quality of the area.
- 9.5. Overall taking these matters together, the proposed environmental and policy harm arising from the development are considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the relatively modest economic and social benefits arising from the provision of 9 new market homes. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be refused.

10. RECOMMENDATION

That permission is refused, for the following reason(s):

1. Located in the open countryside, beyond the built-up limits of Fringford, the proposal constitutes unsustainable development and is therefore unacceptable in principle. The scheme is contrary to Policies BSC1, ESD1 and Villages 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy H18 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 as well as the Council's declared climate emergency and would not accord with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework. This identified policy conflict and environmental harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the proposal's benefits which includes the provision of new housing at a time when the Council's cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.
2. The proposed development would detrimentally impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be out of keeping with the established built form of Fringford. It would result in a harmful urbanisation to the rural setting of the village and the locally distinctive character of this part of the village. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policies C28, C30 and C33 of Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The site lies within an area of known archaeological importance. In the absence of a satisfactory archaeological field evaluation having been conducted and the results assessed, the proposal is unacceptable, as it is likely to cause damage to artefacts of acknowledged archaeological significance. The proposal therefore fails to accord with to Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. Inadequate information has been provided on the potential impact the proposed development, in particular the proposed footway, would have on the protected oak tree to the south east of the site (identified as T18 in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment) which makes a significant positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In the absence of an appropriate mitigation strategy to address any potential harm, the proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies ESD10, ESD13, and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.
5. The application fails to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate an acceptable surface water drainage strategy is possible at the site which would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ESD6 and ESD7 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: James Kirkham

DATE: 23rd September 2022

Checked By: Paul Ihringer

DATE: 27/9/22
