

CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Appeal by CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd against the decision of Cherwell District Council to refuse outline planning permission for a development of up to 200 residential units with access, amenity space and associated works at South Lodge, Fringford Road, Caversfield.

Appellant	:	CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Appeal Site	:	South Lodge, Fringford Road, Caversfield
Appellant's Agent	:	Pegasus Group
LPA Reference	:	13/01056/OUT
Planning Inspectorate Reference	:	APP/C3105/A/13/2208385

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

OF

REBECCA ELIZABETH HORLEY

BSc (Hons) MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer, Cherwell District Council

FEBRUARY 2014

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Purpose and Scope of Proof	3
Appeal site location and proposal	3
Relevant planning history	3
Relevant planning policy	4
Reasons for refusal	4
The Council's case	5
Housing Land Supply	6
Principle of the development	6
Open Countryside policy	8
Green Buffer policy	9
Heritage Assets	10
Encroachment into open countryside beyond the built up limits of Bicester and Caversfield	11
Sustainable development	12
Provision of affordable housing	14
Section 106 obligation	15
Conclusion	15
List of Appendices	17

INTRODUCTION

My name is Rebecca Elizabeth Horley. I hold a science degree with honours in Environmental Planning and I am a full Member of The Royal Town Planning Institute. I have 15 years' experience working as a Planning Officer within the Development Control departments of the London Borough of Southwark and Cherwell District Council and 10 years prior to that employed as a town planning advisor for a major retailer. I have been employed by Cherwell District Council since August 2000 and am currently a Principal Planning Officer, having held the post for 7 years.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF PROOF

In this proof, I will deal with the general planning policy considerations that arise in this appeal. I will explain why the proposal does not accord with development plan and national planning policy, with a particular focus on the principle of the development in this unsustainable location outside the defined village and its wider historic and rural context. I explain why the Council considers the proposal unacceptable as the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Although I mention the landscape and visual impacts of the proposal in general terms below, the detailed evidence on this issue will be provided by the Council's expert, David Huskisson of David Huskisson Associates, who also addresses Green Buffer policy and heritage assets as they relate to this issue.

1. APPEAL SITE LOCATION AND PROPOSAL

- 1.1 A full description has been provided in section 1 of the Council's Rule 6 Statement. Please see *Appendix A* which contains a plan of the site for illustrative purposes only.

2. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1 Details of the relevant planning history have been provided in section 2 of the Council's Rule 6 Statement. A screening opinion (reference 13/00044/SO) was provided and issued on 3 July 2013 determining that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required for the proposed development.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, states that applications for development must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reflected in paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Council's development plan comprises those saved policies of the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (ACLPL), as detailed in section 3 of the Council's Rule 6 Statement. The amount of weight that can be attributed to those saved policies depends on their consistency with the NPPF in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF.
- 3.2 On 13 December 2004, the Council approved the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 (NSCLP) as interim planning policy for development control purposes. Although a material consideration, limited weight can be attributed to policies contained within the NSCLP.
- 3.3 The Cherwell Local Plan 2006-2031 has completed the public consultation stage and was approved unanimously by full Council on 21 October 2013 for submission to the Secretary of State. The Plan was formally submitted on 31 January 2014. Given its current status it can only be attributed limited weight. For clarity, and to differentiate it from the ACLP, this document will be referred to as the Submission Cherwell Local Plan (SCLP).

4. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 4.1 The Council refused planning permission for the following reasons:

"1. The proposal represents development beyond the built up limits of Caversfield where there is no proven need for agriculture or other existing undertaking and the application has not been made on the basis that it is a rural exceptions site. As the proposal cannot be justified on the basis of an identified need in an unsustainable location, it represents sporadic development in the countryside which fails to maintain its rural character and appearance and which fails to conserve and enhance the environment by introducing an incongruous, prominent, urbanising and discordant built form into this rural setting to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area. The application is, therefore, contrary to Policies H15, H18, C7, C8, C28 and C30 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, Policies ESD13, ESD15 & ESD18 and

Villages 1 and 2 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan Incorporating Changes March 2013 and Government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Development of this site would erode an important green buffer gap between the planned expansion of Bicester and the village of Caversfield which would be harmful to the setting and identity of Caversfield itself and also that of the setting of the RAF Bicester Conservation Area as it would fail to preserve or enhance its setting contrary to Policy ESD15 and ESD16 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan Incorporating Changes March 2013 and Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed access is adequate in terms of its visibility so close to a junction which already suffers from substandard visibility. Together with the proposed pedestrian layout and general lack of information with regard to the parking requirements the proposed development would be detrimental to the safety and convenience of highway users, contrary to Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. In the absence of a satisfactory planning obligation, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the infrastructure directly required to service or serve the proposed development will be provided. This would be contrary to the Policy R12 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan, Policies OA1, TR4, R8 and R10A of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011, Policy INF1 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan Incorporating Changes March 2013 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.”

- 4.2 Reason for Refusal No. 4 is the subject of ongoing negotiation with the appellant to agree financial obligations sought by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council. Should a satisfactory planning obligation be completed, the Council would withdraw the fourth reason.

5. THE COUNCIL'S CASE

- 5.1 At its meeting on 3 October 2013, the Council's Planning Committee refused planning permission for up to 200 residential dwellings (including 35% [up to 70 dwellings] affordable housing) with access from Fringford Road together with amenity space and

associated works including new village shop/hall, for the four reasons detailed in section 4 above.

Housing Land Supply

- 5.2 The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The most recent Annual Monitoring Review (December 2013), approved by the Council's Executive on 6th January 2014, states that the Council currently has a 4.7 year housing land supply (including a 20% buffer) for the period 2013-2018. As the Council accepts that paragraph 14 and 49 of the NPPF are engaged, there is no need to give detailed evidence in relation to the supply.

Principle of Development

- 5.3 The appeal site is situated beyond the built up limits of both the village of Caversfield and the town of Bicester and is considered to be open countryside. Policy H18 of the ACLP (Policy H19 of the NSCLP) requires that new dwellings beyond the built up limits of settlements are only approved in the event of them being essential for agriculture or other existing undertakings. It is clear that this does not apply to the appeal proposal therefore it is contrary to Policy H18 of the ACLP.
- 5.4 Whilst it is accepted that the housing supply policies of the ACLP are out of date, this does not mean that the entirety of these policies are no longer to be applied. Housing Policy H18 also serves to protect the countryside outside settlements, which is consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF which states that '[t]he planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:....protecting and enhancing valued landscapes..' In a recent appeal decision for this district (ref: APP/C3105/A/12/2168102 at Adderbury), the Inspector reasoned at paragraph 16 of his report that '[p]olicies that restrict development in the countryside clearly accord with the core planning principle of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' (further referenced at paragraph 17 of the NPPF). This decision is attached at *Appendix B*.
- 5.5 Neither the ACLP nor the SCLP contain a policy which seeks to allocate the appeal site for residential development. Policy H12 allows for development within the built-up limits of rural settlements in accordance with Policies H13, H14 and H15. Caversfield, being unnamed in policies H13 and H14, is a category 3 settlement which is one which is so

small that it should not be subjected to any significant future growth. Development at category 3 settlements such as Caversfield, is restricted to conversions and where there is an essential need for agriculture or other existing undertaking.

- 5.6 As regards landscape conservation, Policy C7 of the ACLP seeks to prevent development that would *cause demonstrable harm to the topography and character of the landscape*. Policy C7 is consistent with the policy of the NPPF and can be accorded significant weight. A similar function is performed by the landscape policies contained within the NSCLP and the SCLP (Policies EN34 and ESD13 respectively).
- 5.7 Policy C8 of the ACLP seeks to resist sporadic development in the open countryside and Policy C15 of the ACLP seeks to prevent the coalescence of settlements and to safeguard the identities of those villages close to the urban areas, in this case Bicester and Caversfield village.
- 5.8 Notwithstanding the above, it is accepted that some green field sites beyond settlement boundaries will have to be developed in order to meet the District's future housing requirements. There can therefore be no blanket protection of sites on the edge of settlements on the grounds that there will be landscape harm and each application has to be determined on its merits.
- 5.9 The focus of the SCLP is on meeting the needs of the District by using a sustainability-based strategy which accords with the NPPF and emphasises the importance that should be attributed to promoting sustainable development. Part of this strategy involves directing the majority of new housing towards the main urban centres within the District, namely Banbury and Bicester. Only limited growth is projected for the smaller rural settlements, depending on the size of the village. This approach is reflected in Policies BSC1 (urban focus of growth) and BSC2 (reuse of brownfield land) and further supported by Policy ESD1, a policy which seeks to secure sustainable patterns of growth.
- 5.10 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF explains that there are three dimensions (economic, social and environmental) to sustainable development. The three roles are stated below:
Economic – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure ;

Social – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and

Environmental - contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

5.11 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent; *“to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system”*.

5.12 The Council accepts that paragraph 14 of the NPPF is engaged in the absence of a five year housing land supply. It further recognises that, in addition to helping to address the housing deficit, the scheme would result in a number of material benefits including a commitment to meet the Council’s 35% affordable housing requirement. However, it is considered that the harm that this proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the landscape would significantly and demonstrably outweigh such benefits.

Open countryside policy

5.13 This proposal would involve building beyond the established settlement boundary into the open countryside and causing harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. Detailed evidence on the nature of this harm, and its extent, is provided by David Huskisson of David Huskisson Associates.

5.14 The policies which are relevant to the appeal relate to issues of sustainability and the protection of the countryside. They are not restricted simply to housing land supply. In respect of saved ACLP H18, paragraph 2.76 makes clear that it has a function of protecting the countryside along with Policy C8, which seeks to resist sporadic development. Substantial weight can still be given to these policies in accordance with the NPPF.

- 5.15 Whilst the Non-Statutory Local Plan 2011 is not part of the statutory Development Plan, it has been approved by Cherwell District Council for development control purposes and is a material consideration, albeit one that carries limited weight. Policies H19, EN30, EN31, EN32 and EN34 are particularly relevant as they reflect the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan policies H18, C8 and C15. Whilst the document as a whole carries limited weight, it is noted that the Council did not allocate this site for development in the NSCLP and seeks to restrict new development in the open countryside. The thrust of the policies is to maintain, conserve, protect and enhance the rural character and appearance of the countryside, preventing sporadic and unplanned development beyond the built up limits of the settlement and further to prevent the coalescence of settlements. These policies are similar to Policies C8 and C15 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. Therefore, as with the equivalent policies in the adopted plan, the proposal is also contrary to Policies H19, EN30, EN31, EN32 and EN34 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan.
- 5.16 The Cherwell Local Plan Submission Document (January 2014) currently carries limited weight as it is still subject to examination having been submitted to the Secretary of State. Nevertheless, it is a material consideration, given the stage it has reached.

Green buffer policy

- 5.17 Green Boundaries to Growth Policy ESD15 of the SCLP seeks to prevent coalescence between settlements to protect the identity of valued features of landscape and historic value such as the setting of RAF Bicester Conservation Area and important views over the rural landscape between Caversfield and Bicester. Without the Green Buffer, the separation and distinctive identity of Caversfield would be harmed through the reduction of the distance between the settlements, leading to coalescence. The Council particularly recognised the threat of Bicester and Caversfield coalescing in the supporting paragraph 9.64 to Policy EN32 of the NSCLP.
- 5.18 The appeal proposal would extend the built form beyond the existing built-up limits of the town of Bicester, into the green buffer beyond the northern part of the town which seeks to protect the separate identity and setting of Caversfield and prevent coalescence. The appeal proposal would therefore be contrary to this emerging Green Buffer policy.

- 5.19 Policy ESD13 states that development will be expected to respect and enhance local landscape character and that proposals will not be permitted if they would cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside or be inconsistent with local character.
- 5.20 Policy ESD16 reflects policies in the extant development plan. It states that new development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting, layout and high quality design. It also states that new development should '[r]espect local topography and landscape features including...historic boundaries, features and their setting'. New development will be expected to preserve, sustain and enhance non-designated heritage assets and their settings and ensure that development is sensitively sited and integrated.

Heritage assets

- 5.21 This is of particular significance to the appeal site because the RAF Bicester Conservation Area forms an important historic boundary to the north of the town. The proposed buffer between Caversfield and the edge of the town and the proposed development at NW Bicester, although necessary for mitigation purposes, would continue to form a distinct visual and physical divide. Attached at *Appendix C* is the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal for RAF Bicester dated 6 October 2008.
- 5.22 The historic separation between Caversfield and the expanding airfield was preserved throughout the 20th century, the only interruption being the creation of the riding stables and accompanying buildings in the very late 20th century. This form of use was considered appropriate to the rural setting due to its essential need. Attached at *Appendix D* is the Inspectors decision for the erection of a dwelling house and single storey annex for groom
- 5.23 Fringford Road was intended to delineate the end of the airfield domestic site. It marks the boundary of development, with the existing houses built before it acting as an "end point" on the eastern side of the road. There is a distinct character to the military residences along Skimmingdish Lane, and there is minimal interaction with the remainder of Caversfield due to the introverted nature of military sites. 1 Skimmingdish Lane acts as a landmark, funnelling traffic down the Lane towards the main domestic site and airfield, and does not actively front any development to the north. This is further compounded by the late 20th century development to the north, which turns its back on Fringford Road, providing no opportunity for interaction. An opportunity for interaction

could have been taken in the 1960s-70s when Barnfield Close was constructed. However, that was another introverted scheme which saw its focus as the domestic site, rather than Fringford Road. Any development on the western side of Fringford Road would therefore be an isolated settlement lacking cohesion with the remainder of the village. While this was, to some degree, the situation with the domestic site, some attempt has been made with other development within Caversfield to integrate with other buildings and to connect with Skimmingdish Lane and the wider conservation area. This would not be possible with development on the western side of Fringford Lane.

- 5.24 The setting of the Conservation Area also makes a vital contribution to its features and its characteristics and it is considered that this proposal would have a harmful effect in this regard. Most Conservation Areas are centred around traditional historic villages characterised by dense central cores becoming more loose knit the further out towards the perimeter with a distinct outward looking aspect. In this case, with the Conservation Area having a military function, there are no soft edges. The features of RAF Bicester are celebrated by the hard edged, "inward looking" character with the crisp, hard edges being an important characteristic. A prerequisite of this character is its location in the countryside, a relationship that would be totally lost by this proposal, particularly as this is the last piece of countryside left on this west side of the Conservation Area. Removal of this countryside setting would have a harmful effect on the setting of the Conservation Area, specifically the domestic site.

The encroachment into open countryside beyond the built up limits of Bicester and Caversfield

- 5.25 This matter is dealt with in detail by David Huskisson, but it is worth noting the concerns that were expressed by officers when the site was first considered for development, and before the Council decided to refuse the application. The 7.1ha site lies to the west of Fringford Road and is formed by paddocks in a single tenancy, with field boundary hedgerows that define the southern, western and eastern edges of the site. Please refer to *Appendix A*. There is no established boundary to the north. The residential areas of Caversfield lie to the east of Fringford Road. To the south is an unnamed road linking Fringford Road and Banbury Road, beyond which is further open land. To the northwest of the site is open farmland. By virtue of its detachment from any settlement, the proposal would breach obvious physical boundaries, extending the built residential form into the open countryside. There is no physical connection or link in the built form of the existing or proposed residential development to either Caversfield or Bicester, as

emphasised by Fringford Road. The lack of any connectivity would be a result of the proposed development being an unplanned encroachment into the rural area and it would feel like a 'bolt-on', beyond the established and well-defined northern edges of Bicester (established by the ring road) and Caversfield (established by Fringford Road). In the same vein, there would be no connectivity to the planned development at NW Bicester on the west side of Banbury Road.

Sustainable development

- 5.26 Sustainable development is at the heart of national planning policy, as paragraph 14 of the NPPF makes clear. Paragraph 6 of the NPPF states that "[t]he purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute what the Government's view of sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system".
- 5.27 The NPPF promotes sustainable transport and paragraph 34 states that decisions should ensure that developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. The site is on the edge of a major urban area where there are walking and cycling possibilities, but the peripheral location of the site would limit the potential for these modes of transport, therefore creating a need for frequent public transport services. The existing bus service is inadequate to serve the additional pressure from the proposed development and as such would require improvement secured by financial contribution. (Please see Oxfordshire County Council's formal highway response attached at *Appendix E*)
- 5.28 If a financial contribution towards improving the existing bus service is secured as requested by the County Council, and this is shown to be CIL-compliant, it is considered that the proposal would satisfy the requirements of paragraph 34 contained within the NPPF. At the time of writing, negotiations were ongoing between the applicant and the County Council.
- 5.29 Paragraph 61 of the NPPF requires that decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

- 5.30 As noted in paragraph 5.26 above, paragraph 6 of the Framework sets out the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice for the planning system. In a case such as this, sustainability concerns more than just proximity to facilities; it also means ensuring that the physical and natural environment is conserved and enhanced as well as creating a high quality built environment which contributes to building a strong economy through the provision of new housing of the right type in the right location at the right time.
- 5.31 The proposal would fail to satisfy all three dimensions of sustainability identified in paragraph 7 of the Framework as outlined in my paragraph 5.10. In particular, the environmental aspect of sustainability requires new development to contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment. Due to its encroachment into the open countryside, the proposal would represent sporadic development beyond the built up limits of the settlement, and would cause demonstrable harm to the rural character and appearance of the area through the coalescence of the Bicester and Caversfield settlements. Furthermore, due to the contribution made by the site to the setting of the Conservation Area, the proposal would fail to contribute to its protection and enhancement. I therefore consider that the proposal would fail to meet the Council's objectives to meet housing need in a way that is in line with the spatial vision for the area.
- 5.32 I also consider, therefore, that the proposal would fail adequately to perform a social role, as the development, being outside a Category 3 village, would not be in the 'right place' and would not create a 'high quality built environment'. Failing to secure a satisfactory planning agreement also indicates that the proposal is not supporting the community. Various requirements have been identified which will assist in providing the infrastructure required to service or serve the proposed development and these have not been agreed.
- 5.33 In seeking to perform an economic role, it is recognised that the development will provide housing for which there is a recognised need. However, it is not in the 'right place' and the necessary infrastructure has not been provided.
- 5.34 There is clearly an overlap in the three roles of sustainable development and paragraph 8 acknowledges this, stating that each role "*should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependent*". Further, "*to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously*".

- 5.35 For these reasons, the proposal would run contrary to the overarching principle of sustainable development.
- 5.36 Paragraph 17 of the Framework sets out 12 core land-use planning principles that should underpin plan-making and decision taking. I consider that the appeal proposal would be contrary to the following core principles in particular:
- “be genuinely plan led”
 - “.....deliverinfrastructure.....that the country needs”
 - “recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside”
 - “conserving and enhancing the natural environment”
 - “....reusing land that has not been previously developed”
 - “conserv[ing] heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance”
- 5.37 The proposal would fail to deliver a sustainable development as outlined above and in particular would cause significant and demonstrable harm to the character of the area by encroaching into the open countryside, changing its character from one of open countryside on the edge of a settlement to one of residential development that results in coalescence with the nearby Caversfield village. It also fails to provide the necessary infrastructure as demonstrated in more detail below.

Provision of affordable housing

- 5.38 The proposal includes the provision of 35% affordable housing, equating up to 70 units. This meets the Council’s current requirement of 35% and that contained within Policy BSC3 of the SCLP. As I acknowledge above, the provision of affordable housing is a material consideration in favour of the proposal but it does not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the development of this site, as described above, in conflict with other policies in the development plan.
- 5.39 Should the appeal be allowed, the delivery of affordable housing would need to be secured by planning obligation.

Section 106 obligation

- 5.40 Financial contributions are required to deal with certain impacts of the development, including (but not restricted to) affordable housing, education, public transport, sports facilities, community facilities, open space and play space. Without such contributions to secure essential infrastructure to support the development, the appeal scheme would be unsustainable. For example, although there are some services within reasonable walking distance of the site, some of the infrastructure is at or close to capacity. Given that alternative provision would be beyond the accepted maximum walking distance of 2km, further increasing the reliance on the private car, a contribution to improve the transport infrastructure would be required. This would accord with the social aspect of sustainability in the NPPF, which requires new development to create a high-quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the needs of the community.
- 5.41 To secure the above contributions, negotiations are still on-going and it is hoped that an agreement will be reached before the inquiry. It is therefore anticipated that the third reason for refusal will fall away if a satisfactory legal agreement is completed.
- 5.42 The Council is satisfied that each contribution it seeks is:
- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - (b) directly related to the development; and
 - (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 5.43 A statement regarding how each individual contribution sought is CIL-compliant will be provided at the inquiry.

6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 14 states that, at its heart, is “a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking”. For “decision-taking”, this is said to mean:
- “approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
 - where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

- 6.2 My evidence demonstrates that the development of the appeal site would fail to deliver a sustainable development resulting in encroachment into the open countryside beyond the established and well-defined physical road boundaries. The extension of the built form into the open countryside would thereby cause significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the rural area and would result in the coalescence of Bicester and Caversfield.
- 6.3 Both the principle of development and the harm which would be caused by encroachment would be contrary to adopted local policies, non-statutory policies, and national policy as set out in the NPPF.
- 6.4 The Council accepts that it cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. However, although the development would provide market and affordable housing in a broadly accessible location, for the reasons set out above, in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, it is considered that the proposal would not result in sustainable development and that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of granting consent.
- 6.5 For these reasons, the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss this appeal. Without prejudice to this request, the draft conditions at *Appendix F* are suggested to be imposed on any approval.

LIST OF APPENDICES REFERRED TO IN THIS PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Appendix A – Plan of the site

Appendix B – SoS Appeal Decision Land South of Milton Road, Adderbury
(APP/C3105/A/12/2168102) (18 June 2012)

Appendix C – RAF Bicester Conservation Area Appraisal (6 October 2008)

Appendix D – Appeal Decision (T/APP/C3105/A/89/121228/P8) dated 24 Oct 1989

Appendix E – Oxfordshire County Council's formal highway response

Appendix F – Suggested conditions

