



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 10, 11 and 12 July 2018

Site visit made on 12 July 2018

by **Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/17/3188671

Land off Blackthorn Road, Launton OX26 5DA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Manor Oak Homes (Mr William Main) against the decision of Cherwell District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01173/OUT, dated 24 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2017.
 - The development proposed is the development of up to 72 dwellings with associated large area of Public Open Space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for the development of up to 72 dwellings with associated large area of Public Open Space at Land off Blackthorn Road, Launton OX26 5DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01173/OUT, dated 24 May 2017, subject to the conditions contained in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Procedural matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters except for access to be reserved for future consideration. The application was supported by various plans and these are identified in the final signed Statement of Common Ground (CDC2) at paragraph 4. It was confirmed that the Feasibility layout, as it is referred to there (the drawing title on the plan is illustrative layout) was for illustrative purposes only to demonstrate one way in which the site could be developed.
3. During the conditions session it was also confirmed that JPP Consulting Plan T7866PM-01-A, from the Transport Assessment revision A, formed part of the plans for which permission was sought. The Council originally refused planning permission for five reasons; by the start of the Inquiry the Environment Agency and the Oxford County Council Drainage Officer withdrew their objections. This resulted in the Council no longer pursuing its objections on grounds of flooding or drainage. The Council confirmed that if a satisfactory obligation was provided to ensure the provision of infrastructure necessary to serve the development it would no longer contest that issue.
4. A completed and executed planning obligation in the form of a planning agreement pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

was provided by the close of the Inquiry. I return to the planning obligations secured below.

5. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 24 July 2018 and the parties were given the opportunity to comment on the relevance this will have on their case.
6. The Government published a Written Ministerial Statement in relation to Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire. I have had regard to the Statement.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - Whether the location and scale of the proposed development would conflict with the development plan's strategy for the distribution of housing in the district; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the settlement of Launton and the surrounding area.

Reasons

8. The development plan for the area comprises the saved policies from the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (CLP 1996) and the Cherwell Local Plan 2031 part 1 (CLP 2031 (part 1)).
9. The Council is in the process of a partial review of the CLP 2031 (part 1) to address the apportionment of Oxford's identified unmet need to the surrounding district Councils. The Council submitted the Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review (Oxford's Unmet Housing Need) to the Secretary of State on 5th March 2018. This has not been the subject of public scrutiny. Whilst the Council may have agreed the level of unmet need it is to receive from Oxford in terms of the proportionate apportionment in the context of this appeal the review carries only little weight at this point in time.
10. Reference is made in the CLP 2031 (part 1) to the Cherwell Local Plan 2031 part 2 (CLP 2031 (Part 2)) however this appears to be in the very early stages of preparation with an issues consultation paper being published in January-March 2016. I have no evidence before me of any further progress on that plan and therefore I am of the view it carries very little weight in the determination of this appeal.

Location and scale of development

11. Underpinning the CLP 2031 (part 1) is a spatial strategy for Cherwell District which focusses the bulk of the proposed growth in and around Bicester and Banbury. It limits growth in the rural areas, directs it towards larger and more sustainable villages and aiming to strictly control development in open countryside.
12. Policy BSC1 identifies that 22,840 dwellings will be provided for between 2011 and 2031; distributed between Bicester, Banbury and the Rest of the District. A significant proportion of the 'rest of the district' figure relates to a strategic allocation at RAF Upper Heyford, the remainder distributed through the categorisation of Villages in Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation and Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the rural areas. The plan seeks to alter

the local pattern of recent housing growth, as a disproportionate percentage (almost half) has taken place in smaller settlements, adding to commuting by car and congestion on the road network at peak hours. The number of new homes outside the two main towns would be around a quarter of the overall plan total.

13. Launton is identified as a category A - service village in Policy Villages 1. Policy Villages 2 confirms that over the plan period a total of 750 homes will be delivered at category A villages. There is no further distribution of delivery within the villages and there is no timeframe or trajectory for delivery associated with the overall figure. All parties accept that the headline figure is not a ceiling and that conflict would only arise if there was a material increase over and above the identified 750 dwellings. This is consistent with the Framework's approach to significantly boost the delivery of housing.
14. The 2017 Annual Monitoring Report for the district identifies that a total of 664 dwellings have been identified for meeting the Policy Villages 2 requirement. By March 2017 there had been 103 completions on those sites. The proposed development would make provision for up to a further 72 dwellings taking the total to 736 (664 + 72). The 750 figure in the policy would not be breached. Furthermore the 750 figure refers to dwellings delivered, of which to date there are only 103, substantially below the 750 figure. As a matter of fact allowing this appeal would not breach this aspect of Policy Villages 2, I return to the criteria based aspects below.
15. My attention is drawn to the dismissal of an appeal in 2015¹ on the grounds that the provision of 95 homes in one location at that early stage of the local plan period would leave little scope for development in other category A villages either in terms of numbers or timing and would thus not be in accordance with the Plan's housing strategy. This was shortly after the plan had been adopted in 2014. Matters have moved on and information is available to consider whether performance across the rest of the district is meeting the aspiration of the strategy.
16. This proposition has been taken forward in more recent appeal decisions² however none of these have been the subject of the full scrutiny of Public Inquiry. Further, there are also significant site specific differences between those decisions and this appeal related to heritage concerns, sustainability and harm to character and appearance.
17. Whilst the level of planning permissions and resolutions to approve is approaching 750 the number of units built is still substantially below that figure. That equates to a delivery rate of some 34 units per annum based on the delivery since 2014. If that were continued the delivery would be too low to reach 750 in the plan period. The latest AMR figures demonstrate that completions and planning permissions outstanding in the two principle towns of Bicester and Banbury amount to in the region of two thirds of housing delivery. The remaining one third being delivery in the rural areas, a substantial proportion of which is at a strategic allocation location. This demonstrates that the overall intention of the strategy to deliver housing in the most sustainable locations of the main towns and strategic allocation and to limit development in the rural areas is succeeding. The proportion of housing being delivered at the

¹ APP/C3105/W/14/3001612

² APP/C3105/W/16/3158925, App/C3105/W/17/3169168 and APP/C3105/W/17/3187461.

smaller villages is significantly less than half of delivery as was identified as a main driver for the development of the strategy.

18. The 750 figure is not an upper limit and it would require a material exceedance to justify arriving at a conclusion the policy was being breached. Whilst the figure is moving towards the actual figure there is still some headroom available. Time has moved on and we are now further into the plan period, any permissions that are now granted will take time to produce the delivery of housing and therefore it is likely that the delivery of the units identified in this appeal would not arise until the plan was in the second half of its term. It is in my view no longer appropriate to characterise this as early in the plan period. The CLP 2031 (part 2) plan has the potential to review the implications of these policies or a formal review of the part 1 plan could come forward.
19. On the basis of the evidence before me I am satisfied that the proposed development would not lead to a breach of this aspect of Policy Villages 2 or the overall plan strategy.
20. In any event, there is evidence to demonstrate that housing delivery is strengthening. That it is focussing in the main towns of Bicester and Banbury and the strategic allocation and that the contribution from the more sustainable villages (category A villages) in the rural area to the overall delivery of housing is achieving the plans overall need in a manner consistent with the strategy. Whilst I accept that the delivery of all of the level of housing anticipated through Policy Villages 2 could reduce the flexibility later in the plan period I have been provided with no evidence that the granting of permission here would prevent development at a more sustainable location in another Category A village.
21. Indeed it is no part of the Council's case that Launton is not a sustainable village and does not have the services and facilities to meet the day to day needs of the future residents of the proposed development. The number of units proposed would not be excessive in relation to the services and facilities available in the village. The village contains a number of facilities including two pubs, a convenience store, farm shop, primary school, community hall and small business enterprises. It is categorised as a Category A village which are those villages in the district with the highest sustainability credentials in the rural area. The village is also well served by public transport. The additional demands placed on existing facilities would be addressed through the provision of the planning obligation. The scale of the development would not substantially detract from the character of the village as I conclude below. The increase in the number of new homes would not therefore result in materially harmful effects.
22. Any future developments at Category A villages in the future would need to be considered in the context of the circumstances pertaining at that time which would include, but not be limited to, matters such as whether the 750 figure had been materially exceeded, the specific needs for that development in relation to the village and the effect on the overall settlement strategy.
23. On the basis of the above conclusions I am satisfied that the location and scale of the proposed development would not conflict with the development plan's strategy for the distribution of housing in the district. The development would not conflict with policy BSC1, Policy Villages 1 or Policy Villages 2 and would

not undermine the overall strategy of the development plan, with which it would comply.

Character and appearance

24. The Council's reason for refusal alleges that the application contained insufficient information to enable it to assess the impact of the proposed development on its surroundings.
25. I have had regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance with regard to Design and Access Statements (DAS) and to the two court cases³ submitted in Closing by the appellant to address the concern of the adequacy of the DAS. Given that the application is in outline with all matters reserved, other than access, much of the detailed layout, design and appearance are matters more properly considered at reserved matters stage. With the application before me the focus is on whether the scale and quantum of development could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site. As the PPG advises DASs are concise reports to provide a framework for applicants to explain how the proposed development is a suitable response to the site.
26. The PPG goes on to advise that the DAS must explain the design principles and concepts and demonstrate the steps taken to appraise the context and how the design takes that context into account. There is no prescriptive formulaic sequencing or ordering of steps that are to be undertaken or how these are to be ordered or reported in the final report. Given the outline nature of the application I am satisfied that there is sufficient depth and detail of analysis of the site and context and how the scheme has taken these matters on board in reaching its proposed outcome. The illustrative master plan is also just that, illustrative as one way in which the scheme could come forward, and is not set in stone.
27. The Council's witness Mr Stock confirmed under cross examination that he accepted that there was sufficient information before the Inquiry to enable me to make a proper assessment of these matters. I am satisfied that the amended DAS, the proofs of evidence of the various witnesses, the additional information submitted during the Inquiry including APP 8, along with my visits to the site and surrounding area enable me to come to an informed conclusion on the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
28. Launton is a category A larger village in the rural area of the district. Its historic form was based on a linear settlement pattern focused predominantly along Station Road and West End. There was some consolidation of built form around the cross roads created by Blackthorn Road and Bicester Road. There remain a number of historic buildings fronting primarily onto Station Road and West End with a scattering along Bicester Road and a number at the junction of Blackthorn Road and Station Road. The historic core and buildings are identifiable and visible along the main roads and it is from these vantage points that the visual contribution the historic buildings make is most readily apparent. To the north and west Launton has significantly increased in density, depth of development and form which readily detaches the historic linear form

³ Two High Court Decisions: Michael Jonathan Parker v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Rother District Council and Peter Bull [2009] EWHC 2330 (Admin). & [2011] EWHC 2325 (Admin) the Queen on the application of Bizzy B Management company Limited v Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council v Python Properties (A Firm).

of the village from the countryside and surrounding fields. Similarly to the south much of the physical relationship to the rural hinterland has been interrupted with more modern development.

29. The appeal site is located to the east and south of Station Road. The site is open fields. However the site is not readily appreciated or viewed from Station Road and there are limited views when the historic core and field pattern surrounding the village would be read in the same views. There have been some modern developments to the rear of these properties in Station Road including at The Green which further detaches the rural fields from the historic core of the settlement.
30. Approaching the village from the south along Blackthorn Road there is modern development on one side of the road up to the point where the entrance feature demarking the entrance to the village is located. On the opposite side of the road the land is also developed, in the form of a pumping station and water works. The proposed development would abut the built development of the edge of the village and provide for a significant area of retained open space. The site is reasonably well screened from the wider countryside, with significant areas of tree planting and hedge boundaries. In this regard I am satisfied that, designed with care, the proposed development would not be unduly assertive or excessively intrusive such that it would undermine the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside at this location. A suitable layout arrangement could address Blackthorn Road in a manner consistent with the existing development fronting the road. The development would not, in my view, result in the appearance that the village boundary had appreciably extended into the open countryside as the development would be within the village entrance demarcation and would be well contained by landscape features.
31. The development is proposed with a single point of access. It would therefore be a cul-de-sac of some 72 units. The illustrative layout suggests this would be with a principle spine with roads off it. I saw a number of Culs-de-sac in the village. Whilst none contained as many dwellings as that proposed in this scheme, there were a number with a similar pattern (single point of entry and accesses off a central spine) and a comparable size, eg at Sherwood Close (57 properties) and Skinner Road and Ancil Avenue (46 properties). I do not consider that the scale of development would inevitably lead to an excessively complex road layout.
32. It is no part of the Council's case that the setting of individual listed buildings would be affected by the proposed development. Further, the Council does not object to the effect of the development on landscape character. The design and appearance of the buildings, the materials to be used, the layout of the scheme are all matters that would be considered at the reserved matters application. I have neither seen nor heard anything to suggest that a competent architect could not design a scheme that would be in keeping with its surroundings.
33. I am satisfied that the provision of a Cul-de-sac including development fronting Blackthorn Road could be made to reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the village. There would be change, that is not in dispute; a field would be developed for housing but that would not in my view result in material harm to the character and appearance of the village. There is

no identified landscape harm and any residual impact can be addressed by condition, the reserved matters can ensure the design and appearance of the scheme is compatible with and reflects local distinctiveness.

34. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the settlement of Launton and the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would not conflict with policies ESD15 of Policy Villages 2 in the CLP 2031 (part 1) or policies C28 and C30 in the CLP 1996. The development would therefore comply with the development plan in these regards.

Planning Obligations

35. The appellant has provided a planning obligation in the form of a deed of agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 and section 1 of the Localism Act 2011.
36. Overall the Obligations of the agreement are related to requirements of development plan policies and are all necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They are all, furthermore, directly related to the development, are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, and are in place to mitigate the effects of the development where appropriate. The planning obligations therefore comply with the tests set out in the Framework, the advice in the National Planning Practice Guidance and with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (CIL). There is no conflict with CIL Regulation 123(3).

Other matters

37. At the outset of the Inquiry in my opening I identified whether the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites as a main issue to address. I dealt with housing land supply as a discreet topic and conducted this as a hearing style discussion session. I have taken account of the latest Written Ministerial Statement in relation to Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire. However, given my conclusions in respect of the main issues above, if I accept the Council's position on its Housing Land Supply, my overall conclusion would be that the proposals accord with an up-to-date development plan. They would therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 11 c of the Framework. This overall conclusion would not change taking on board the governments WMS on Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire. It is therefore not a matter on which my decision turns.
38. The proposed development would provide for market housing and affordable housing. The positive contribution to the supply and delivery of housing in the district given the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes (Framework paragraph 59) is a benefit of significant weight. The District has identified it has a high need for affordable housing. Securing the provision of affordable housing, through the planning obligation, therefore is also a significant positive benefit of the scheme.
39. The appeal scheme identifies a significant area of public open space the scheme would include details to enhance the biodiversity and conservation target area landscape qualities in the area. In this regard this would assist in fulfilling policy ESD11 and a minor benefit is derived from the scheme as a

result of the enhancements to biodiversity that could be secured through the development of the site.

40. The additional traffic generated by the proposed development would not result in material harm to highway safety. There is no objection from the Highway Authority and the design of the access has been accepted on the basis of the information submitted. There was no evidence to demonstrate that there would be significant inconvenience or hazard that would be caused by the proposed access location or the additional traffic that would pass through the cross roads in the centre of the village.

Conditions

41. A list of draft conditions was provided by the Council (CDC1) and updated during the Inquiry (CDC 6). I have considered the conditions in the context of the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and the model conditions set out in the annex (which remains extant) to the otherwise now cancelled Circular 11/95, the use of conditions in Planning Permissions. A number of the suggested conditions are in effect informative or advisory indicating the content of future submissions under the reserved matters, or cover matters that fall squarely within the ambit of the reserved matters. Unless it is necessary to restrict the discretion of both applicant and local planning authority at this outline stage, I have not imposed such conditions, as the submission of details/reserved matters would be the subject of evaluation.
42. Conditions 1 to 3 are the standard outline conditions and there is no reason to vary these other than removing access as a reserved matter as that was the basis of the application. Conditions 4 through to 8 address matters related to access, parking and travel. They are required to ensure the development is satisfactorily accessed and that suitable parking provision (both car and cycle) is provided and maintained on site and to ensure that the site is accessible by a range of modes of transport.
43. Conditions 9 through to 11 are required to ensure that the development is safe from flooding and does not result in an increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Launton is not connected to mains gas. Conditions 12 and 13 are required to avoid an excessive proliferation of above ground fuel tanks that could compromise the design and appearance of the final development. It could be argued that this could be left to the reserved matters but it is an important design principle and the imposition of such a condition now will ensure this matter is properly addressed at an early point in the consideration of the design of the detailed scheme.
44. Condition 14 will ensure that adequate regard is paid to the potential for buried remains and condition 15 ensures that appropriate consideration is given to securing the biodiversity enhancements and on the basis of policy ESD11. A Construction Environment and Management Plan (condition 16) is required to ensure the site is safely accessed during development, to safeguard the living conditions of surrounding residents and to ensure the development is carried out in a neighbourly manner. The site includes previously developed land and conditions 18 through to 21 address the potential for the site to be contaminated and the necessary steps to be undertaken in the event contamination is encountered. Condition 22 requires the removal of an existing residential dwelling unit to ensure the satisfactory completion of the proposed development.

45. Conditions 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 22 are 'pre-commencement' form conditions, or include such elements, and require certain actions before the commencement of development. In all cases the matters they address are of an importance or effect and need to be resolved before construction begins.

Overall conclusions

46. I have concluded that the proposed development would accord with the strategy and objectives of the CLP 2031 (part1) and that there would be no conflict with policies BSC1 or Policy Villages 1 or Policy Villages 2 in that plan in respect of the scale and location of the development. Moreover, I have concluded that there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the village or the surrounding area and therefore no conflict with policy Villages 2 or ESD15 in the CLP 2031 (Part 1) or policies C28 and C30 in the CLP 1996. On this basis I conclude that the proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan as a whole and as such would amount to sustainable development in the context of paragraph 11 of the Framework for which there is a presumption in favour of.
47. Section 38(6) of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
48. Even if I were to accept the Council's position in terms of its five year housing land supply, that there was a 5.4 year supply, that would not alter my conclusions in respect of the development plan, the presumption in favour of development or the section 38(6) position. The issue of housing land supply therefore is not determinant in this appeal.
49. The proposal accords with the development plan and there are no other material considerations that indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. The scheme benefits from the presumption in favour of development as set out in the Framework. I therefore will grant planning permission without delay.
50. With the imposition of the above mentioned conditions and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Gwion Lewis	Counsel, instructed by Amy Jones, Solicitor Cherwell District Council
He called	
Yuen Wong BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Principal Planning Policy Officer Cherwell District Council
Nathaneal Stock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Team Leader General Developments Team Cherwell District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Paul Tucker (and Sarah Reid)	Queens Counsel, instructed by Huw Mellor
He called	
Huw Mellor BA(Hons) MRTPI	Partner Carter Jonas LLP.
Ashley Thompson BA(Hons) PGDip ARCH MA ARB RIBA	Director ATA (Architecture) Ltd.
Jacqueline Mulliner BA(Hons) BTP(Dist) MRTPI	Director and Head of National Planning Terence O'Rourke Ltd.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Robert Armstrong	Local Resident
---------------------	----------------

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL (CDC)

CDC1	Draft List of suggested conditions
CDC2	Signed copy of the Statement of Common Ground
CDC3	Opening submissions on behalf of the Council
CDC4	Extract of Planning Supporting Statement by Barwood Strategic Land II LLP in respect of Land West of Bloxham Road, Banbury
CDC5	Home extensions and Alterations – Design Guide for Householder Applications March 2007 Cherwell District Council
CDC6	Updated Draft list of suggested conditions
CDC7	Update from Oxford County Council on its submissions in respect

- of Planning Obligations and compliance with Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010.
- CDC8 Copy of Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) February 2018 published by Cherwell District Council.
- CDC9 Closing submissions on behalf of Cherwell District Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY the APPELLANT (APP) – MANOR OAK HOMES

- APP1 List of appearances for the appellant
- APP2 Unsigned final draft of the Statement of Common Ground
- APP3 Draft of Final version of the Planning Obligation agreement
- APP4 Schedule of developer responses to the 2017 AMR comprehensive review of sites (on disputed sites only)
- APP5 Pack containing details of consultation on amended illustrative amended plan carried out by the appellant.
- APP6 Revised Flood Risk Assessment (Revision E: June 2018 R-FRA-T7866PM-01-E) by JPP Consulting.
- APP7 Opening submissions on behalf of the appellant
- APP8 Aerial photograph with existing Culs-de-sac and dwelling numbers identified.
- APP9 Extract from Planning Policy Guidance on Design and Access Statements.
- APP10 Letter from one of the site owners to confirm the tenancy arrangements related to the existing 'caravan' on site.
- APP11 Certified copy of the planning obligation by deed of agreement
- APP12 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant (including two attachments of cited court cases).

Richborough Estates

Schedule of conditions for appeal APP/C3105/W/17/3188671

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full details of both means of access between the land and the highway, including, position, layout, construction, drainage and vision splays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The means of access shall also include:

- lengths of footway on the north side of Blackthorn Road in either direction from the site access
- two uncontrolled crossing points
- alterations to the existing traffic calming and village entry treatment

Thereafter and prior to the first occupation of the development, the means of access shall be constructed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

- 5) No dwelling shall be occupied until car parking space(s) to serve that dwelling have been provided according to details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All car parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter.
- 6) No dwelling shall be occupied until cycle parking space(s) to serve that dwelling have been provided according to details that have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All cycle parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking of cycles at all times thereafter.
- 7) Prior to occupation of the first dwelling hereby approved, a Residential Travel Plan Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the Travel Plan shall be operated and reviewed in accordance with details to be included in the agreed Travel Plan Statement.
- 8) Travel Information Packs, the details of which are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development, shall be provided to every resident on first occupation of each dwelling.

- 9) The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Proposed Residential Development, Land off Blackthorn Road, Launton, Bicester, Oxfordshire by JPP Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers, Revision E, June 2018 R-FRA-T7866PM-01-E and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

- There shall be no built development within the 1% annual probability (1 in 100) flood extent with 35% allowance for climate change; and
- Finished floor levels will be located a minimum of 150mm above the predicted flood level.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of the dwellings to which they relate and in accordance with the timing/phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme.

- 10) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and management of a minimum 10m buffer zone alongside the Launton Brook shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. The buffer zone covered by the scheme shall be free from built development (including lighting), domestic gardens, footpaths and formal landscaping.

The scheme shall include:

- Plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone;
- Details of any proposed planting scheme (for example native species);
- Details of the timing and implementation of the scheme;
- Details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development and maintained over the longer term including proposed financing, the body responsible for management and production of a detailed management plan.

- 11) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a surface water drainage scheme for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development. . The scheme shall also include:

- Discharge Rates
- Discharge Volumes
- Maintenance and management of SUDs
- Sizing of features – attenuation volume
- Infiltration tests to be undertaken in accordance with BRE365
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers

- SUDS (list the suds features mentioned within the FRA to ensure they are carried forward into the detailed drainage strategy)
- Network drainage calculations
- Phasing plans
- Flood routes in exceedance (to include provision of a flood exceedance route plan).

The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details

- 12) Prior to the commencement of development details of the services and energy infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted.
- 13) Notwithstanding any provisions contained within the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (and any Order or Statutory Instrument amending, revoking or re-enacting that order), No above ground fuel tanks to serve the proposed development shall be provided unless with the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- 14) An archaeological investigation shall be completed in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any demolition on the site and the commencement of the development.
- 15) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, including any demolition, and any works of site clearance, a method statement for enhancing Biodiversity on site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the biodiversity enhancement measures shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.
- 16) Prior to the commencement of the development, a Construction Environment and Traffic Management Plan (CEMP), which shall include details of the measures to be taken to ensure construction works do not adversely affect residential properties adjacent to or surrounding the site together shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP will include a commitment to deliveries only arriving at or leaving the site between 0930 and 1630. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.
- 17) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a desk study and site walk over to identify all potential contaminative uses on site, and to inform the conceptual site model shall be carried out by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the Local

Planning Authority has given its written approval that it is satisfied that no potential risk from contamination has been identified.

- 18) If a potential risk from contamination is identified as a result of the work carried out under condition 16, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a comprehensive intrusive investigation in order to characterise the type, nature and extent of contamination present, the risks to receptors and to inform the remediation strategy proposals shall be documented as a report undertaken by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place unless the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval that it is satisfied that the risk from contamination has been adequately characterised as required by this condition.
- 19) If contamination is found by undertaking the work carried out under condition 17, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of remediation and/or monitoring to ensure the site is suitable for its proposed use shall be prepared by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval of the scheme of remediation and/or monitoring required by this condition.
- 20) If remedial works have been identified in condition 18, the development shall not be occupied until the remedial works have been carried out in accordance with the scheme approved under condition 18. A verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 21) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, no further development shall be carried out until full details of a remediation strategy detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the remediation strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 22) No development subject of this permission shall commence until the mobile home that is the subject of certificate of lawfulness 09/01814/CLUE dated 18 March 2010, and associated structures, have been removed from the site.

END