



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 27-30 April, 4-7, 11 and 12 May 2021

Site visit made on 10 May 2021

by Harold Stephens BA MPhil Dip TP MRTPI FRSA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861

Little Sparrows, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire RG4 9NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Senior Living (Sonning Common) Limited and Investfront Ltd against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P19/S4576/O, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a hybrid planning application for the development of a continuing care retirement community care village (Use Class C2) of up to 133 units with ancillary communal and care facilities and green space consisting of (i) A full planning application for 73 assisted living units within a "village core" building with ancillary communal and care facilities, gardens, green space, landscaping and car parking areas and residential blocks B1-B4; and (ii) An outline application (all matters reserved except access) for up to 60 assisted living units with ancillary community space, gardens, green space and landscaping and car parking areas.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hybrid planning application for the development of a continuing care retirement community care village (Use Class C2) of up to 133 units with ancillary communal and care facilities and green space consisting of (i) A full planning application for 73 assisted living units within a "village core" building with ancillary communal and care facilities, gardens, green space, landscaping and car parking areas and residential blocks B1-B4; and (ii) An outline application (all matters reserved except access) for up to 60 assisted living units with ancillary community space, gardens, green space and landscaping and car parking areas at Little Sparrows, Sonning Common, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P19/S4576/O, dated 12 December 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule attached to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. At the Inquiry an application for a partial award of costs was made by South Oxfordshire District Council (the Council) against the Appellant. This is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. The appeal follows the refusal of the Council to grant planning permission to a hybrid planning application for development at Blounts Court Road, Sonning Common. The planning application was determined under delegated powers

on 30 June 2020 and there were seven reasons for refusal (RfR) set out in the decision notice.¹

4. The application was supported by a number of plans, reports, and technical information. A full list of the plans on which the appeal is to be determined is set out at Appendix 4 of SoCG 4 Planning² which was agreed by the main parties. A full list of all documents forming part of the consideration of this appeal is set out at Appendix 3 of SoCG 4 which was agreed by the parties.³
5. I held a Case Management Conference (CMC) on 4 March 2021. At the CMC the main issues were identified, how the evidence would be dealt with at the Inquiry and timings. In the weeks following the CMC the main parties continued discussions on the appeal to ensure that matters of dispute were clear and that all matters of agreement were documented in either Statements of Common Ground or in draft Planning Conditions such that time on these matters was minimised at the Inquiry. The following Statements of Common Ground were submitted: SoCG 1 Landscape; SoCG 2 Transport; SoCG 3 Viability; SoCG 4 Planning and SoCG 5 Five Year Land Supply.
6. At the Inquiry a Planning Obligation was submitted.⁴ The Planning Obligation is made by an Agreement between Investfront Limited, Lloyds Bank PLC, Senior Living (Sonning Common) Limited, South Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council under s106 of the TCPA 1990. The Planning Obligation secures, amongst other matters, an off-site financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision of £7,510,350. The s106 Agreement is signed and dated 26 May 2021 and is a material consideration in this case. A Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Compliance Statement⁵ and an Addendum to the CIL Statement⁶ were also submitted in support of the Planning Obligation. I return to the Planning Obligation later in this decision.
7. In relation to RfR7 (affordable housing), following discussions on viability, the Appellant reached agreement with the Council on the payment of an off-site financial contribution towards affordable housing that is secured through a s106 Agreement. Therefore, it is agreed that having regard to development viability, the appeal proposal would provide an adequate level of affordable housing provision and this matter is no longer in dispute.
8. The application was screened for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prior to submission of the application and the Council determined that EIA was not required on 6 November 2019. I agree with the negative screening that was undertaken by the Council.

Main Issues

9. In the light of the above I consider the main issues are:

(i) *Whether the proposed development would be in accordance with the Council's strategy for the delivery of older persons accommodation throughout the district as set out in the development plan;*

¹ See Appendix A in CD H.1

² CD H.5

³ Ibid

⁴ INQ APP11

⁵ INQ LPA7

⁶ INQ LPA8

- (ii) *The impact of the proposed development on the landscape character of the AONB and the landscape setting of Sonning Common;*
- (iii) *The effect of the design of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the village;*
- (iv) *Whether the proposed development makes adequate provision for any additional infrastructure and services that are necessary, including affordable housing, arising from the development.*
- (v) *Whether, in the light of the criteria set out in paragraph 172 of the NPPF, there are exceptional circumstances to justify the proposed development within the AONB.*

Reasons

Planning Policy context

10. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this appeal, the development plan comprises the following documents:
 - The South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 (Adopted 2020) (SOLP); and
 - The Sonning Common Neighbourhood Plan (2016) (SCNP).
11. The determination of the planning application, the subject of this appeal, took place against the background of a different development plan framework to that now in place. Although the SOLP has been subsequently adopted, the SCNP was based upon the Core Strategy which has been withdrawn, including the out of date housing requirements derived from the old Regional Strategy, significantly reducing the weight that can be afforded to it.
12. The development plan policies that are relevant to this appeal are agreed by the main parties and are set out in SoCG 4⁷ and INQ LPA6 provides an agreed schedule of the replacement policies for those cited in the decision notice.
13. The SCNP is currently under review. An initial public consultation was held between 29 February - 23 March 2020 but the Plan has not at this stage progressed further and there is as yet no agreed timetable. No weight can be given to that review.
14. SoCG 4 sets out the sections of the NPPF which are relevant in this case.⁸ It also sets out a list of Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance⁹ which should be considered in this appeal and specific parts of the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)¹⁰ which are considered relevant.
15. The appeal site is located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Chilterns AONB is a 'valued landscape' in respect of paragraph 170 of the NPPF. AONBs, along with National Parks and the Broads, benefit from the highest status of protection in relation to conserving and

⁷ Paragraph 3.3

⁸ Paragraph 3.5

⁹ Paragraph 3.6

¹⁰ Paragraph 3.7

enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW) places a duty on relevant authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF requires “great weight” to be given to those matters in decision making. It is common ground that the appeal proposal involves major development within the AONB and as such should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

16. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF requires particular consideration to be given to:
(a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; (b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and (c) any detrimental effects on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. I deal with these matters under the main issues but at the outset it is important to address whether or not the Council has a five year supply of housing.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

17. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF sets the requirement for Local Planning Authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old.
18. Since 2018, Oxfordshire only needed to demonstrate a three-year supply of housing. However, on 25 March 2021 the Minister of State for Housing confirmed that a five-year housing land supply was again required. The Council produced a Housing Land Supply Interim Statement (IHLS)¹¹ setting out their initial position for the period 1 April 2020 to the 1 April 2025 which asserts a 5.35-year supply. However, at the Inquiry, the Council conceded that the supply had fallen on its own case to 5.08 years. The five-year supply requirement is a minimum requirement and it needs to be deliverable. The definition of deliverable is contained in Annex 2 to the NPPF.
19. The most up-to-date position as regards the difference between the main parties is summarised in the agreed SoCG 5. There is no disagreement as to the housing need (900 dpa) or the time period for the assessment (2020/21 to 2024/25). The five-year requirement including an agreed shortfall of 922 dwellings and 5% buffer is 5,693. The difference between the main parties comes down to the Council’s position that there is a 5.08 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the Appellant’s assertion that it is instead a 4.21-year supply. Table 3 of SoCG 5 contains a schedule of 15 disputed sites. I have assessed these disputed sites in the context of the test of deliverability set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. This specific guidance indicates which sites should be included within the five-year supply.
20. I have also had regard to the PPG advice published on 22 July 2019 on ‘Housing supply and delivery’ including the section that provides guidance on

¹¹ CD: K.32 South Oxfordshire Local Plan Housing Land Supply Interim Statement 2021

‘What constitutes a ‘deliverable’ housing site in the context of plan-making and decision-taking.’ The PPG is clear on what is required:

"In order to demonstrate 5 years' worth of deliverable housing sites, robust, up to date evidence needs to be available to support the preparation of strategic policies and planning decisions."

This advice indicates to me the expectation that ‘clear evidence’ must be something cogent, as opposed to simply mere assertions. There must be strong evidence that a given site will in reality deliver housing in the timescale and in the numbers contended by the party concerned.

21. Clear evidence requires more than just being informed by landowners, agents or developers that sites will come forward, rather, that a realistic assessment of the factors concerning the delivery has been considered. This means not only are there planning matters that need to be considered but also the technical, legal and commercial/financial aspects of delivery assessed. Securing an email or completed pro-forma from a developer or agent does not in itself constitute ‘clear evidence’. Developers are financially incentivised to reduce competition (supply) and this can be achieved by optimistically forecasting delivery of housing from their own site and consequentially remove the need for other sites to come forward.
22. It is not necessary for me to go through all of the disputed sites in Table 3 of SoCG 5. In my view, the Council was not able to provide clear evidence of delivery on most of the disputed sites which significantly undermines its position. For example, the Council suggests that 100 dwellings would be delivered at Site 1561: Land to the south of Newham Manor, Crowmarsh Gifford whereas the Appellant says 100 dwellings should be deducted. The comments set out by the Appellant for this site in Table 3 are compelling. Similarly, at Site 1009: Land to the north east of Didcot, the Council suggests 152 dwellings would be delivered whereas the Appellant says 152 dwellings should be deducted. The Appellant provides cogent evidence to support its case. Furthermore, at Site 1418: Land at Wheatley Campus, the Council agrees a deduction but only of 62 dwellings whereas the Appellant says the deduction should be 230. There is no clear evidence before me that would suggest that these sites or indeed most of the disputed sites would deliver the completions suggested by the Council in the next five years.
23. Overall, I consider that the Appellant’s assessment of supply set out in Table 2 of SoCG 5 is more realistic taking into account the test of deliverability set out in Appendix 2 to the NPPF and the PPG advice published on 22 July 2019. I am satisfied that the Appellant’s approach is consistent with national policy, case law, appeal decisions and informed by current housebuilder sales rates, assessment of the technical complexities of delivering development sites and experience of the housebuilding industry including lead-in times.
24. My conclusion on housing land supply is that there are a number of sites that together significantly reduce the Council’s five-year housing land supply. Many of the sites that the Council includes within the supply cannot be justified applying the current definition of deliverable. Following discussions between the main parties, deductions from the IHLS figure of 6,093 dwellings, have been identified and summarised at Table 1 of SoCG 5 and the impact which this has on the five year housing land supply is summarised at Table 2.

25. I consider that the Council's supply figure should be reduced to reflect the Appellant's position set out in Table 2 of SoCG 5. The Council's supply figure of 5,785 dwellings in Table 2 should be reduced to give a more robust total supply figure of 4,789 dwellings for the five year period. Although the Council maintains there is a 5.08 year supply, the evidence that is before me indicates a housing land supply equivalent to **4.21** years. The implications of not having a five-year housing land supply are significant. Not only is there a shortfall, but it also means most important policies for determining the application are automatically out-of-date. The Council accepts that means all the policies in the SOLP and the SCNP are out-of-date. It also means if the paragraph 172 tests in the NPPF are satisfied then the tilted balance applies.

First Issue - whether the proposed development would be in accordance with the Council's strategy for the delivery of older persons accommodation throughout the district as set out in the development plan;

The Need for Extra Care

26. The Council argues that the appeal proposal would be contrary to Policies H1 and H13 of the SOLP and due to its location in the AONB, outside but next to Sonning Common, brings into play Policies ENV1 and Policy H4 of the SOLP, and Policies ENV1, ENV2, H1, H2 and H2a of the SCNP. It is also claimed that the provision of 133 units of specialist housing for the elderly would be inconsistent with the proportionate growth in general housing planned for Sonning Common at both levels of the development plan.
27. Clearly the need for specialist accommodation for older people is recognised in the SOLP, which promotes the identification of suitable sites in the neighbourhood planning process and the inclusion of specialist accommodation on strategic sites,¹² and favours specialist housing for the elderly over conventional housing on unallocated sites.¹³ Although extra care housing is referred to in the supporting text,¹⁴ the SOLP does not prescribe particular levels of provision by type of accommodation, which allows flexibility in provision, adapting to what is an evolving sector. I note that no attempt is made to differentiate between types and tenure of specialist housing for older people, nor to address the need for each. No quantum for extra care accommodation is set out in the SOLP. Although Table 4f of the SOLP shows an outstanding requirement for 96 units over the plan period for Sonning Common it makes no reference to the needs arising from within existing households arising from their ageing.
28. Quantification of the need for open market extra care housing is not straightforward, in part because whether an owner-occupier moves to extra care housing is ultimately a matter of choice, in part because there is no prescribed or generally accepted methodology. The Government very clearly supports the identification and provision of extra care accommodation as a recognised form of specialist accommodation for the elderly.¹⁵ Moreover, it is important to bear in mind that the NPPF definition¹⁶ of 'older people' does not

¹² See CD: C.4 Policy H13(2), (3)

¹³ See CD: C.4 Policy H1(3)(ii)

¹⁴ See CD: C.4 paragraph 4.70

¹⁵ See paragraphs 59 and 61 of the NPPF

¹⁶ See Annex 2

exclusively mean the very frail elderly rather it embraces a wide range of people in that category both in terms of a very wide age range and significant variation in issues surrounding matters like mobility and general health.

29. Within the PPG on 'Housing for older and disabled people' it states that:¹⁷

"The need to provide housing for older people is critical. People are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. In mid-2016 there were 1.6 million people aged 85 and over; by mid-2041 this is projected to double to 3.2 million. Offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking"

30. The Government plainly recognises that the need is 'critical' and the importance of 'choice' and addressing 'changing needs'. Offering greater choice means a greater range of options being offered to people in later life and that the range of options should at the very least include the categories the Government recognises in its guidance. This includes extra care. The PPG also advises what 'range of needs should be addressed'. It recognises the diverse range of needs that exists and states that:¹⁸

"For plan-making purposes, strategic policy-making authorities will need to determine the needs of people who will be approaching or reaching retirement over the plan period, as well as the existing population of older people".

31. Plainly, when compared with Government guidance, the development plan is left wanting in terms of addressing a need for extra care. There is no reference in Policy STRAT 1 to the PPG insofar as assessing the needs of older people. There is no reference in Policy STRAT 2 to the accommodation needs of those local residents who will make up more than a quarter of the total population of South Oxfordshire by 2035. Policy H13 in the SOLP expressly deals with specialist housing for older people. It covers all forms of specialist housing for older people, but it is completely generic as to provision. No attempt is made to differentiate between types and tenure of specialist housing for older people, nor to address the need for each. The needs of all older people are simply lumped together. Nor is there any engagement with the market constraints and viability considerations relating to specialist accommodation for older people evidenced by Mr Garside during the Inquiry.
32. Paragraph 3 of Policy H13 suggests that provision be made within strategic allocations. The strategic sites are mostly focused around Oxford or in the more northern part of the District. Only one such strategic site has planning permission – Wheatley Campus but no extra care is proposed. The Council want to see it on Ladygrove East. That is not a strategic allocation in the SOLP. But in any event the Council is seeking affordable extra care there and the developer (Bloor Homes) is resisting it. The Council conceded that the strategic sites do not really feature at all in its five-year housing land supply calculations. The Council also accepted that landowners and developers would achieve a better return if they build market houses.

¹⁷ See paragraph 001 Reference ID: 63-001-20190626

¹⁸ See paragraph 003 Reference ID: 63-003-20190626

33. Reference is made to encouraging provision through the neighbourhood planning process.¹⁹ However, without a more definitive district wide requirement it would be difficult for neighbourhood plan groups to assess the levels of provision required, which will vary; and neighbourhood plan groups generally lack the expertise to fully appreciate the requirements and the different housing models available and their viability and practicality.²⁰
34. The Appellant's primary evidence on need is given by Mr Appleton, the principal author of two key publications in this area: *More Choice: Greater Voice (2008)*²¹ and *Housing in Later Life (2012)*.²² Both of these publications seek to address how best to quantify the need for specialist housing for the elderly. They advocate a method which is based on the population and other nationally available data to look at the characteristics of an LPA area.
35. The PPG highlights the need to begin with the age profile of the population. I note that the proportions of people aged 65 and over within South Oxfordshire District currently sits above the national average.²³ Furthermore, there is presently a population of 15,000 in South Oxfordshire District, who are aged 75 years or older which is forecast to increase to 21,100 by 2035.²⁴
36. In terms of care needs, 4,019 people in this population have difficulty managing at least one mobility activity on their own at present, set to rise to 6,046 by 2035.²⁵ They are overwhelmingly owner occupiers, with 81.23% of people aged 75-84 and 75.25% aged 85 and over owning their own home compared with 13.74% and 17.42% respectively Council or social rented.²⁶ Importantly, South Oxfordshire sits significantly above the national trend toward owner occupation as the dominant tenure for older people.
37. For the Appellant it is argued that there is a significant under-supply of retirement housing for leasehold sale to respond to the levels of owner-occupation among older people in the District.²⁷ There is a total of approximately 1,641 units of specialist accommodation for older people. However, there is a very marked disparity in the availability of specialised housing for older homeowners compared with the supply available to older people in other tenures.²⁸ The current rate of provision favours those in tenures other than home ownership with nearly four times as many units available to them in sheltered, retirement and extra care housing than are currently available for their peers who are homeowners.²⁹ At present, it is submitted that there are 120 units of affordable extra care housing and 113 units of market extra care housing.³⁰
38. Mr Appleton sets out a provision rate for private extra care of 30 per 1,000 of the 75 and over population in the District based on a total provision of 45 extra care units per 1,000 (4.5%) across both the affordable and private sectors, but split on a ratio of one third for social rented and two thirds for

¹⁹ See CD: C.4 Policy H13 paragraph 2

²⁰ POE of Simon James paragraph 5.1.11

²¹ CD: K.44

²² CD: K.45

²³ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Section 6

²⁴ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table One

²⁵ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table Five

²⁶ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table Twelve

²⁷ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton paragraph 9.2

²⁸ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table Fourteen

²⁹ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton paragraphs 9.7-9.9

³⁰ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table Fourteen

sale. This takes into consideration the research in "*More Choice: Greater Voice*" and revisions in "*Housing in Later Life*". I note that the 45 units per 1,000 is to be divided as suggested in order to bring supply into closer alignment with tenure choice among older people.³¹ That is 450 units now. Projecting forward, an indicative provision of 633 units of market extra care would be required by 2035.³² The Council refers to the Oxfordshire's Market Position Statement³³ which assumes a lower need figure for extra care housing but the focus there appears to be on social rented extra care housing. The Council also suggests that the SHMA³⁴ evidence is to be preferred. However, I note that it does not identify figures for extra care, nor does it relate to the present PPG.³⁵ In my view, Mr Appleton's provision rate is preferred and the need for more private extra care is overwhelming.

39. At present even a very modest level of provision of 30 units per 1,000 in the 75 and over population seems unlikely in South Oxfordshire District, especially as the SOLP now requires affordable housing to be provided, when previously it was not required. No other extra care market proposals are coming forward. The Rectory Homes proposal at Thame, refused on appeal for not providing an affordable contribution has been resubmitted but the s106 Agreement is not signed. Nor is Rectory Homes Ltd a provider of care.
40. In my view, there is a strong case that Mr Appleton's 45 per 1,000 overall, with 30 per 1,000 to market extra care, should be far more ambitious given not only the true tenure split in the District but also what it could mean for the ability to contribute towards addressing the housing crisis. Mrs Smith conceded that the figure of 30 per 1,000 was hardly ambitious and, if anything, was underplaying the scale of the potential need.
41. Turning to supply, with only 113 units of market extra care units of extra care housing existing in South Oxfordshire and a current need of 450 units this leaves a shortfall of 337. As to the existing pipeline, Mr Appleton analysed the same at Figure Two of his Needs Report, which was updated at INQ APP12. The total 'pipeline' supply of extra care not already included in Mr Appleton's tabulation of current supply are the proposed 110 units in Didcot and Wallingford, and the 65 units proposed at Lower Shiplake. This gives a total gain of 175 units. However, both Wallingford and Didcot sites have been confirmed as affordable extra care. The Council did not dispute the 175 figure and Mrs Smith accepted that she did not know if the 110 units in Didcot and Wallingford would be affordable or market. I consider that only 65 units can reasonably be considered as pipeline.
42. The pipeline needs to be set against the current shortfall of 337 which still leaves 162 units even if Didcot and Wallingford are included and 272 if they are not. That is a substantial unmet need now which will only further climb and in respect of which there is nothing in the pipeline and no prospect of any strategic allocated site delivering in the five year housing land supply.
43. There is plainly a very limited supply of extra care housing for market sale (leasehold) in South Oxfordshire. Adding further concern, it is of note that

³¹ See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton paragraph 11.6

³² See APP 2.3 Nigel Appleton Table Seventeen

³³ See CD: K.27 Market Position Statement for Oxfordshire in relation to Care Provision and Extra Care Housing Supplement assumes a need for 25 units of extra care housing for every 1,000 of the population aged 75+ page 9

³⁴ See CD: 14 HOUS5 Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment April 2014

³⁵ Ibid

from 2012 to date just 133 units have been delivered despite there being in the same period permissions for a net gain of 447 additional Care Home beds. This runs completely contrary to the policy set out in the Market Position Statement of reducing reliance on Care Home beds and increasing capacity in extra care. The case for more market extra care provision now is very clear. Furthermore, the need is set only to grow.

44. The Council sought to undermine the Appellant's need case with reference to earlier data from Housing LIN and the @SHOP tool. This on-line tool is highlighted in the PPG as a basis for calculating need. But the fact is it only provides a figure based on existing prevalence and then seeks to project that forward with a proportion increase based on the increase in the 75+ age group in the District. This is not a measure of need.
45. The Council provided a list of specialist accommodation for older people³⁶ most of which is not market extra care, but mostly affordable extra care. Oxfordshire County Council has two sites with market extra care, but those schemes are in Banbury and Witney and not in the District.³⁷ In short, the pipeline adds up to very little. I consider there is hardly any market extra care housing in the District. The stark fact is that choice is largely unavailable.

Policy Compliance

46. Plainly the proposed development would make a substantial contribution toward the provision of a more adequate level of provision for older homeowners looking for an environment in which their changing needs could be met. The fact that the need is proposed to be met at Sonning Common seems entirely appropriate. Sonning Common is one of just 12 larger villages where a need for extra care provision has been identified in the SCNP, and where there is the oldest 65 and over population in the County. The SCNP expresses support for a small scale development of extra care housing in Policy H2a but no site is allocated for such use. The Sonning Common Parish Council (SCPC) accepted that SCNP policies referred to in the RfR are out of date due to a lack of five year housing land supply. That includes Policies ENV1, ENV2 and H1, which is only expressed as a minimum.
47. Policy H13 (1) in the SOLP gives support to extra care on unallocated sites. This adds to the weight that can be given to the need case. Policy H13 is the key policy in respect of specialist accommodation for older people. Though the appeal site is not a strategic site, nor allocated in the SCNP, Policy H13 does not itself require it to be. I have already discussed the difficulties associated with any of the strategic sites coming forward with market extra care either within the five year housing land supply period or at all.
48. Policy H13 (1) is clear that encouragement will be given to developments in locations "with good access to public transport and local facilities." The Council accepted that public transport for staff on the site would be more likely to take the form of bus services and they would perhaps have no difficulty walking. For residents there is a choice and it depends on their mobility. I saw that most of the site is flat. It does have a gradual gradient to the west then a steeper gradient close to Widmore Lane. The presence of a hairpin in the proposed design is to deal with the gradient which requires a

³⁶ See Nicola Smith's Appendix 1

³⁷ CD: K.27 page 5

longer path to accommodate people with disabilities. I note that a minibus service is proposed which would take residents to the local supermarket. With regard to other trips, for example to the post office or to other facilities, residents could walk or take the minibus. Importantly, the core building has all facilities centrally. Residents could cook in their premises and meals would be provided on site. There would also be a small convenience shop on site and staff would be on hand to not only care for but also to assist people. Garden maintenance would be provided and there would be a wellbeing centre to help people's health and fitness. Overall, the facilities would take care of a considerable amount of day-to-day needs. In my view all of this would comprise "good access to public transport and local facilities."

49. With regard to matters of principle I accept that Policies ENV1 and STRAT 1 (ix) of the SOLP affords protection to the AONB and in the case of major development, it will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest. I give these matters detailed consideration in other issues. The proposal fully accords with Policy H1 3ii) of the SOLP. With regard to Policy H4 of the SOLP, although the timeframe for review of the SCNP does not run out until December 2021 that does not bring the SCNP back into date. Whilst the review of the SCNP has commenced, it is at its earliest stage and no weight can be given to it. I conclude on the first issue that the appeal proposal would conflict with some but would comply with other elements of the Council's strategy for the delivery of older persons accommodation throughout the district.

Second issue - the impact of the proposed development on the landscape character of the AONB and the landscape setting of Sonning Common

50. SoCG 1 Landscape has been agreed between the parties and addresses landscape and visual matters. The appeal site is within the Chilterns AONB which is a 'valued landscape' in respect of paragraph 170 of the NPPF. The Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2019-2024³⁸ defines the 'special qualities' of the AONB and the most relevant to the appeal site and its context are summarised at paragraph 3.5 of SoCG 1.
51. In essence, the Council, supported by the SCPC, the Chilterns Conservation Board and others, consider that the proposed development would create a prominent and incongruous intrusion into Sonning Common's valued rural setting, relate poorly to the village, and cause material harm to the landscape character of the AONB. It is also claimed that the proposal would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB and would fail to protect its special qualities.³⁹ The policy context at the time of the decision notice referenced policies in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 which is now superseded by the adopted policies in the SOLP.⁴⁰ Policies ENV1 and ENV2 of the SCNP are also relevant. I note the illustrative Masterplan,⁴¹ the LVIA and the Landscape Appendix⁴² submitted by the Appellant.

³⁸ CD: F4 pages 10 and 11

³⁹ See RfR 2

⁴⁰ See LPA INQ6 which sets out the relevant SOLP policies including STRAT1 (ix), ENV1 and ENV5 and Design policies DES1, DES2, DES3 and DES5

⁴¹ See Appendix 4.3.1 of James Atkin Drawing reference 1618_L_01_01 Rev3

⁴² CD: A.9 and CD A.10 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Landscape Appendix

52. To address these points, it is necessary to understand what the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB are and the extent to which those special qualities relate to the appeal site and its context. From the evidence that is before me and from my site visit, I do not consider the appeal site or its local landscape context to be representative of the special qualities as set out in the Chilterns AONB Management Plan. Where the appeal site does exhibit some such qualities, they are generic. In all other respects, they are entirely absent.
53. Planning policy and statute give equal protection to all parts of the AONB. However, it would be unrealistic to expect the appeal site and its immediate context to share all or even most of these special qualities. It is important to have a balanced interpretation of how such special qualities relate. To that end, Mr Atkin's Table 1⁴³ summarises that relationship, drawing together judgements on the landscape and the extent to which the appeal site is characteristic, or otherwise, of the AONB. In summary, Mr Atkin's analysis demonstrates that the appeal site does not reflect the majority of the special qualities and, where there is a connection, the association is limited. It seems to me that the appeal site is more typical of an agricultural landscape that is commonplace around many settlement fringes. Plainly the appeal site and its local landscape context is less sensitive than other parts of the AONB.
54. The core characteristic of the appeal site and its context, and the most relevant of the special qualities to it, is the extensive mosaic of farmland with tree and woodland cover. However, this is probably the broadest and most generic of the special qualities acting as a 'catch all' for the extensive areas of farmland across the area. Other parts of the AONB are more distinct. The ancient woodland of Slade's Wood is located off site, outside of the AONB designation, though it does form part of its setting. As to extensive common land, this is not representative of the appeal site. In its local landscape context, Widmore Pond is designated as common land but is not an 'extensive' area contrasting with other parts of the AONB.
55. At my site visit I saw that the appeal site, being directly adjacent to the relatively modern settlement fringe of Sonning Common, detracts from any potential tranquillity. This is particularly so due to the neighbouring JMTC complex and associated car parking. It is common ground that the JMTC is 'institutional in scale'. In terms of ancient routes, there is no formal access to the appeal site. In the local landscape context, the closest rights of way are the public footpaths to the north-west and east both of which give access to the wider landscape to the north and east of Sonning Common where the characteristics of the AONB are more readily apparent.
56. The Council agreed that new development can be accommodated in the AONB and as a matter of principle can be an integral component. Indeed, the SCNP allocates development within its boundaries. I saw that the AONB in this location already contains a significant amount of built development. That contrasts significantly with the deep, rural area of countryside within the AONB some of which is located to the north east of the appeal site where the road turns east down the valley bottom heading to Henley-on-Thames. There, there is no settlement or village, no industrial buildings or surface car parks

⁴³ See James Atkin's Appendix 4.1 pages 18-20

with 100 plus spaces. It is simply deep countryside with very limited urban development and is very attractive. That cannot be said about the appeal site.

57. Having considered how the special qualities of the AONB relate to the appeal site, I now consider the landscape character of it. The appeal site is partly located on an area of plateau between two valleys, within a landscape identified in the South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (2017)⁴⁴ as semi-enclosed dip slope, which in turn forms part of the broader Chilterns Plateau with Valleys Landscape Character Area (LCA10). The eastern part of the site is located above the 95m contour on the plateau area.⁴⁵ The southern and western parts of the site fall towards a shallow valley which contains neighbouring parts of Sonning Common. At a further distance to the north is a deeper valley which separates Sonning Common from Rotherfield Peppard.
58. The Landscape Assessment for the Local Plan 2033 for the semi enclosed dip slope LCT states:

"...this part of the Chilterns dip slope has a surprisingly uniform character, despite its irregular pattern of plateaux and valleys and its mosaic of farmland and woodland. This complexity is a consistent and distinctive feature of the area, and the most obvious differences in landscape character are between the very intimate, enclosed wooded landscapes and those which have a more open structure and character."

It is clear to me that there is a difference between the parts of the AONB in the dry valley and those on the plateaus.

59. What is distinctive about this part of the landscape and relevant to the landscape of the appeal site and its context is the uniformity across a larger scale area of the landscape characterised by a complex mosaic of farmland and woodland. It is this complex mosaic at the larger scale which is more closely aligned with the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB and not the appeal site itself. It isn't the loss of a part of this mosaic that is important, which in the case of the appeal site would be a relatively small agricultural piece of the mosaic; rather, it is the implications for the wider mosaic and whether that would be disrupted in terms of a reduction of its scale, or would result in the creation of a disbalance between particular parts of the mosaic.
60. SCPC referred to the Sonning Common Character Assessment and Design Statement 2013.⁴⁶ I accept that this formed part of the evidence base to the SCNP, but it appears to still be in draft form only many years later. Its main purpose was to provide comparative comment on sites identified for potential future development limited to only the shortlisted sites. It does not address the wider appeal site. I have also taken into account the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project⁴⁷ and the various landscape capacity assessments cited by Mr Jeffcock that have looked at the appeal site.
61. As I perceive it, Sonning Common is very much part of the local landscape context, just as much as the adjacent agricultural land and the wider mosaic of the AONB. The appeal site performs a role of a brief transition and gateway between the suburban and rural environments. In its local context, the settlement fringes of Sonning Common, including the residential areas across the valley and on the plateau to the west and south are influential in terms of

⁴⁴ CD: D.23, section 15.

⁴⁵ See John Jeffcock's Appendix 1, Figs 2, 7, 8

⁴⁶ CD: C.7

⁴⁷ CD: I.5

the local landscape character, as is the prominent built form of the JMTC to the north. Adjacent to the appeal site is the JMTC car park which further erodes the sense of more 'remote' or rural countryside. To the south the settlement extends some distance along Peppard Road and there is a clear experience of entering the suburban character of the village, long before the appeal site is perceptible. There are specific locations where the settlement edge is less apparent notably along Blounts Court Road from the east and in this direction the more rural aspect of the site is more dominant.

62. The Council's LCA draws a very clear distinction between the character of development on the plateau and the character found in the dry valleys.⁴⁸ The landscape strategy set out there suggests that development on the plateau is in keeping whereas into the valley is a negative thing. It seems clear to me that Sonning Common has grown up developmentally on two plateaus either side of the dry valley.
63. It is common ground that, like any development anywhere, physical impacts on the landscape fabric will be limited to those which occur within the appeal site itself. However, landscape character impacts and the consequent effects would not be limited to the appeal site. It is agreed that there are not likely to be significant effects on the wider landscape or visual effects further afield than a localised area set out in the SoCG 1.⁴⁹
64. Although there would be localised losses of vegetation due to the access off Blounts Court Road and the proposed pedestrian connection to Widmore Lane, the proposed development would largely involve the loss of open agricultural land and the construction in its place the built development of the appeal proposals. On the most elevated part of the site, there would be a substantial, cruciform core building, 2.5 storeys (about 11.2m)⁵⁰ in height, with a footprint of approximately 3,900m², and four apartment blocks with ridge heights of between 10.3m and 11.2m, the largest two of which would have footprints of about 550m² each. However, the recent application submitted for the JMTC shows that the present buildings making up the complex are between 8.7m and 10.6m depending on ground levels with block 4 up to nearly 11m in height. I accept that there would be a physical loss to the mosaic, but in character terms, the appeal site is not essential to its character and the built elements of the scheme would be consistent with the settlement fringe.
65. There would be potential impacts arising from the 15m woodland belt along the southern and eastern edges of the appeal site. This would be beneficial in terms of moderating the effect of the development. It would also provide a green infrastructure link between Slade's Wood and the green infrastructure network in the surrounding landscape. This would have a positive impact on the 'wooded' aspects of the mosaic. The woodland belt would create a further 'layer' in the landscape which would physically and visually contain the site.
66. The overall consequence of this is that there will be a highly localised impact on the 'mosaic' in terms of agricultural land use, but not to a point where, given the scale of what makes this distinct, the mosaic is disrupted or undermined. At a local and wider scale, this would not constitute 'harm' to the Chilterns AONB. Only a small part of the mosaic would be impacted, and this

⁴⁸ CD: D18 page 572 which deals with Sonning Common at 9.10

⁴⁹ CD: H.02 SoCG 1 Landscape paragraphs 3.21-3.22

⁵⁰ See John Jeffcock's POE paragraph 4.3.3.

would not alter the overall character of the wider mosaic or the LCT. Plainly such limited impacts would not cause 'material harm' to the landscape character of the AONB, nor would it conflict with the aims of protecting its special qualities. The appeal site would, in being development on a plateau, be in keeping with the landscape character.

67. I accept that the appeal site and the immediate landscape context within the Chilterns AONB form part of a valued landscape⁵¹ this is primarily on the basis of the landscape designation and related less to the demonstrable physical attributes of the appeal site.⁵² Although the Appellant's LVIA determines landscape value to be 'high' with some localised variations, I consider that the appeal site in its local landscape context is of 'medium to high' value taking into consideration that it is in the AONB but also the site's own merits. There is, frankly, a considerable difference between this area and more typical, characteristic parts of the AONB.
68. As to landscape susceptibility, this can be appropriately described as 'low to medium' in the appeal site's local landscape. This is a medium scale enclosure that has capacity to accommodate some form of development across the majority of the site. The settlement of Sonning Common provides some reference and context for development and the presence of the JMTC in this part of the AONB reduces landscape susceptibility to new development. The landscape sensitivity is appropriately judged as 'medium' with the AONB designation having a high sensitivity. Mr Jeffcock considers that the appeal site has a high landscape value and high sensitivity to change. However, his assessment is overstated. In my view the appeal site has a medium to high value, and low to medium susceptibility with medium sensitivity overall.
69. The appeal site is located on the very fringe of the AONB, and Sonning Common is excluded from it. This is not a core part of the Chilterns AONB and its special qualities are largely absent. Of relevance is the mosaic of wooded farmland that characterises much of the plateau and dip slope. The appeal proposals would result in a change to this characteristic at a very localised level, with the loss of an open agricultural field to built development but balanced with the introduction of further woodland and green infrastructure. This would not disrupt, or unduly influence, the mosaic. I agree that the 'slight to moderate adverse' effect on landscape character would not represent a significant impact in respect of the Chilterns AONB.⁵³
70. As for visual effects, these would differ depending on the viewer and the viewpoint. The landscape witnesses provided a number of example viewpoints and I carried out an extensive site visit with the parties to see these and other views for myself. I have also taken into account the ZTV⁵⁴ and LVIA information provided by the Appellant.
71. SoCG 1 Landscape records that the physical impacts of the proposed development would be limited to the appeal site, and that consequent impacts on landscape character would be limited to a relatively small number of areas including viewpoints to the south (the route of the B481 Peppard Road); to the south west (Sonning Common village e.g. Grove Road); to the north

⁵¹ Within the meaning of paragraph 170(a) of the NPPF

⁵² See James Atkin's Table 2 POE pages 27-28

⁵³ See James Atkin's POE page 33 paragraph 6.48

⁵⁴ Zone of theoretical visibility

(footpath 331/16/20) close to the southern edge of Rotherfield Peppard); to the west (the settlement edge of Sonning Common) and to the east and north east (the routes of public right of way 350/11/20 and 350/10/10). Outside of these areas it was agreed there would not likely be any significant effects on the wider landscape or on visual receptors further afield.⁵⁵

72. In terms of visual amenity, the evidence demonstrates that potential views of the appeal proposals would be limited to a small envelope, largely related to the immediate context of the appeal site and not extending further into the Chilterns AONB landscape. This limited visibility reduces the perception of change to landscape character. The ZTV demonstrates that, aside from some locations very close to, or immediately adjacent to the appeal site, potential visibility from the wider landscape (and AONB) is limited. In my view this accords with the landscape character guidance which refers to the 'semi-enclosed dip slope' as having a 'strong structure of woods and hedgerows' which provide 'visual containment and results in moderate to low intervisibility'. This strong structure of woods and hedgerows provides containment in the landscape.
73. What is clear, is that only a small number of nearby locations would have direct views of the appeal proposals. This includes a very short section of Peppard Road, short sections of public footpaths to the east (350/11/20 and 350/11/40) and the approach to the settlement along Blounts Court Road. In each of these instances, impacts could be moderated by appropriate landscape works and particularly the inclusion of the woodland belt. The contained nature of the appeal site and the limited extent of landscape effects mean that the overall character of the semi-enclosed dip slope LCT would not be fundamentally altered and the effects on landscape character at this scale would not be significant. Plainly, the appeal proposals would not give rise to significant visual effects overall; either in the local landscape context of Sonning Common or in respect of the scenic quality of the Chilterns AONB.
74. The most relevant assessment is that of 'Year 15' once the tree planting proposals have had the opportunity to thrive. Those proposals are a specific and positive part of the proposed development which would deliver additional environmental functions to that of visual screening. It is common ground that the planting would be significant. It is reasonable to expect that the growth of native species would reach good heights in the medium term and mature heights that are comparable to the existing trees and woodland in the area. There would be glimpses of the built development through the perimeter planting. However, it would provide a substantial screen in the long term and help to integrate the appeal proposals into the landscape particularly when viewed from the east and from the south.
75. For the above reasons I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would have some localised landscape and visual effects, but these would not result in unacceptable impacts on the AONB or the landscape setting of Sonning Common. As such, in respect of this issue I consider the appeal proposal would conflict with Policies STRAT 1 (ix) and ENV1 of the SOLP together with Policy ENV1 of the SCNP. However, for the reasons set out above those adverse effects would be limited. I shall consider this further in the planning balance.

⁵⁵ CD: H.2 SoCG 1 Landscape paragraphs 3.21-3.22

Third Issue - the effect of the design of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the village

76. The Council's concerns about the design of the proposed development are based on RfR4 and are supported by the SCPC. In summary these are: (i) the development would not integrate with the village by reason of scale, massing, layout and character; (ii) it would result in a dominant and intrusive form of development having a significant urbanising effect on the settlement edge; and (iii) the layout and design would result in poor amenity for residents by virtue of the lack of access to private amenity space and publicly accessible green space, an overdominance of car parking and limited space for tree planting. I address each of these concerns in turn.
77. The main parties agreed a section on design within SoCG 4 Planning.⁵⁶ Amongst other matters it is agreed that: the detailed layout (Phase 1) is the proposed layout for that part of the site; the proposed masterplan is provided to demonstrate how the development could be laid out to respond to the physical and technical constraints and opportunities of the site; the layout for Phase 2 will be subject to future reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) and remain in the Council's control; the Council has no objection to the choice of building materials, detailing and hard landscape materials proposed; and the extent of existing tree retention and the selection of proposed plant species, grass, hedge and shrub planting is agreed.
78. It is also noteworthy that policies within RfR4 relate in the main to the previous South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012 and South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011. The corresponding policies are set out at INQ LPA6. Policy D1 of the SCNP 2016, the South Oxfordshire Design Guide⁵⁷ and the NPPF (in particular paragraphs 127, 130 and 131) also apply.
79. I turn first to integration with the village in terms of scale, massing, layout and character. The Council and the SCPC are concerned that the scale and layout of the proposed development are being driven by operational requirements and the business model of the Appellant. Reference is made to the large apartment blocks and the village core which it is claimed are at odds with the more modest scale of development in Sonning Common. However, I consider it is important at the outset to understand the existing context and character of Sonning Common. At my site visit I saw that Sonning Common is not the archetypal Chilterns Village, and it clearly lies outside the AONB. It was developed in a more planned manner with the character being 'plotlands' and later infill housing termed 'estates'.
80. The local vernacular consists of a mix of building types, but the immediate neighbouring existing development is comprised of the estates typology - Churchill Crescent, Pond End Road and the northern edge of Widmore Lane. The existing context has a range of design components that help create its character. In particular, I note that Sonning Common: is primarily 2 storeys but with elements of 2.5 storeys; is primarily domestic in scale; has predominantly traditional architecture; is relatively verdant with trees and landscaping being visible within and as a backdrop to the streetscape; and has occasional larger built form such as the school or JMTC. Furthermore,

⁵⁶ CD: H.5 SoCG 4 Planning Section 6

⁵⁷ CD: C.8

Sonning Common has: brick walls; painted rendering on walls; clay roof tiles; chimneys; and a mix of gables, hipped roofs and porches.

81. The Design and Access Statement (DAS)⁵⁸ describes the appeal proposals as domestic in scale and character. I accept that the scheme is largely domestic in form and with detailing consistent with residential houses in the area.
82. In terms of *height*, the proposed buildings would reflect the heights of buildings within Sonning Common. Both plotlands and estate buildings include two storey buildings and two storey buildings with roof rooms. The proposed apartment buildings would be two storeys with the Village Core rising to two and a half storeys in places. The Village Core has accommodation in the roof space to keep the overall ridge height low. The height to the ridgeline from ground level of the Village Core Centre building is up to 2.5 storeys dropping to single storey on the eastern side. This must be seen in the context of the height of the adjacent JMTC, typically equivalent to 3 storeys, and groups of 2.5 storey dwellings on the northern side of Blounts Court Road to the west of the site. Most of the proposed development would be two storeys in height as is the overwhelming majority of built development in Sonning Common.
83. As to *massing*, the initial indicative sketch elevation demonstrates that the apartments and the Village Core would have the appearance of semi-detached buildings or groups of buildings combined into short terraces with a varying roofline which are reflective of the existing residential buildings in Sonning Common.⁵⁹ The massing of the apartments is derived from a variety of footprint depths which, when formed into larger blocks, allows for the scale and mass to be broken down into roof elements with simple breaks in the roofline. Appropriate equal roof pitches would give each apartment building an elegant scale. There would be elements of hipped roofs, and chimneys incorporated into the roof plane. The apartment buildings would have balconies, single and double gables further breaking down the overall mass. The Village Core would have accommodation in the roof space and the roof planes would be broken down with larger single gables, smaller double gables with a central gutter and small dormer windows.
84. In my view the *layout* of the proposed development would reflect the way existing 'plotlands' and 'estates' buildings in Sonning Common are orientated, with the arrangement of buildings fronting the main vehicular route with active frontages. A number of apartments would be arranged around the Village Core. Buildings fronting Blounts Court Road would be positioned so that they would replicate the linear street scenes typical of development within Sonning Common.⁶⁰ I note that the proposed building line would be setback some 15m-20m from the road edge to retain an element of openness along the streetscape allowing boundaries to be defined by planting and hard landscaping. This would reflect the layout of the 'plotlands' buildings within Sonning Common. Buildings along the main access route and internal streets would similarly front the street with setbacks from 6m-15m allowing boundaries to be defined by planting and hard landscaping. The setback for 'estate' residential buildings ranges from about 4m-14m. In my view, the proposals would be in a similar range.

⁵⁸ CD: A.31

⁵⁹ See Mr Carr's Appendix UD4

⁶⁰ See CD: C7 Sonning Common Character Assessment and Design Statement

85. The Council and SCPC argued that the appeal proposal could be smaller in scale. However, it was accepted that greater economies in scale could be achieved with larger retirement village developments with extensive communal facilities. It is noteworthy that the Appellant is proposing a development which is half the size of the optimum.⁶¹
86. With regard to *character* it is clear that the Council has no objection to the choice of building materials, detailing and hard landscape materials proposed, as recorded in the SoCG 4. In any event, the proposed development would accord with the local vernacular which consists of a mix of building types found within the key character areas. In summary, Sonning Common has predominantly traditional architecture and the proposed development would have traditional architectural detailing; it is relatively verdant with trees and landscaping being visible within and as a backdrop to the streetscape and the proposed development would have similarly substantial planting in the streetscape as well as proposed and existing large scale tree planting creating a tree lined backdrop. Sonning Common has also occasional larger built form such as the school or JMTC and the proposed development has a Village Core.
87. It is fair to say that Sonning Common has an eclectic architecture which is quite conventionally suburban. There is a significant amount of 1970s housing. It has a fairly bland architecture, evidenced by the images in the Sonning Common Character Assessment and Design Statement.⁶² Given that the site is within the Chilterns AONB, the design should not just duplicate Sonning Common, but use materials such as flint panels and dark stained boarding and design components that respond to the AONB setting.
88. In my view, the architecture would reflect a varied composition with gables, projections and porches. The proposed elevations would respect the traditional patterns, style and scale of buildings and the fenestration would be inspired by traditional Chiltern building with a solid wall area balanced with the window and door openings, relatively pitched roofs with a ridgeline, use of 'L' and 'T' building shapes, chimneys and prominent flint panels.
89. It is clear to me that the proposed new buildings would plainly add to the sense of place and local character and would 'belong' to the Chilterns. The proposed development would also create a soft edge to the countryside⁶³ and would not 'turn its back' on it; particularly given the lack of any rear garden fences defining the edge of the settlement.
90. I recognise that this is a hybrid application and there is therefore an outline element to the proposals. However, to demonstrate their commitment to provide the same level of detailing and materials as presently indicated, the Appellant has produced a Design Commitment Statement.⁶⁴ Importantly, this could be conditioned to provide reassurance and an additional way of ensuring that the future reserved matters keep to the quality required in this setting.
91. The Council contended that the proposal would be a dominant and intrusive form of development and it would have an urbanising effect on the settlement edge. I disagree. The apartments and cottages proposed as part of the appeal scheme would be largely consistent with a domestic form and would be very

⁶¹ See INQ LPA 2 page 13.

⁶² See CD: C7 page 16

⁶³ See CD: K4 Chilterns Building Design Guide principle item 3.16 page 25

⁶⁴ See Mr Carr's Appendix UD7

similar in size and form to houses in Sonning Common and the wider AONB. It is logical to site the Village Core building where it is, on a predominately level area, avoiding any large man-made cuttings and embankments to facilitate it. Plainly having the core building on a level area is appropriate for residents in their later years of life who would want facilities to be very easy to access.

92. The NPPF emphasises the importance of making efficient use of land.⁶⁵ Clearly where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. I accept that it is imperative that sites such as the appeal site are optimised when developed. However, optimising does not mean fitting in as much as you can regardless, but it does mean using land efficiently. As this would be an apartment based development then I accept that it would have a greater density than a conventional residential scheme.
93. The Council argued that the proposal would have an urbanising effect. However, the proposed development would be very different to an urban character. There would be a significant landscape setting breaking up the built form and the countryside edge, when read in the context of the proposed planting, would be assimilated in townscape terms. Much has been made of the AONB designation in which the appeal site falls; but this does not mean preservation without any change. The proposed development would in many ways be read as part of the evolution of the area's character.⁶⁶ In my view the proposed development would create an appropriate designed edge to the settlement and an appropriate robust transition with a managed landscape that is a better edge than the back gardens adjoining the settlement boundary that can be found at the settlement edge around parts of Sonning Common.
94. I turn now to the Council's concerns that the layout and design would result in poor amenity for residents by virtue of a lack of access to private amenity space. It is common ground that in policy terms, there is no private amenity requirement prescribed for a retirement community care village. Nonetheless, the proposed development would provide a total of 1,300 msq of private amenity space⁶⁷ comprising: private balconies totalling 0.03 hectare; and directly accessible private landscape and terraces totalling 0.1 hectare.
95. Over and above the private amenity space there would be an extensive amount of publicly accessible green space provided. Again, I note that there is no policy requirement for a retirement community care village yet there would be: landscaped space amongst and between the built form (including foot and cycleways) totalling 1.7 hectares; and a native tree belt and woodland buffer totalling 1 hectare. Combined with the private amenity space there would be 2.83 hectares of amenity land which would be ample given that the site totals 4.5 hectares. That is 62.8% of the appeal site and equivalent to 212.78 msq for each of the 133 units.
96. All of the above is in the context of extra care developments being very different to general housing. I accept that residents do not want the work of managing their own garden. In my view, the layout of the development would

⁶⁵ NPPF paragraph 123.

⁶⁶ See Michael Carr's POE paragraph 7.20

⁶⁷ See Appendix UD5 of Michael Carr's POE

be safe, attractive and inclusive with plenty of natural surveillance of the landscaped spaces which is important given the age restriction of the development and why people would choose to live there.

97. The appeal proposals include access to landscaped spaces and woodland opening up an area that would otherwise be inaccessible private land. This maximises the public benefit of the scheme and would positively contribute to the health and well-being of both residents and the community, to which weight is given in the NPPF as part of the social objective. The Council agreed that there may well be community integration and intergenerational activity through the facilities on site.
98. With regard to car parking, the appeal proposals have been designed to avoid what would otherwise be unplanned 'ad hoc' parking through a formal provision. This is not in one place, rather the design would disperse the necessary parking across the proposed development in a series of clusters. These would be set back and visibly screened from the main routes through the development and would avoid harsh urban parking courts. The proposed 15m woodland belt is a relevant consideration. The proposed planting would buffer and screen views of parked cars and both soften and integrate the parking areas so that they are read as designed landscaped courts. The Council raised concerns about the space available for tree planting. However, in my view there would be ample space on site to accommodate the tree planting the final details of which would be under the Council's control.
99. Overall, I consider the proposal would be in broad accordance with the SOLP policies including DES1, DES2, DES3, DES4 and DES5, SCNP policies D1 and D1a and other design guidance and the NPPF. I conclude on the third issue there would be no reason to dismiss the appeal due to the effect of the design of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the village.

Fourth Issue - whether the proposed development makes adequate provision for any additional infrastructure and services that are necessary, including affordable housing, arising from the development

100. This issue relates to the absence of a completed s106 Agreement to secure infrastructure to meet the needs of the development. At the time of the decision, agreement could not be reached with the Council on the requirements for a planning obligation. Since then, agreement has been reached and a s106 Agreement was submitted at the Inquiry. I have considered the s106 Agreement in the light of the CIL Regulations 2010, as amended, the advice in the NPPF and the PPG.
101. The NPPF indicates that LPAs should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations.⁶⁸ Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, as amended by the 2011 and 2019 Regulations, and paragraph 56 of the NPPF make clear that Planning Obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following three tests: (i) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (ii) directly related to the development; and (iii) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

⁶⁸ NPPF paragraph 54

102. The Council's need for additional infrastructure and services is set out in relevant SOLP policies which include H9 Affordable housing; INF1 Infrastructure; DES 1 Delivering High Quality Development; TRANS2 Promoting Sustainable Transport and Accessibility; TRANS4: Transport Assessments, Transport Statements and Travel Plans; and TRANS5: Consideration of Development Proposals. The Council's SPD (2016) is also relevant. Based on the SPD and the relevant policies, the appeal proposal should provide: (i) a financial contribution towards local primary health care (£73,735); (ii) a recycling and waste contribution (£24,738); (iii) a street naming contribution (£2,977); (iv) a District S106 monitoring fee (£2,686); (v) an affordable housing contribution (£7,510,350); (vi) a public transport services contribution (£117,000); (vii) a travel plan monitoring contribution (£2,040); and (viii) a County S106 monitoring fee (£1,500).
103. The primary care contribution is directly related to the development because it results from the additional pressure on local health services as a result of the future residents. It is fair and reasonable as the amount has been calculated based on the number of future residents. The recycling and waste contribution is necessary for the development to be served by waste infrastructure and the calculation is directly related to the bins needed for this development. It is necessary for the development to be served by street naming plates and the calculation is directly related to the name plates needed for this development. The completion of a planning obligation requires the Council to administer and monitor those obligations. The monitoring fee contribution is necessary to cover the Council's costs and is directly related to the nature of the obligation.
104. The proposal will deliver affordable housing which is required under Policy H9 of the SOLP. It will do so via a contribution in lieu of on-site provision. The s106 Agreement secures the payment of £7,510,350 to be paid by the owners. A financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing is necessary to equate with a 40% affordable housing provision under Policy H9. It is directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. The financial contribution has been calculated based on the open market value of a unit to be delivered on the site.⁶⁹ The s106 Agreement requires the total affordable housing contribution to be used towards the provision of off-site affordable housing within the District.
105. The relevant policies which support the transport contributions are set out in the CIL Compliance Statement.⁷⁰ A contribution is required to provide an improved bus service (service 25) for residents, visitors and staff associated with the proposed development as an appropriate and viable alternative to the use of private cars and to promote travel by public transport. The contribution required would be used towards increasing the frequency of the existing service operating between Sonning Common and Reading to every 30 minutes between 0600 - 2030, Monday to Saturday and an hourly service in the evenings (up to 2300) and on Sundays (0800-1800). The contribution is directly related to the number of residential units but excludes the proposed 16 high care units, as these residents are unlikely to use public transport. A

⁶⁹ INQ LPA7 provides the methodology for the calculation of the commuted sums based on the open market value of a unit to be delivered on the site.

⁷⁰ INQ LPA7 NPPF paragraphs 102, 103, 108 and 111; Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire County Council's Fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 2015-2031 Volume 1 Policy and Overall Strategy Updated 2016 Policy 3 and Policy 34; Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire County Council's Fourth Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 2015-2031 Volume 2 Bus & Rapid Transit Strategy (2016) paragraphs 91, 93-95.

travel plan monitoring fee is required to monitor the implementation of the travel plan and an administration and monitoring fee is required to monitor the planning obligation.

106. In my view, all of the obligations in the Planning Obligation are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, they all meet the tests within Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and should be taken into account in the decision. I conclude on the fourth issue that the proposed development makes adequate provision for any additional infrastructure and services that are necessary, including affordable housing, arising from the development.

Fifth Issue - whether, in the light of the criteria set out in paragraph 172 of the NPPF, there are exceptional circumstances to justify the proposed development within the AONB

107. There is no dispute that the appeal scheme would be a major development in the AONB. The tests relating to allowing such development are set out clearly in paragraph 172 of the NPPF. The relevant factors which must be considered are then listed in paragraph 172 a) to c) but it is not an exhaustive list. Great weight must be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs and planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.

The need for the development and the impact on the local economy

108. I have already discussed the need for the development in detail under the first issue. That discussion is not repeated in detail here, but it is plainly relevant to paragraph 172 a) of the NPPF. There is an immediate unmet need for extra care market housing. This arises not from some ambitious target for extra care. The target for need suggested by Mr Appleton is in fact very modest. It is just 4.5% of the District's population of people 75 years of age and over. It arises because there is hardly any of it available. There are only two schemes which have been built offering 113 units. The only future supply which is available is the market extra care that would be provided at Lower Shiplake for 65 units. Retirement Villages has now sold that site and want a larger site. Whether the Lower Shiplake scheme gets built is therefore uncertain. But even with it the supply of extra care that is available is only 178 units.
109. This against a need, based on a modest aspiration of 4.5% - that is 450 units across the whole District for an overall population of 15,000 in this age category, gives rise to an immediate shortfall of 272. The figure is 337 if the Lower Shiplake proposal is excluded. The stark fact is there is hardly any choice or to put it another way choice is largely unavailable.
110. I am in no doubt that the development of 133 units is needed. Firstly, it is needed to address the immediate shortfall in the five year housing land supply in the District which is only equivalent to some 4.21 years. Secondly, it is needed in this District where at present a population of 15,000 who are aged 75 years or older is forecast to increase to 21,100 by 2035. The demographic evidence indicates a 'critical' need for extra care housing in the District. In this case, the proposed development should be of sufficient size to support the communal facilities that are necessary to ensure an effective operation.

111. Thirdly, it is important to recognise the fact that extra care accommodation, together with all other forms of specialist housing for older people can assist in `freeing up' existing family and other housing by allowing them to `right size' by moving to more appropriate accommodation. This type of specialist housing could significantly contribute towards the easing of the present housing crisis in this District where under occupancy amongst older households is greater than for England as a whole. The sale of the 133 units in the appeal proposals would release 133 family houses of three bedrooms or more.⁷¹ The appeal scheme would be likely to free up 39 family dwellings locally but it could be as high as 64.⁷² Significant weight can be given to this.
112. Fourthly, the health and well-being benefits of the appeal proposal should also be recognised and given significant weight. Such benefits to elderly people are entirely obvious. I accept that such health and care benefits apply and also that they are separate from housing delivery. The benefits specialist housing for older people can bring include addressing concerns about suitable supervision, frailty, care, assistance, recreation, loneliness and isolation.
113. I do not consider the impact of refusing the proposed development would be seriously damaging to the local economy, there is no clear evidence to that effect. There is no requirement that has to be demonstrated. However, I do accept that the proposal would deliver economic benefits to the local economy and jobs as well.⁷³ The Appellant has also proposed a local employment and procurement condition which I accept is plainly relevant.⁷⁴ I am satisfied that there is a need for the development and that it is in the public interest.

The cost and scope of developing elsewhere or meeting the need in another way

114. With regard to paragraph 172 b) of the NPPF, the Council's case is that with Policy H1 and H13 the need for specialised housing for the elderly can be met outside of the AONB. The Council refers to the Oxford County Council's Market Position Statement Extra Care Housing Supplement 2019-2022 and to the SHMA. However, the Council does not quantify a need for extra care, albeit the SHMA does recognize it as a category of need and distinguishes between market and affordable extra care housing.⁷⁵ The Council also suggests that the need can be met in people's homes and that needs can be met by 2035. In my view, there is a specific need for extra care provision and market extra care housing. The needs which have been identified are modest and the idea that they be met at home is misplaced. The most relevant need is the immediate need and Mr Appleton's evidence demonstrates what this is.
115. I note that at both the application and appeal stages the Appellant relied upon a sequential assessment of alternative sites to show a lack of suitable sites. The Council questioned this assessment but never really suggested any alternative sites. At the Inquiry reference was made to 8 extra care sites in Mrs Smith's Appendix 1. However, all of those sites have been addressed by Mr Appleton and that information was updated during the Inquiry to reveal that there were no sites with planning permission in the pipeline other than

⁷¹ Paragraph 6.24 of Roland Bolton's POE

⁷² Paragraph 6.27 of Roland Bolton's POE

⁷³ See CD: A.6 Economic Benefits Assessment Report, it is calculated that operation of the site would provide up to circa 70 jobs (FTE). This does not include construction jobs, which are assessed to be of the order of 108 over a period of 4 years, although in practice this maybe higher dependent upon individual project needs.

⁷⁴ See *Verdin v SSCLG* [2016] EWHC

⁷⁵ See CD: D.14 Table 6 page 25

Lower Shiplake which is now uncertain. Therefore, it seems to me that the Council's own evidence supports the Appellant on the lack of alternatives.

116. Moreover, when the Appellant persuaded the landowner to agree to pay the full affordable housing contribution, that significantly strengthened the Appellant's case in respect of paragraph 172 b). That is because the appeal site stands alone as the only site in the whole of the District which can deliver extra care market housing and deliver the affordable housing contribution which the SOLP now requires for C2 uses. Mrs Smith accepted that there are no other sites in the District with planning permission for extra care market housing. The problem is a combination of land economics and SOLP Policy H9 which requires affordable housing on extra care housing schemes. Given this context the appeal proposal does connote rarity and uniqueness.
117. Extra care housing undoubtedly operates in a very different market. Mr Garside provided detailed evidence to the Inquiry how the market for land operates to the detriment of extra care operators. Extra care housing providers cannot compete with house builders or with other providers of specialist housing for older people because of the build costs, the level of the communal facilities and the additional sale costs including vacant property costs. The communal facilities must be provided before any units can be sold and sales tend to be slower.⁷⁶ However, I accept that extra care schemes can charge a premium for the specialist accommodation provided and also benefit from an income from deferred management fees.
118. It seems to me that these factors, all mean that age restricted developments and in particular extra care communities are less viable than traditional housing schemes. Ultimately, age restricted developers are less able to pay the same price for land as residential developers and it is much harder for age restricted developers, and in particular those seeking to deliver extra care, to secure sites for development and meet the housing needs they aim to supply.⁷⁷ Viability is clearly a relevant factor which supports the case under paragraph 172 b) of the NPPF. There is also a strong case for the appeal scheme given the lack of alternative sites in the light of Policy H9 of the SOLP.
119. I note that the SOLP does not allocate any sites for extra care housing, unlike for example in Central Bedfordshire. I also note that the need for extra care housing is recognised in the SCNP, which supports, as was agreed, extra care housing on unallocated sites due to Policy H2a. I am satisfied that the Appellant's need could not be met elsewhere or in any other way and that it would be in the public interest for this to happen on the appeal site.

Detrimental effect on Environmental, Landscape and Recreation opportunities, and the extent to which they could be moderated.

120. This factor has been considered in the second issue above. That discussion is not repeated here but it is plainly relevant to paragraph 172 c). Suffice it to say that I have concluded that there would only be localised landscape and visual effects on the AONB. These limited impacts would not cause material harm to the landscape character of the AONB, nor would they conflict with the aims of protecting its special qualities. I have concluded there would be localised landscape and visual effects on the AONB that could be moderated.

⁷⁶ See section 4 of Richard Garside's POE

⁷⁷ See paragraph 4.65 of Richard Garside's POE

Other Benefits

121. The scheme would deliver other benefits. In my view, these can also form part of the exceptional circumstances and public interest. It is the collective benefits and harms which are relevant to paragraph 172 of the NPPF. Both Mr James and Mr Garnett gave evidence as to numerous other significant benefits, individually and cumulatively, which should be weighed in favour of the proposals. These include contributing to the overall supply of housing which is under five-years; savings in public expenditure (NHS and adult care);⁷⁸ creating new employment and other economic investment (construction and operation);⁷⁹ providing new facilities and services further reinforcing the role and function of Sonning Common; and additional net revenues from Council tax and new homes bonus receipt. Mrs Smith accepted the economic benefits and that bringing facilities to the area, particularly for the older population would be a benefit. It was also accepted that there could be benefits in supporting existing facilities in that residents of Inspired Village sites having the option to support those businesses if they wanted to. No good reason was provided by the Council for discounting the benefits evidence by Mr James or Mr Garnett. The social and economic benefits are matters to which I attribute significant weight. There is a very strong case on exceptional circumstances and public benefits here.

Conclusion

122. Section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 seeks to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of an AONB and paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. This is not the same as requiring that every development proposal engenders enhancement. Indeed, if that were the case it is difficult to see how major development in an AONB could ever be permitted. It is clearly a matter of balance, but in undertaking that exercise the NPPF makes clear that conserving and enhancing the designated resource is a matter of great weight. In this case I have given great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and natural beauty of the AONB. The need for the development and the conclusion that there are presently no alternatives outside the designated area are also matters of substantial importance in the public interest. The social and economic benefits attract significant weight. Overall, the benefits would outweigh the localised landscape and visual effects to the AONB. For these reasons I conclude on this issue that exceptional circumstances are demonstrated and that the development would be in the public interest.

Other Matters

123. I have taken into account all other matters raised including the concerns raised by the SCPC, the Rotherfield Peppard Parish Council, the representations made by interested persons including those who gave evidence at the Inquiry and those who provided written submissions. I have already dealt with many of the points raised in the main issues.

124. The SCPC and others objected to the proposed development in the context of the neighbourhood planning process. However, the review of the SCNP has

⁷⁸ See paragraphs 6.16 to 6.33, PoE of Stuart Garnett. See also CD: K7, CD: K8 (Appendix 1 at page 20 onwards), CD: K12 (pages 2-3), and CD: K30 (pages 6, 12, 13, 20 and 24-26 in particular).

⁷⁹ See paragraphs 6.10 to 6.15, PoE of Stuart Garnett

been ongoing since around 2018 but there are no concrete proposals. It is suggested that the proposal is not small scale. However, site SON2 is in fact 3.3 hectares and broadly of the same scale.⁸⁰ The SCNP expressly supports extra care housing at Policy H2a albeit no site is allocated. The SCNP policies are now out of date because of the lack of a five year housing land supply to which I attach significant weight. The concerns about the neighbouring planning process are not sufficient to warrant dismissing this appeal.

125. A number of interested persons cited concerns over impacts on local services in particular the doctor's surgery and parking capacity within the centre of Sonning Common. With respect to impacts on local health services, Mr Garnett's evidence provides details of both operational efficiencies and associated social benefits of extra care, which includes the financial benefits arising from savings to the NHS and social care. I consider that extra care housing benefits elderly people in terms of health and wellbeing. The secure community environment and sense of independence can reduce social isolation and encourage greater fitness and healthy lifestyles. It is reasonable to assume that these factors would likely result in a lower number of visits to the GP, reduced hospital admissions and overall savings to the NHS. This is borne out in the research submitted to the Inquiry.
126. A number of objectors raised concerns over parking capacity within the centre of Sonning Common. However, the appeal site lies within an acceptable walking distance of a number of the facilities within the village centre. Trip generation associated with the proposals would not have a materially negative impact on the road network. I note also that a Travel Plan has been submitted in relation to the proposals.⁸¹ I consider that this matter is capable of being secured by means of an appropriately worded planning condition. In addition to the 'supported transport provision' that would be provided for residents, it would be reasonable to expect that a number of residents would use the existing footpath links to access the village centre.
127. A number of objectors also raised concerns over transport safety and the sufficiency of parking on the appeal site. I note that a number of matters are agreed between the Council and the highway authority in SoCG2 Transport. A new vehicular access would be constructed to the east of the existing access on Blounts Court Road. The proposed scheme would provide for off-site highway improvements comprising works associated with the proposed site access, proposed works to pedestrian facilities along the site frontage either side of the site access, widening of the carriageway and a gateway feature along Blounts Court Road, and provision of a zebra crossing on Widmore Lane. Provision would also be made within the scheme for 93 car and 58 cycle parking spaces (12 visitor, 10 staff and 36 resident) that would be provided in relation to the full aspect of the development. Notwithstanding the original RfR5 the highway authority raises no objection to the proposal subject to the agreed conditions and the contributions contained within the s106 Agreement. In my view the concerns raised about transport issues would not provide a reason for rejection of this appeal.
128. A number of objections relate to the impact on local ecology. The appeal site contains habitats of a lower biodiversity value, which are common and

⁸⁰ See CD: K.18 page 580

⁸¹ See CD: A.8

widespread throughout the District. The appeal scheme provides for a net increase in biodiversity across the site, specifically an increase of 51% for the detailed element. The Ecological Impact Assessment⁸² was accepted by the Council as demonstrating net benefit⁸³ and I attach significant weight to this.

129. At the Inquiry reference was made to numerous appeal decisions. I have taken these into account as appropriate in coming to my decision in this case.

Planning Balance

130. I have concluded that the appeal proposals would be a major development in the AONB where exceptional circumstances apply, and which would be in the public interest. I have given great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. In terms of paragraph 172 a) of the NPPF I am in no doubt that there is a need this development of 133 units to address the immediate shortfall in the five year housing land supply; to address the critical need for extra care housing in the District; to assist in the freeing up of family housing within South Oxfordshire and to provide the health and well-being benefits to elderly people.

131. The Council argued that with Policy H1 and Policy H13 the need for specialist housing for older people could be met outside the AONB; could be met in people's homes and that needs could be met by 2035. However, I have concluded that there is a specific and immediate need for extra care provision and market extra care housing. From the up-to-date evidence provided at the Inquiry it is clear to me that there are no sites with planning permission in the pipeline other than the Lower Shiplake site which is now uncertain. The case under paragraph 172 b) has been met. That is because the appeal site stands alone as the only site in the whole of the District which can deliver extra care market housing and deliver the affordable housing contribution which the SOLP Policy H9 now requires for C2 uses. In my view extra care housing cannot compete with housebuilders or even other forms of specialist housing for older people because of the build cost, the level of communal facilities and additional sale costs including vacant property costs.

132. In terms of paragraph 172 c) I have concluded there would be localised landscape and visual effects, but these would be relatively small. Only a limited part of the mosaic would be impacted, and this would not alter the overall character of the wider mosaic of the LCT. Plainly such limited impacts would not cause material harm to the landscape character of the AONB, nor would it conflict with the aims of protecting its special qualities. In terms of visual impact, only a small number of nearby locations would have direct views of the appeal proposals where glimpses of the development would be filtered and moderated by perimeter planting and particularly by the woodland belt. Overall, I have concluded under paragraph 172 of the NPPF that the circumstances in this case are exceptional and that the grant of planning permission would be in the public interest.

133. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case where the test in paragraph 172 of the NPPF

⁸² See CD: A32

⁸³ See PoE of Simon James Appendix 11

has been met it is difficult to see how a decision maker could nonetheless refuse to grant planning permission applying paragraph 11 of the NPPF. However, in terms of the development plan I accept that the proposal conflicts with some elements of the development plan, but it also complies with others. Policies in the SOLP are up-to-date and can be given full weight. The appeal proposal conflicts in part with the SOLP, in particular in terms of the overall strategy (STRAT1) and with relevant policies relating to the AONB (ENV1) However, there is partial accord with Policy H13 and full accordance with Policies H1 3ii, H4, H9, H11, DES1, DES2, DES3, DES4 and DES5.

134. With regard to the SCNP, this was made in 2016, against a different housing requirement albeit it is still within the grace period allowed by Policy H4(2) of the SOLP. The SCNP policies can only be given limited weight in the context of the NPPF as it was based on a Core Strategy which is now withdrawn, and it is out of date for that reason. Its policies reliant on the AONB are also out of date given the lack of a five year housing land supply. The proposal would conflict with Policy H1 in so far as the limitation of development is concerned but the policy is expressed as a minimum and the base target has been increased through the SOLP quantum of housing so the appeal scheme would contribute to that. There would be conflict with Policy ENV1 which aims to protect the AONB but there are exceptional circumstances here. There would be broad accordance with Policy H2a, D1 and D1a and ENV2 albeit that three storey development is an exception and must be justified. I conclude that the appeal proposal is in overall accordance with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate otherwise.
135. Even if I had decided that the proposal was in overall conflict with the development plan this is a case where there is no five year housing land supply and therefore the most important policies for determining the appeal are out of date.⁸⁴ As to which policies are out of date, it is agreed that the most important for determining the appeal are set out in the RfR. Thus, the tilted balance would be triggered by way of footnote 7 of the NPPF unless paragraph 11 d) i. is satisfied. In this case under paragraph 11 d) i. the adverse effects would not provide a clear reason for refusing the proposed development. It follows therefore that even if the appeal proposal was contrary to the development plan and the tilted balance under paragraph 11 d) ii. of the NPPF applied then the many and varied benefits of the proposals set out above would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any adverse effects. There is no reason to withhold planning permission in this case and I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Planning Conditions

136. The Council submitted a list of conditions which I have considered in the light of the advice in paragraphs 54 and 55 of the NPPF and the Government's PPG on the Use of Planning Conditions. The Appellant has agreed to all of the suggested conditions except for Condition 27 which relates to a Procurement and Employment Strategy. The Appellant has also given consent in writing that Conditions 7-27 may be applied as pre-commencement conditions.⁸⁵ Conditions 1, 4 and 5 relate to required time limits and Conditions 2 and 3 are necessary to determine the scope of the application and for the avoidance of

⁸⁴ NPPF paragraph 11 d) footnote 7

⁸⁵ See INQ APP14

- doubt. Conditions 6, 7 and 29 are necessary to secure net gains for biodiversity and Condition 8 is required to minimise the impacts of the development on biodiversity. Condition 9 is necessary to limit the local impact of construction work and Condition 10 is required to ensure that electric vehicle charging is provided. Condition 11 is required in the interests of highway safety and Condition 12 is necessary to ensure adequate car parking.
137. Condition 13 is required in the interests of sustainability and to encourage the use of cycling. Condition 14 on sample materials and Condition 15 on ground levels are required in the interests of visual amenity. Condition 16 is required to ensure adequate provision for the management of waste. Condition 17 is necessary to ensure high standards of sustainable design and construction. Condition 18 is necessary to protect the appearance of the area, the environment and wildlife from light pollution. Conditions 19 and 20 are necessary to ensure that the development is assimilated into its surroundings. Condition 21 is necessary to safeguard the trees which are visually important on the site. Condition 22 is required to safeguard heritage assets of archaeological interest. Condition 23 is necessary to prevent pollution and flooding. Condition 24 is required to ensure the proper provision of foul water drainage. Condition 25 is required to prevent pollution and flooding. Condition 26 is necessary to ensure that the development is not unneighbourly.
138. Condition 27 relates to a procurement and employment strategy. The Council considers that the condition would fail the test of necessity as there is no policy support for this requirement and there would be problems about enforcement. However, it seems to me that a local employment and procurement condition is plainly relevant following the Verdin judgment.⁸⁶ Employing local people and using local produce, to save miles travelled seems to epitomize the principle of sustainable development. Moreover, the strategy would put in place arrangements to ensure that the information was regularly provided to the Council to demonstrate the performance and effectiveness of the initiatives. The condition would not impose unreasonable or unjustified demands on the Council. The condition would meet the tests in the NPPF.
139. Condition 28 is required to ensure the provision of adequate pedestrian and cycle access to the site in the interests of highway safety. Condition 30 is necessary to ensure that sustainable transport modes are taken up. Condition 31 is necessary to avoid sewage flooding and potential pollution incidents. Condition 32 is necessary to ensure that the development is not unneighbourly or detrimental to highway safety. Condition 33 is required to protect the occupants of nearby residential properties from noise disturbance. Condition 34 is required to mitigate any impacts on air pollution.

Overall conclusion

140. Having considered these and all other matters raised I find nothing of sufficient materiality to lead me to a different conclusion. The appeal is therefore allowed subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Harold Stephens

INSPECTOR

⁸⁶ See INQ APP15 Verdin v SSCLG [2016] EWHC

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING CONDITIONS (1-34)

Time limit and approved plans relating to the full planning permission

Commencement – Full

- 1) The development subject to full planning permission, comprising the areas shown as shaded red and green on Drawing No. URB SC[08]00 01 D02 (Site Location Plan), [Phase 1] must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Approved Plans

- 2) That the element of the development hereby approved full planning permission, as shown within the areas shaded red and green on Drawing No. URB SC[08]00 01 D02 (Site Location Plan), [Phase 1] shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the following approved plans, except as controlled or modified by conditions of this permission:

URB SC [08] 00 01 Rev D02 (Site Location Plan)
URB SC [08] 00 03 Rev D04 (Proposed Block Plan)
02 Rev 03 (Landscape Plan)
03 Rev 03 (Hard Landscaping)
04 Rev 03 (Soft Landscaping)
URB VC [08] 70 01 Rev D02 (Village Core Elevations)
URB VC [08] 70 02 Rev D01 (Village Core Elevations)
URB VC [08] 70 03 Rev D01 (Village Core Elevations)
URB VC [08] 70 04 Rev D01 (Village Core Elevations)
URB VC [08] 00 01 Rev D02 (Village Core Ground Floor Plan)
URB B01 [08] 70 01 Rev D01 (Block 1 Elevations)
URB B02 [08] 70 01 Rev D01 (Block 2 Elevations)
URB B03 [08] 70 01 Rev D01 (Block 3 Elevations)
URB B04 [08] 70 01 Rev D01 (Block 4 Elevations)
URB B01 [08] 00 01 Rev D00 (Block 1 Floor Plans)
URB B01 [08] 20 01 Rev D00 (Block 1 Roof Plan)
URB B02 [08] 00 01 Rev D00 (Block 2 Floor Plans and Roof Plan)
URB B03 [08] 10 01 Rev D00 (Block 3 Floor Plan)
URB B03 [08] 00 01 Rev D00 (Block 3 Floor Plan)
URB B03 [08] 20 01 Rev D00 (Block 3 Roof Plan)
URB B04 [08] 00 01 Rev D00 (block 4 Floor Plans)
URB B04 [08] 20 01 Rev D00 (block 4 Roof Plan)
URB SS [08] 00 01 Rev D00 (Substation)
OX5025-11PD-004 Rev H – Road Carriageway Widening
OX5025-16PD-006 Rev A - Cross Sections of Proposed Widening along Blounts Court Road
OX5025-16PD-004 Rev C - Proposed Off-Site Improvements
OX5025-16PD-002 Rev C - Proposed Site Access Arrangements
OX5025-16PD-003 Rev D - Proposed Internal Layout
OX5025-11PD-007 Rev F - Review of Revised Masterplan (6 Metres Internal Carriageway)
OX5025-11PD-009 Rev F Proposed Zebra Crossing at Widmore Lane

Outline Plans

- 3) That the element of the development hereby approved outline planning permission, as shown within the areas shaded blue on Drawing No. URB SC [08] 00 01 D02 (Site Location Plan) shall be carried out in general accordance with the details shown on the following documents:

Illustrative Masterplan PW.1618.L.01 Rev 03
Design and Access Statement May 2020
Design Commitment Statement URB-SC A3 90 02-D00 April 21

Reserved matters and time limit relating to the outline planning permission

Reserved Matters

- 4) Within a period of three years from the date of this permission all of the reserved matters shall have been submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The reserved matters shall comprise: details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development. All reserved matters for any one phase shall be submitted concurrently. No development shall commence within any one phase until there is written approval of all of the reserved matters for that phase and the development shall be carried out in accordance with all of the approved reserved matters.

Commencement – Outline

- 5) The site subject to outline planning permission, comprising the area shown as shaded blue on Drawing No. URB SC [08]00 01 D02 (Site Location Plan) [Phase 2], shall be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
- (i) 3 years from the date of this permission: or
 - (ii) 2 years from the approval of the final reserved matters application.

Biodiversity Enhancement Plan – Outline

- 6) Concurrent with the submission of any reserved matters application related to this outline planning permission, a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The BEP should be broadly in accordance with the outline details of habitat enhancements illustrated in Appendix 13 of the supporting Ecological Impact Assessment (Southern Ecological Solutions, 26/06/2020, Rev E). The BEP should include:
- (a) Details of habitat creation or enhancements (this could cross reference relevant landscape plans) and include suitably detailed drawings and cross sections as required.
 - (b) Details of species enhancements including relevant scale plans and drawings showing the location, elevation and type of features such as bat and bird boxes as appropriate.
 - (c) Selection of appropriate strategies for creating/restoring target habitats or introducing target species.

- (d) Selection of specific techniques and practices for establishing vegetation.
- (e) Sources of habitat materials (e.g. plant stock) or species individuals.
- (f) Method statement for site preparation and establishment of target features.
- (g) Extent and location of proposed works.
- (h) Details of a biodiversity metric assessment

Thereafter, the biodiversity enhancement measures shall be developed on site and retained in accordance with the approved details. All enhancements should be delivered prior to the final occupation of the relevant phase.

Pre-commencement conditions

Biodiversity Enhancement Plan – Full

- 7) Prior to the commencement of the development subject of full planning permission, a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The BEP should be broadly in accordance with the details of habitat enhancements illustrated in Appendix 13 of the supporting Ecological Impact Assessment (Southern Ecological Solutions, 26/06/2020, Rev E). The BEP should include:
- (a) Details of habitat creation or enhancements (this could cross reference relevant landscape plans) and include suitably detailed drawings and cross sections as required.
 - (b) Details of species enhancements including relevant scale plans and drawings showing the location, elevation and type of features such as bat and bird boxes as appropriate.
 - (c) Selection of appropriate strategies for creating/restoring target habitats or introducing target species.
 - (d) Selection of specific techniques and practices for establishing vegetation.
 - (e) Sources of habitat materials (e.g. plant stock) or species individuals.
 - (f) Method statement for site preparation and establishment of target features.
 - (g) Extent and location of proposed works.

Thereafter, the biodiversity enhancement measures shall be developed on site and retained in accordance with the approved details. All enhancements should be delivered prior to the final occupation of the relevant phase.

Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity

- 8) Prior to the commencement of any development (including vegetation clearance) a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following:
- (a) Update ecological surveys for relevant habitats and species, update surveys shall follow national good practice guidelines (badgers surveys shall be no older than 6 months).
 - (b) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.

- (c) Identification of biodiversity protection zones.
- (d) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid, reduce or mitigate the impacts on important habitats and protected species during construction.
- (e) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- (f) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- (g) Responsible persons and lines of communication.
- (h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

Thereafter the approved CEMP (Biodiversity) shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Phasing

- 9) Prior to the commencement of any development subject to full planning permission or submission of the first Reserved Matters for the development subject to outline planning permission, a phasing plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development of the site shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Electric Vehicle Charging

- 10) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development a scheme to provide that phase with Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of that phase.

Estate Roads and Footpaths

- 11) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, details of the estate roads and footpaths within that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, before first occupation of any unit within that phase, the whole of the estate roads and footpaths (except for the final surfacing thereof) shall be laid out, constructed, lit and drained.

Car Parking Plan

- 12) Prior to the commencement of the reserved matters phase of the development plans showing car parking within that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the agreed car parking provision shall be provided before first occupation of that part of the site and be retained as such thereafter.

Cycle Parking

- 13) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, details of cycle storage, for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority. The agreed cycle parking shall be provided before first occupation of that part of the site and be retained as such thereafter.

Materials

- 14) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, details of all materials, including samples where required, to be used in the external construction and finishes of the development within that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development of the site shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Site Levels

- 15) Prior to the commencement of any development, detailed plans showing the existing and proposed ground levels of that phase, together with the slab and ridge levels of the proposed development, relative to a fixed datum point on adjoining land outside of the application site, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Refuse and Recycling

- 16) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, details of refuse and recycling storage for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The refuse and recycling storage shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development in each phase and retained thereafter.

Energy Statement

- 17) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, an Energy Statement demonstrating how the development within that phase will achieve at least a 40% reduction in carbon emissions compared with code 2013 Building Regulations, and details of how this will be monitored, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

External Lighting

- 18) Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development approved in full, and accompanying the first Reserved Matters application for the development approved in outline, a detailed lighting scheme (including street and pathway lighting) for that phase, including a programme for its delivery, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Landscaping

- 19) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, a scheme for the landscaping of that phase including the planting of trees and shrubs, the

treatment of the access road and hard standings, and the provision of boundary treatment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details shall include schedules of new trees and shrubs to be planted (noting species, plant sizes and numbers/densities), the identification of the existing trees and shrubs on the site to be retained (noting species, location and spread), any earth moving operations and finished levels/contours, and an implementation programme.

The scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation or use of that phase of development and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

In the event of any of the trees or shrubs so planted dying or being seriously damaged or destroyed within 5 years of the completion of the development, a new tree or shrub or equivalent number of trees or shrubs, as the case may be, of a species first approved by the Local Planning Authority, shall be planted and properly maintained in a position or positions first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Landscape Management Plan

- 20) Prior to the commencement of the first phase of development, a maintenance schedule and a long term management plan for the soft landscaping works for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include those areas of the site which are to be available for communal use as open space. The schedule and plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed programme.

Tree Protection

- 21) Prior to the commencement of any site works or operations (including the removal of any vegetation or trees) required in relation with the full or outline planning permission, an arboricultural method statement to ensure the satisfactory protection of retained trees during the construction period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The matters to be encompassed within the arboricultural method statement shall include the following:
- (a) A specification for the pruning of, or tree surgery to, trees to be retained in order to prevent accidental damage by construction activities.
 - (b) The specification of the location, materials and means of construction of temporary protective fencing and/or ground protection in the vicinity of trees to be retained, in accordance with the recommendations of BS 5837 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction' and details of the timing and duration of its erection.
 - (c) The definition of areas for the storage or stockpiling of materials, temporary on-site parking, site offices and huts, mixing of cement or concrete, and fuel storage.
 - (d) The means of demolition of any existing site structures, and of the re-instatement of the area currently occupied thereby.

- (e) The specification of the routing and means of installation of drainage or any underground services in the vicinity of retained trees.
- (f) The details and method of construction of any other structures such as boundary walls in the vicinity of retained trees and how these relate to existing ground levels.
- (g) The details of the materials and method of construction of any roadway, parking, pathway or other surfacing within the root protection area, which is to be of a 'no dig' construction method in accordance with the principles of Arboricultural Practice Note 12 "Through the Trees to Development", and in accordance with current industry best practice; and as appropriate for the type of roadway required in relation to its usage.
- (h) Provision for the supervision of any works within the root protection areas of trees to be retained, and for the monitoring of continuing compliance with the protective measures specified, by an appropriately qualified arboricultural consultant, to be appointed at the developer's expense and notified to the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development; and provision for the regular reporting of continued compliance or any departure there from to the Local Planning Authority.
- (i) The details of the materials and method of construction of the pedestrian and cycle access to Widmore Lane, which is to in part be of a 'no dig' construction method in accordance with the principles of Arboricultural Practice Note 12 "Through the Trees to Development", and in accordance with current industry best practice; and as appropriate for the type of surface required in relation to its usage.
- (j) A specification of the foundation design for the pedestrian and cycle access to Widmore Lane demonstrating absolute minimal soil excavation, soil compaction or soil contamination within the root protection area of the adjacent trees.

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details with the agreed measures being kept in place during the entire course of development.

Implementation of Archaeological work

- 22) Prior to any earth works forming part of the development or the commencement of the development (other than in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation), a programme of archaeological mitigation shall be carried out by the commissioned archaeological organisation in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The programme of work shall include all processing, research and analysis necessary to produce an accessible and useable archive and a full report for publication which shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Ground Investigation

- 23) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development the results of an intrusive ground investigation, analysing the potential for dissolution features and mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The results shall then be implemented in accordance

with the approved programme and used to inform the surface water drainage design.

Foul Drainage

- 24) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, a detailed foul water drainage scheme for that phase 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 and no part of the development in the phase to which the scheme relates shall be occupied or used until the foul water drainage works to serve that phase have been completed.

Surface Water Drainage

- 25) Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, a detailed surface water drainage scheme relating to that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should be based on the principles contained within Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy reference 3424 Dec 2019 by Scott Hughes Design, sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development.

The scheme shall include:

- (a) Discharge rates.
- (b) Discharge volumes.
- (c) Catchment plans.
- (d) Maintenance and management of SUDS features.
- (e) Sizing of features – attenuation volume.
- (f) Site wide infiltration tests to be undertaken in accordance with BRE365.
- (g) Ground Investigation Report.
- (h) Detailed drainage layout with pipe/chamber/soakaway numbers & sizes.
- (i) Proposed site levels, floor levels and an exceedance plan.
- (j) Detailed network calculations to include the worst case 1:100 + 40% event.
- (k) SUDS features and sections.
- (l) Details of proposed Primary, Secondary and Tertiary treatment stages to ensure sufficient treatment of surface water prior to discharge.
- (m) Drainage construction details.
- (n) A compliance report to demonstrate how the scheme complies with the "Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire."
- (o) A range of SuDS techniques throughout the site to manage water quantity and maintain water quality.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and no part of the development in the phase to which the scheme relates shall be occupied or used until the surface water drainage works to serve that phase have been completed.

Construction Method Statement

- 26) No development shall commence on site (including any works of demolition), until a Construction Method Statement, which shall include the following:
- (a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - (c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - (d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - (e) wheel washing facilities;
 - (f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - (g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
 - (h) details of measures for the control of noise during construction works;

has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved construction methods.

Procurement and Employment Strategy

- 27) Prior to the commencement of development, a Local Employment and Procurement Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall include:
- (i) Details of recruitment within the development to achieve a minimum of 25% of village staff from within a 5 mile radius of Sonning Common;
 - (ii) Details of the use of local businesses, including purchase of food, beverage and other items to achieve a minimum of 50% of fresh produce (meat, bakery, dairy, fruit and vegetables) from within a 5 mile radius of Sonning Common;
 - (iii) The timing and arrangements for the implementation of these initiatives; and
 - (iv) Suitable mechanisms for monitoring the effectiveness of these initiatives.

All parts of the approved Local Employment and Procurement Strategy shall be implemented in full and retained thereafter.

Pre-occupancy conditions

Pedestrian and Cycle Access

- 28) Prior to occupation of any development subject to full or outline planning permission, details of the pedestrian/cycle access to the site from Widmore Lane, including a 3.5m wide combined pedestrian/cycle path through the site, associated street lighting facilities and a zebra crossing along Widmore Lane shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be based on those shown on plan OX5025-11PD-009 Rev F, subject to the tree protection measure shown in condition 21. The works shall

be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved details before occupation of any part of the site, and permanently retained as such thereafter.

Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

- 29) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) for the whole site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:
- (a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
 - (b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
 - (c) Proposals for ecological enhancements for habitats and species as agreed in the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan.
 - (d) Aims and objectives of management.
 - (e) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
 - (f) Prescriptions for management actions.
 - (g) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).
 - (h) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
 - (i) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall include details of the legal and funding mechanism by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management bodies responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and management prescriptions implemented across the site for a timeframe to be agreed within the LEMP.

Green Travel Plans

- 30) Prior to the occupation of the first phase of the development hereby approved a full and detailed Travel Plan and Travel Information Packs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These documents will be updated upon the submission of subsequent phases of the development. Thereafter, that part of the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved documents and the associated Travel Information Packs issued to each resident upon first occupation.

Wastewater

- 31) No properties shall be occupied in any phase until confirmation has been provided that either:

- (i) All wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or-
- (ii) A housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional properties to be occupied.

Where a housing and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed housing and infrastructure phasing plan.

Service and Delivery Management Plan

- 32) No building shall be occupied until details of a comprehensive servicing and delivery management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Deliveries and service areas shall be managed in accordance with the agreed scheme.

Compliance conditions

Construction Hours

- 33) The hours of operation for construction and demolition works shall be restricted to 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 on a Saturday. No work is permitted to take place on Sundays or Public Holidays without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Air Quality

- 34) The air quality mitigation measures outlined in the Air Quality Assessment (Ref REP-10111755A-20191212) shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations and specifications in the report and implemented prior to occupation of each unit. Thereafter, the mitigation measures shall be retained as approved and in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Robin Green of Counsel

Instructed by the Solicitor to South
Oxfordshire District Council

He called:

Mr John Jeffcock
BA (Hons) MA CMLI NZILA

Associate of Michelle Bolger Expert
Landscape Consultancy

Mr Julian Kashdan-Brown
B Arch (Hons) Dip Arch MSc MA RIBA

Architect and Urban Designer

Mrs Nicola Smith BSc (Hons) MSc

Principal Major Applications Officer

Mrs Emma Bowerman BA (Hons) MSc

Principal Major Applications Officer

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Christopher Young QC
Ms Leanne Buckley Thompson of Counsel

Both instructed by the Appellant

They called

Mr Nigel Appleton MA (Cantab)

Executive Chairman of Contact
Consulting (Oxford) Ltd

Mr Stuart Garnett BSc Dip TP MRTPI

Planning Director Inspired Villages

Mr James Atkin BSc (Hons) Dip LM CMLI

Director (Landscape) Pegasus Group

Mr Michael Carr BA (Hons) Dip LA Dip UD
RUDP

Director (Design and Master
Planning) Pegasus Group

Mr Roland Bolton BSc (Hons) MRTPI

Senior Director, DLP Planning Ltd

Mr Richard Garside RICS

Director and Head of Development
Consultancy at Newsteer

Mr Simon James BA Dip TP MRTPI MIEMA

Managing Director DLP Planning Ltd

FOR SONNING COMMON PARISH COUNCIL:

Mr Ben Du Feu of Counsel

Instructed by the Parish Council

He called

Mrs Emily Temple BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Director ET Planning Ltd

FOR OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL:

Mr Dave Harrison BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT Senior Public Transport Planner
M Inst TA

Ms Judith Coats LLB Infrastructure Funding Team
Leader

Interested Persons

Mr Tom Fort Chairman of Sonning Common
Parish Council

Ms Julia Whitelaw Local Resident

Dr Kim Emmerson General Practitioner

Ms Georgina Forbes Local Resident

Mr Jonathan Berger Acting Chair of the Rotherfield
Peppard Parish Council

Mrs Joanne Shanagher Local Resident

Dr Michael Stubbs PhD MSc MRICS MRTPI Planning Adviser, The Chilterns
Conservation Board

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY:

Local Planning Authority Documents

INQ LPA1 Opening Statement
INQ LPA2 Factsheet 6 Design Principles for Extra Care Housing (3rd edition)
INQ LPA3 Proof of evidence Erratum sheet, Nicola Smith
INQ LPA4 Appendix 1 update, Nicola Smith
INQ LPA5 Five-year Housing Land Supply Erratum, Nicola Smith
INQ LPA6 Replacement Policies Schedule
INQ LPA7 CIL Compliance Statement
INQ LPA8 CIL Compliance Statement Addendum
INQ LPA9 Costs application
INQ LPA10 Conditions
INQ LPA11 Closing Submissions

Appellant Documents

INQ APP1 Opening Statement
INQ APP2 Summary and comparison of landscape and visual effects
INQ APP3 Correction sheet to JWA06
INQ APP4 Open letter to Boris Johnson
INQ APP5 Briefing Note Errata to Contextual Study of James Atkin
INQ APP6 Service Charges Note of Stuart Garnett
INQ APP7 References to height Johnson Matthey Planning Statement

INQ APP8 NPPF consultation document
INQ APP9 Mr Doyle email
INQ APP10 Extracts from Village News by Tom Fort
INQ APP11 s106 Agreement
INQ APP12 Nigel Appleton's Note
INQ APP13 Central Bedfordshire Policy H3 Main Modifications
INQ APP14 Pre commencement note
INQ APP15 Verdin Judgment
INQ APP16 Closing Submissions
INQ APP17 Appellant's response to the Costs application

R6 Party Documents

INQ PC1 Opening Statement
INQ PC2 Closing Submissions

Interested Persons Documents

IP1 Statement by Mr Tom Fort
IP2 Statement by Ms Julia Whitelaw
IP3 Statement by Dr Kim Emmerson
IP4 Statement by Ms Georgina Forbes
IP5 Statement by Mr Jonathan Berger
IP6 Statement by Mrs Joanne Shanagher
IP7 Statement by Dr Michael Stubbs