

# **WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE**

**Date: 2 November 2015**

### **Report of Additional Representations**



---

**WEST OXFORDSHIRE  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

---

**Agenda Index**

<b>15/03099/FUL</b>	<b>Land South of Forest Road, Charlbury .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>15/03128/OUT</b>	<b>Land South of High Street, Milton Under Wychwood.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>15/03303/FUL</b>	<b>Sunnyside, Ditchley Road, Charlbury .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Report of Additional Representations

<b>15/03099/FUL</b>	<b>Land south of Forest Road, Charlbury</b>
Date	29.10.15
Officer	Abby Fettes
Recommendation	<b>Approve subject to S106</b>
Parish	Charlbury
Grid Ref:	435053 219434

### Application details

Residential development of 25 dwellings comprising self/custom build, market housing and affordable housing (use class C3) and a 12 bed supported living (use class C3) facility with associated access, parking and landscaping.

### Applicant

Mr Ian Cox

### I Additional Representations

- 1.1 **The applicant's agent** has sent the following addition comments responding to Highways comments made 21st September.
- 1.2 This note addresses the following key areas;
  - Access on foot – Forest Road
  - Access on foot – within the site
  - Sightlines/visibility
  - Internal layout & tracking of a 11.5m vehicle
2. Access on foot – Forest Road
  - 2.1 The site is located in a well-established, semi-rural location. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear throughout that development in rural locations, where highways conditions are inherently different to those seen in the urban area, is acceptable. At paragraph 29 it recognises that different policies and measures will be required and that solutions will vary between rural and urban areas.
  - 2.2 When choosing where development can and cannot be located, local authorities should ensure that schemes generating significant amounts of movement are located in areas with high levels of non-car access. This decision need to take account of policies elsewhere in NPPF, particularly when dealing with rural areas, where the standards of an urban area may not be applicable in a rural one. IMA Transport Planning are not aware of specific guidance that suggests or indicates that footways should be one width in urban areas and another width in more rural locations. As a result, a pragmatic view needs to be taken on the level of non-car infrastructure that is suitable, adequate and proportional.
  - 2.3 Footway width along Forest Road is in the region of 1m. However, when combined with the fact that there high pedestrian footfall, a comparatively low level of car traffic and that in the peak hour much of the vehicle traffic is comings-and-goings from the train station (i.e. regular users of the road) and they expect high pedestrian footfall, and drive accordingly.
  - 2.4 The ability to improve the footway is significantly constrained by the fact that the majority of Forest Road, to the east of the site, on either one or both sides lies on an embankment; this severely limits the ability for footway widening.

- 2.5 What is being suggested is that the existing footway be reconstructed such that it is flush with the carriageway. The 'demarcated footway' could then be increased to some 1.8m wide and isolated or separated from the main carriageway through the use of , say, a 15mm kerb upstand, 'vibraline' or similar. The 'demarcated footway' surface could be finished in a contrasting colour, with pedestrian symbols. This arrangement would reduce carriageway width to a nominal 5m, which would be sufficient to allow a car and large vehicle to pass, with room to spare (based on figure 7.1 of manual for streets).
- 2.6 When two large vehicles need to pass one another, one vehicle would be able to momentarily move over onto the demarcated pedestrian area. This is expected to happen very infrequently.
- 2.7 The above principle is shown indicatively on drawing IMA-15-125-005.
- 2.8 To the east, over the Dyers Hill Bridge, a 1-way shuttle working operation could be implemented, allowing a widened footway to be provided, and introducing an element of traffic calming.
- 2.9 Drawing IMA-15-125-005 is intended to be a starting point for discussion, with a view to the applicant making a contribution towards such a scheme. The views of the local authority are sought.
- 2.10 With regards the general location of the site to facilities and amenities, a residential planning application to the east (15/00567/FUL Erection of 22 dwellings on land north of Little Lees), to which OCC have raised no objection sets out that a walking distance of up to 2Km and a cycling distance of up to 5Km are acceptable distances to facilities/amenities. The submitted Transport Statement provides a walk table to facilities/amenities. The table is duplicated below, with distances to both the Little Lees and Rushy Bank Site given. The closest facilities/amenities are highlighted in green.

<b>Service/Facility</b>	<b>Distance from Little Lees site (m)</b>	<b>Distance from Rushy Bank Site (m)</b>
Bus Stop	231	795
Charlbury Medical Centre	880	1100
Charlbury Dental Practice	880	1100
Charlbury Primary School	570	1300
Post office	850	750
Charlbury Library	805	795
Londis	300	930
The Co-operative Supermarket	760	930
The Co-operative Pharmacy	895	700
Town centre	750	700
Pub	100	700
Five Ways Takeaway	305	700
Charlbury Railway Station	1600	350

Table 1.0 – Nearby Facilities/Amenities

- 2.11 Table 1. Shows that all of the nearby facilities/amenities are within the upper walk threshold limit of 2Km and that for roughly half of all the facilities/amenities sampled, the Rushy Bank site is closer to the facilities/amenities than the Little Lees site. This show that the site is close and gives access to a suitable range of facilities and amenities.
3. Access on Foot – Within the Site
- 3.1 Section 5 deals with this matter.

#### 4. Sightlines/Visibility

- 4.1 The highways comments suggest that sightlines at the access should be based on the national speed limit requirement of 60mph. This assertion is incorrect. The scheme is dependant upon the success of the TRO. If the TRO fails, the scheme would not proceed.
- 4.2 What is suggested is that a Grampian condition is applied, to the effect of “*Prior commencement of development, the TRO must be in place*”.
- 4.3 If the TRO consultation process fails, the development would not be able to proceed. If the TRO process is successful, the proposed sightlines would be suitable as the roadspeed is now 30mph.

#### 5. Internal Layout

- 5.1 Plan 6A (being an updated version of Plan 6 contained within the TA) shows an 11.5m long refuse vehicle traversing through the site and using the passing places as necessary.
- 5.2 The submitted site layout drawing I61-W101 was incorrect in respect of how it showed the footway at the site access. IMA Drawings Plan 4 and 5 (contained within the TA) were correct in this regard; the footway is wholly conventional in that pedestrians simply walk alongside the carriageway on an elevated surface, separated from the main road by a kerb.
- 5.3 The footway is continuous along the eastern side of the site (as indicated on drawing I61-W101) past the YDUK facility. The intention is at the far south of the site for the area to be a shared surface, serving 8 or so dwellings arranged in an informal ‘courtyard’.
- 5.4 Visitor parking has not been provided for the reason that there is no way of restricting its use to visitors of the site. Thus, there is a high probability that the spaces would be used by those actually visiting the adjoining train station, to avoid the daily parking charge of some £4 per day.
- 5.5 The applicant can provide visitor spaces if the local authority prefer, although there is a good chance they will be abused.

#### **Friends of Evenlode Valley additional comments**

- 6.1 This is a supplement to our Planning Assessment not a repetition or in substitution of it. We regret the need to submit it but we find the officer’s report (the OR) to be so seriously flawed – to a degree way beyond mere disagreement over the planning judgment - that we have no option.
- 6.2 As with our full Assessment, the detailed reasons follow our conclusions, which are that, overall, the OR:
- fails to address a number of important issues raised by consultees and objectors;
  - misrepresents and/or fails adequately to summarise some of those responses and objections;
  - fails properly to apply WODC’s own policy criteria or to assess the proposals in accordance with them;
  - fails properly to assess the sustainability of the scheme;
  - does not include a competent and objective assessment of the landscape impact and ignores previous WODC assessments of the area;
  - does not and cannot address the additional impact of any roadworks (and thus the collective impact of the scheme as a whole) because revised plans have yet to be submitted;

- places too great a weight on the social desirability of the YDUK element without a proper assessment of it in planning terms;
- fails to assess the need for such a high proportion of market housing (40%), contrary to WODC's own requirements;
- and misquotes and/or misapplies national policy, most tellingly in that it fails to recognise that even if this scheme represents 'sustainable development', the presumption in favour of such development does not apply in the AONB.

The reasoning process by which the report's conclusions are reached is thus fundamentally flawed. The potential consequences of a grant of permission based upon it we have little doubt will be obvious to the Committee.

### Detailed Response

- 6.3 Using the same headings and paragraph numbers as in the OR, other cross-references are to the emerging Local Plan (WOLP31), the Planning Policy Officer's comments of 14/04/15 (PPOC), our own assessment (FEV). The CCB and CCAC are also referred to.

### Consultations

- 6.4 The CCB's objection is not just maintained but reinforced by reference to an appeal decision. As a major consultee, it should be fully reported.
- 1.4 & 5.21 (FEV 7) The Highways objections have been significantly 'downplayed', as if of little importance. The HA do not consider the development sustainable. Discussions may be continuing (at the time of writing) but the works necessary to meet their requirements would be so extensive that no decision should be taken until the plans have been fully revised and further consultation has taken place.
- 1.6 (cf FEV 11) The ecologist response is heavily conditional.
- 1.8 We have been unable to find this response on the WODC website. As with the ecologist's, it is highly conditional.
- 1.10 The housing scheme is presented as intended for 'local' people. It is unclear whether there are sufficient 'local' households on the Council's waiting list who would qualify or whether this is a district-wide assessment.
- 1.11 See below at 5.21.
- 1.12 We can find no response from Natural England on the WODC website. It cannot therefore be assumed they have no objection. They sought a properly conducted Landscape Impact Assessment on the first application which has still not been carried out (FEV8).
- 1.14 We would urge the Committee to read the PPOC for themselves.

### Representations

- 2.1 We have no wish to play a numbers game – but a large proportion of the comments in support were on pre-printed postcards, some at least from people who appear

never to have seen the site. This decision must be taken on planning grounds, not out of sentiment for a 'worthy cause'.

- 2.4 Only the first comment is attributable to the CCB. It is a general statement where they have made a specific and weighty objection to these proposals.
- 2.13 (FEV Summary of Conclusions) Omitted from the OR is the important opening phrase "For the detailed reasons given in this Assessment:" So too is the emphasis we placed on the phrase "in this location" in the final sentence.

### Planning Assessment

- 5.4-5.7 *Principle.* (cf PPOC and FEV Sections 2-6). In practice, greater weight can now be attached to the WOLP31 criteria than to its predecessor's. The OR analysis fails properly to address the questions set out in the PPOC or to apply the criteria in WOLP31 OS2 and H2. It also shows little or no understanding of the historical or physical context. If you start with the questions, is this site "within or on the edge of the settlement?" (OS2) or, does it "adjoin the built up area" (H2(1)), there is only one answer – as per the PPOC response "the site does not adjoin the built up area of Charlbury".

Despite that statement, and though not explicit, the OR appears to assume that the scheme falls to be assessed against WOLP31 H2(1). The site is actually within the open countryside, so the proposals have to be assessed against H2(2) and (3). They do not meet any of the rural exception criteria, either locational or in the housing balance (FEV5). The final paragraph of WOLP31 H4 is directly relevant to the YDUK element (cf FEV6) and again is not met. The OR fails also to address the issue of sustainability in any real sense, relying superficially on the location near the station (cf FEV 6 & 7 in particular – but also the Highways objection).

Many factors influence the way in which settlements grow. There is no rule that they should do so in a circular fashion outwards from the centre. The fact that some fields well beyond the edge of the built up area may be closer to the centre than some parts of the town is not a reason to build on them. It is neither possible to say how the town might have expanded without the Evenlode floodplain on its western side nor is it a relevant consideration. Any development scheme has to be assessed in its actual physical context, not a hypothetical one.

Both the PPOC and our Assessment work through the policy issues. The former poses the questions, the latter gives our answers. This is not a matter of planning judgement, of weighing in the balance, but a question of whether the proposals meet WODC's own policy criteria. The OR fails adequately to address those criteria, despite the PPOC guidance. If they are not met, the question then becomes one of whether other considerations outweigh the 'in principle' objection.

- 5.8 -5.9 *Precedent.* (cf FEV 14). Rushy Bank has been specifically rejected as not even worthy for assessment under the SHLAA process, a point we cannot find mentioned in the OR. Whatever the specific considerations arising in this case, a housing estate is a housing estate. The point is that it would alter the character and appearance of the immediate area making it that much harder to control future development around it,

especially with major ‘improvements’ to the roads and footways serving it – and see below re the woodland.

- 5.10-5.12 *Siting.* As above, the relevant criteria are those under HP2(2) and (3), not HP2(1). There is little analysis of them in terms of the wider impact, merely an assertion of compliance. More specifically, the revised proposals would still leave a wide bellmouth junction and houses close to the main road either side of it, not to mention all the urbanising roadworks needed.
- 5.13–5.20 (cf PPOC, FEV Sections 2, 8 & 9, CCB & CCAC responses) *Conservation Area, Landscape Impact & AONB.*

We agree these are key issues.

- The obligation in AONBs is inaccurately quoted. As the government continues to remind us, AONBs “have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.”
- Cf OR 1.11 and FEV 2 & 8.5. The OR makes no reference to the West Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment nor to any of the other WODC assessments we have cited. That is a serious omission. There are also serious reservations over the objectivity and conclusions of the Applicants’ Landscape Impact Assessment. On such an important issue, the Council should not contemplate granting permission without at least an evaluation of that assessment from a suitably qualified officer or independent consultant.
- A reduction in visual impact compared to the previous scheme does not mean this one is acceptable.
- The OR gives no consideration to the location within the Wychwood Project Area (cf WOLP31 EHI and para 8.11)
- 5.16 “Such applications” in NPPF para 116 is a reference to “major developments” in the AONB (cf also WOLP31 para 8.4). So the writer of the OR must be assumed to consider this a “major development”. He or she has forgotten to mention that such developments “should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest”. The OR contains no analysis of what might constitute “exceptional circumstances” for this purpose.
- 5.18 The final sentence does not make sense. The YDUK element does not need to be in the AONB at all. Housing does for people with genuine local connections because the AONB ‘washes over’ the town and beyond. That does not make this site suitable for it – and other sites continue to come forward.
- 5.19 The footpath network would only need to be enhanced in order to serve this development! Neither the OR writer nor the Applicants’ consultants have considered the effect of building a row of houses close to, below and on the eastern side of a belt of 25m high trees (cf FEV 8.7-8.8 & photos). How long would it be before some of them have to be felled for safety and other reasons? What effect would that have on the landscape?
- 5.20 The issue is not the visibility of the site from the CA but the impact the development would have on its setting – see CCAC response and FEV 9.



## Planning Benefits

- 5.24 (cf FEV 5). The WOLP31 sets out requirements in relation to affordable housing, viability and the need to show why market housing is needed to subsidise a scheme such as this. The OR contains no analysis of the mix of housing proposed (as against policy requirements) nor why 40% of the dwellings would need to be at full market value. So far as we are aware, the relevant information to enable that assessment to be carried out has not been supplied – if this is genuinely a “community led” proposal, why the secrecy? To give permission without a full viability assessment would be a serious procedural and policy omission.

## Conclusions

- 5.30-5.32 Specific points are addressed above or in our main Assessment. The most glaring and substantial error however is that even if the scheme amounts to ‘sustainable development’ (it doesn’t), paragraph 14 of the NPPF disapplies any presumption in favour of it in the AONB. Having set that out in our Assessment – and even in the summary that has been ‘cut and pasted’ into the OR - the implications are obvious. Most importantly, and together with the other points made above, it means the reasoning process by which the OR’s conclusions have been reached is fundamentally flawed.

## Report of Additional Representations

<b>15/03128/OUT</b>	<b>Land south of High Street, Milton Under Wychwood</b>
Date	29.10.15
Officer	Abby Fettes
Recommendation	<b>Approve subject to S106</b>
Parish	Milton Under Wychwood
Grid Ref:	438228 213001

### Application details

Erection of up to 62 Dwellings, landscaping including change of use, formation of footpath and creation of ecological enhancements, and ancillary infrastructure and enabling works.

### Applicant

Sharba Homes

### I Additional Representations

#### I.1 Shipton Parish Council – further comments

My Parish Council wishes to claim funding for a Pedestrian Crossing of appropriate specifications opposite the Wychwood School in view of the greatly increased traffic movements arising from this development. They also wish to claim support for a local bus service to serve Witney and Chipping Norton as well as Kingham and Charlbury station with a modest timetable tailored to local needs. The evidence before the Committee is clear on the inadequacy of local transport provision. A more detailed set of costings can be prepared but a precautionary estimate for a crossing with five years transport subsidy would be around £125,000.

#### I.2 Sharba Homes

### Background

To set the context for this application, it is necessary to consider the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme. There were two reasons for refusal, which can be summarised as follows:

- (i) Impact of the proposed site access on the residential amenity of the occupiers of The Cottage.
- (ii) Localised landscape impact

Importantly no harm was identified to the wider AONB; the ability of Milton under Wychwood to accommodate the development was not questioned; and the sustainability credentials of the site and the settlement were not questioned. Overall, therefore the principle of development on this site was not brought into question – instead the refusal focused around two very site specific items.

Both these items have now been addressed:

- (i) The Site access has been moved further west such that it will no longer face directly onto any existing residents.
- (ii) Following discussions with Council Officers and the Councils appointed external landscape consultant (specifically employed to review the landscape matters relating to this application), additional landscaping has been provided in full accordance with that which was requested. Your

Officers and your landscape consultant are now happy that this additional planting addresses the previous landscape reason for refusal in full.

As confirmed in your Officers report, nothing has changed significantly in planning policy terms which would now warrant consideration of anything additional which would otherwise affect the recommendation of your Officers. We are aware of course that there is local objection to the scheme however you have seen in the report that some villagers consider that residents are wary of supporting the scheme due to the vociferous nature of the objectors. Indeed, it is our understanding that in reaching the decision not to object, the Parish Council actively consulted residents other than the objectors, to ascertain the views of the 'silent majority' and the feedback from this led to the decision by the Parish Council to support the development.

### **Site Suitability**

Turning to the need for the development in this location, the Council's emerging Local Plan proposes the development of 800 dwellings within the Burford-Charlbury sub-area. This will be delivered through a combination of completions; commitments (sites which have been granted planning permission); SHLAA sites and windfalls. As it currently stands, you are proposing the delivery of 400 dwellings (50% of the overall sub-area housing target) through windfall developments. This is a significant percentage

This sub area contains five only settlements which are regarded by the Council as sustainable enough to accommodate more than just local housing need, there are very limited opportunities for logical extensions to these settlements which would not lead to significant landscape, heritage, ecological or highways harm.

A review of these settlements (all of which lie within the AONB) has been undertaken, the result of which underlines the fact that Milton-under-Wychwood is the most sustainable location for development which has the greatest capacity for change. For example, it is the only large settlement within the Burford – Charlbury sub-area which does not also contain a Conservation Area.

Furthermore, when the close neighbouring settlement of Shipton-under-Wychwood, with which it is closely associated and shares services, is taken into consideration, Milton-under-Wychwood is considered within the Council's emerging Local Plan's evidence base to be as sustainable as some Service Centres (regarded by the adopted Local Plan as the most sustainable location for development outside Witney, Carterton and Chipping Norton). Even considered alone, Milton is the second largest settlement, with the second highest sustainability ranking in terms of services and facilities in the village, and has relatively the lowest sensitivity of the five in terms of other constraints such as Conservation Areas.

It also has a rail-bus service, and is the only settlement that has a school bus service to Burford School. Finally, for a village, there are a number of unusual additional facilities including vets, osteopaths, and a library and an unusually extensive variety of employment opportunities. There is no doubt that this village is a highly sustainable location.

The village and the adjoining villages offer an extraordinarily high level of local employment provision. This means that the level of local employment opportunities are extremely high and as such, there are employment opportunities within walking distance of the site thus reducing travel to work and increasing sustainability.

As confirmed in your Officers report, a development of 62 dwellings in a settlement of 777 dwellings represents only an 8% increase in the number of dwellings. The statutory consultees have all responded on the application and it is confirmed that subject to the appropriate S106 payments, the development will not have any adverse impact on existing infrastructure.

## **Housing Delivery**

Elsewhere on the agenda this afternoon, you are being given a 6 monthly update on progress on housing approvals. The emphasis behind this report is, in my opinion, very clear – as a Council you need to be increasing the number of consents on suitable sites.

As confirmed in that report, the five year housing land supply requirement is a rolling annual target. With the removal of two sites which your Officers have identified as ‘exceptionals’ only 91 dwellings were consent in the ‘Uplands Area’. This will not be sufficient to maintain a five year supply of housing land. The importance of continuing to maintain this supply, and thus maintain control of future growth, is set out in paragraph 5.5 of the Officers report for this application.

## **Summary**

The scheme is considered to represent a sustainable form of development which complies with the ‘economic’, ‘social’ and ‘environmental’ threads set out in paragraph 7 of the Framework. This includes, amongst other things, the following key benefits:

### **Economic Benefits**

- The construction of the Proposed Development will support construction jobs directly and indirectly related to the development.
- The provision of 70 new dwellings will generate additional convenience, comparison and leisure services expenditure in the local area which will assist in supporting local facilities.
- The Council will gain a direct contribution through the New Homes Bonus, provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government.
- West Oxfordshire District Council will gain additional income from the proposed development through additional Council Tax payments.

### **Social Benefits**

- The provision of 70 new homes will support the enhancement of strong, vibrant and healthy communities.
- Additional customers for shops and facilities to ensure greater ongoing viability.
- The provision of 50% affordable housing will increase the District’s supply of affordable housing and help to reduce inequalities. The development will provide a mixture of affordable units and are to be provided on-site.
- The development of the Site would contribute towards ensuring the Council’s continuous five year housing land supply within a sustainable location.
- The proposed development incorporates formal and informal open spaces which are within easy walking distances of the new homes and will encourage the development of healthy communities as well as ensuring positive linkages with the existing community.
- The Site is in an accessible location with connections to pedestrian routes, which link to key services and facilities located within Milton-under-Wychwood and Shipton-under-Wychwood.
- The new circular footpath link to the existing network will create a public facility for the entire village through enhancing public leisure benefits as a whole for new and incoming residents.
- Access to the newly created ecological enhancement area will enhance the ecological experience for both existing and new coming residents and promote greater understanding and appreciation of the natural environment and AONB.

## Environmental Benefits

- The proposed development includes retention of existing ecological assets and the enhancement of biodiversity including the areas of planting and trees across the Application Site and the provision of a dedicated ecological enhancement area that will generate a net gain in biodiversity across the proposals.
- The development proposals will provide public open space which not only provides a buffer to existing residential dwellings, it will also soften the transition between the site and the wider countryside setting.
- The scheme will provide the opportunity to enhance/restore the Cotswold stone walling along the north-east boundary adjacent to the High Street.
- Ability to create additional recreational footpaths with the possibility of linking to the existing footpath network to the south and south east within an enhanced green corridor.
- The Site is contained by existing built-form along two boundaries ensuring that the impact on the surrounding landscape is minimised.

It is clear that the previous reasons for refusal have been addressed in full as confirmed by your Officers and your appointed external landscape consultant; there is a continued need to deliver housing in the District; Milton under Wychwood is a village which is capable of accommodating development; and this site is suitable for development. Overall, the proposal represents a sustainable form of development in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.

## Report of Additional Representations

Application Number	15/03303/FUL Sunnyside, Ditchley Road, Charlbury
Date	29th October 2015
Officer	Joanna Lishman
Officer Recommendations	Approve
Parish	Charlbury
Grid Reference	436389 E 219983 N

### Application details

Erection of four dwellings with associated landscaping and hard surfacing.

### Applicant

Mrs Enid Hill  
C/O Savills

## I Additional Representations

I.1 Two further objections received summarised as follows:

- Highway safety implications
- No mix of housing types
- Precedent – possible development on the quarry land opposite.
- There must be community compensation for no low cost housing.
- Protection of species and habitats.

I.2 Ecology Consultation Response

Ideally the mitigation habitat bat tiles and habitat bat boxes should be shown on the drawings for the new dwellings as well as some native hedge & tree planting.

If all the recommendations are implemented, the development will not cause any harm to reptiles, bats or birds, and therefore the policy and guidance requirements of Policies in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan, the NPPF (including section 11) and the NPPG and three habitat regulation tests are all met.

Officers recommend a condition similar to that applied to the approval at the adjacent site:

*The development shall be carried out in accordance with the ecological recommendations contained in Section 5 of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Protected Species Report V3 dated August 2015 by Lockhart Garratt. Details for the provision of bat and bird boxes within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. Planting of native species-rich hedgerow or equivalent scrub and tree planting along boundaries and within the developed area shall be provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All details so approved shall have been implemented in full by the end of the planting season immediately following completion of the development or the dwellings being occupied whichever is the sooner. All mitigation and enhancement works must be completed before all of the four new dwellings are first brought into use and all mitigation must be permanently maintained thereafter.*

*In order to discharge this condition the results of the monitoring must be submitted to the LPA.*

**REASON:** *To ensure that bats and their roosts are protected in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular section 11), West Oxfordshire District Local Plan Policies including EH2 and saved policy NE13 and In order for the Council to comply with Part 3 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.*