

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
UPLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2.00pm on Monday, 30 April 2018

PRESENT

Councillors: J Haine (Chairman), D A Cotterill (Vice-Chairman) R J M Bishop, N G Colston
C Cottrell-Dormer, Dr E M E Poskitt, A H K Postan, G Saul and T B Simcox

Officers in attendance: Catherine Tetlow, Sarah de la Coze, Phil Shaw and Paul Cracknell

94 MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 3 April, 2018, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

95 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from A C Beaney, Mrs M J Crossland and C J A Virgin.

96 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Whilst not a disclosable interest, Mr Cotterill advised that the applicant in respect of application No. 18/00272/FUL (Fourwinds, Burford Road, Shipton-under-Wychwood) was a former Chairman of the West Oxfordshire Conservative Association and would be known to some Members in that capacity.

There were no other declarations of interest from Members or Officers relating to matters to be considered at the meeting at this juncture. Subsequently, whilst not a disclosable interest, Mr Colston and Mr Cottrell-Dormer advised that they had purchased seed from Honeydale Farm.

97 APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated.

(In order to assist members of the public, the Sub-Committee considered the applications in which those present had indicated a particular interest in the following order:-

17/01082/OUT, 17/01670/FUL, 17/04060/FUL, 18/00272/FUL, 17/02814/FUL and 18/00605/FUL

The results of the Sub-Committee's deliberations follow in the order in which they appeared on the printed agenda).

RESOLVED: that the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, subject to any amendments as detailed below:

3 17/01670/FUL Land East Of Stonesfield, Woodstock Road, Stonesfield

The Principal Planner introduced the application.

Mr David Lines addressed the Meeting in opposition of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

Mrs Wendy Gould then addressed the Meeting on behalf of the Stonesfield Parish Council. A summary of her submission is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Huw Mellor, the applicant's agent, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

The Principal Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal. In response to comments made by Mr Mellor in his presentation she advised that Natural England had indicated that they had no objection to the development subject to the provision of a suitable landscape buffer and a sensitive lighting scheme. Whilst there were no objections from technical consultees, there had been a significant volume of objection from local residents.

The Principal Planner advised Members that the emerging Local Plan enabled the Council to operate a policy of restraint in relation to development within the AONB through paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF. The proposal was unacceptable on this basis without reference to the tilted balance.

Mr Bishop indicated that the application had generated a significant level of local opposition. The Local Plan Inspector had concluded that sites within the AONB should be removed from the Plan and such allocations had now been deleted.

Mr Bishop made reference to the Officer's report which stated that it was considered that there was no need for the 68 units proposed and no acceptability in principle for this scale of development in this location under the terms of the revised Plan. Further, it was considered that there would be an unacceptable effect on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB arising from this particular proposal. Officers were of the view that housing needs could be met outside the designated area and this development was not necessary. Finally, the report concluded that the harm arising from the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits and, for the reasons set out in the report, Mr Bishop proposed the recommendation of refusal.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Cottrell-Dormer.

In response to a question from Dr Poskitt it was confirmed that the County Council's earlier concerns regarding parking arrangements and access for refuse collection vehicles had been addressed in the current scheme.

Mr Bishop noted that the proposed development was isolated and in an exposed position with no connection to the village. Mr Postan agreed that the scheme had no relationship with the existing settlement and the need to rely upon use of a vehicle rendered it unsustainable.

The recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was carried.

Refused

21 17/02814/FUL Chipping Norton War Memorial Hospital, Horsefair, Chipping Norton

The Senior Planner presented her report and advised Members that the Highway Authority had withdrawn two of the three objections set out at paragraph 5.13 of the report.

As the only remaining objection related to the absence of a full surface water strategy, the Planning Officer made a revised recommendation that the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to the submission of a full surface water drainage strategy which complies with paragraphs 103 and 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to such conditions as are considered appropriate.

Mr Saul was pleased to hear that the outstanding issues had been resolved and that the application was now considered to be acceptable. This derelict site was a blot on the landscape and the scheme needed to be built out as soon as possible. Mr Saul considered the proposals to be an attractive and appropriate form of development and, whilst it was regrettable that no provision had been made for affordable housing, he acknowledged that no provision had been required in the original application. He noted that the site had been marketed unsuccessfully over the last five years and recognised that this tended to suggest that financial margins were tight.

The revised Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Saul and seconded by Mr Colston who agreed that the site was in need of redevelopment. Mr Colston welcomed the revised arrangements for bin storage and expressed the hope that the project would now move forward.

Mr Cottrell-Dormer also expressed his support for the application.

In response to a question from Mr Cotterill it was confirmed that refuse collection vehicles would not enter the site but collect directly from the bin store on the frontage to Spring Street. Dr Poskitt questioned whether these arrangements were satisfactory.

Mr Haine questioned the distance between the proposed unit 14 and existing properties and the Development Manager advised that, whilst the separation distance was limited, it would be greater than that which existed between the properties and the former hospital building.

Mr Haine questioned whether this gave rise to concern with regard to overlooking and the Development Manager advised that, whilst the relationship was tighter than would be expected, it had been considered acceptable in the previous application and had to be assessed having regard to the existing construction on the site. Mr Simcox noted that such limited separation distances were common in town centre locations.

Mr Postan questioned whether provision for affordable housing could be made by way of shared ownership, whether an independent assessment of the drainage scheme was required and whether alternative parking arrangements could be devised. In response, the Development Manager advised that, when the site had been purchased, the Council's Planning Policies did not require the provision of affordable housing. Having considered the financial information provided, Officers were satisfied that the provision of affordable housing would prejudice the viability of the scheme.

Whilst he acknowledged the concerns expressed over drainage the Development Manager advised that the Council was reliant upon the advice of its technical consultees. However, this issue would come under greater scrutiny as the County Council, as Flood Authority, had required details of arrangements for surface water drainage.

The Development Manager acknowledged the concerns expressed over tandem parking and advised that, whilst the Council could not require an amendment without the support of the Highway Authority, Officers could seek to negotiate a revised car parking layout. Mr Saul and Mr Colston agreed that Officers should be requested to do so and amended their proposition accordingly.

The revised recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Resolved:

- (a) That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to approve the application subject to the submission of a full surface water drainage strategy which complies with paragraphs 103 and 104 of the National Planning Policy Framework and to such conditions as are considered appropriate.
- (b) That Officers be requested to seek to negotiate a revised car parking layout.

The Senior Planner introduced the application.

The applicant, Mr Ian Wilkinson, addressed the Meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Senior Planner then presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval and recommended the inclusion of an additional condition regarding investigation of potential contamination on the site.

In proposing the revised recommendation, Mr Simcox expressed his support for the application and the work carried out at Honeydale Farm. The proposition was seconded by Mr Cotterill who also complimented the applicant on his efforts.

Mr Postan enquired whether the existing dwellings on the site were to be demolished and it was confirmed that this was the intention. The Development Manager suggested that an additional condition should be applied to this effect and Mr Simcox and Mr Cotterill agreed to revise their proposition accordingly.

The revised recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the following additional conditions:-

13. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11, and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be prepared to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property, and which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the environment in the interests of the amenity. Relevant Policies: West Oxfordshire Local Planning Policy BE18 and Section 11 of the NPPF.

14. Prior to the first occupation of the replacement dwellings, the existing dwellings on the site shall be demolished and all debris shall

be removed from the site.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the area

40 18/00272/FUL Fourwinds, Burford Road, Shipton-Under-Wychwood

The Development Manager introduced the application.

The applicant, Mr Kevin Rillie, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager presented the report and advised Members that it was their role to determine the application on its planning merits.

In response to comments made by the applicant, the Development Manager noted that, whilst not objecting to the development, the Parish Council had acknowledged that it was an isolated site.

He drew attention to paragraph 5.7 of the report and advised that, whilst the Council was satisfied that it had a five year housing land supply, it could **not** demonstrate that as a matter of fact until such time as the Local Plan Inspector's Final Report had been received and the draft Local Plan 2031 adopted. In consequence, the 'tilted balance' set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF continued to apply.

The Development Manager indicated that whilst paragraph 55 of the NPPF did allow for residential development which would reuse redundant and disused buildings and would subsequently lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting. The key question was whether or not the buildings in question were appropriate for conversion to residential use.

Given the extent of the works proposed, Officers considered that the buildings were unsuitable for conversion and the development would be tantamount to the siting of a new build dwelling in an unsustainable location.

Accordingly, the Development Manager recommended that the application be refused on the basis set out in the report but that the proposed reason for refusal be revised to ensure clarity.

Mr Simcox indicated that he considered the existing buildings to have some architectural interest and, whilst this was an isolated location, there were other buildings in the immediate vicinity. Mr Simcox suggested that the site was not within open countryside and enquired whether it would be considered as 'brown field' land in terms of the NPPF. In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst the site had clearly been built on, the NPPF excluded agricultural and forestry buildings from the definition of previously developed land.

Mr Colston indicated that approval of this application would set an adverse precedent as there were hundreds of similar redundant agricultural buildings

throughout the Cotswolds. Whilst they had no further agricultural value they were of no architectural merit and Mr Colston proposed that the application be refused.

In seconding the proposition, Mr Cotterill indicated that the buildings were not worthy of retention and suggested that it would be preferable if the site was cleared and an application brought forward for new development of an appropriate nature such as holiday lets.

Mr Postan suggested that the site was not as isolated as it first appeared as there were some neighbouring properties.

Dr Poskitt suggested that these were not the sort of buildings that the Council's policy on barn conversions had in mind. Mr Cottrell-Dormer indicated that the site was totally isolated and the buildings not worthy of retention. The proposed 'conversion' was effectively a new build. Mr Saul concurred.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was carried.

Refused for the following revised reasons:-

1. By reason of the remote countryside location, the development as proposed would fail to represent sustainable development as it would result in new homes in an open countryside location which is remote in relation to neighbouring settlements, services and facilities and public transport links where no special circumstances have been demonstrated to apply in favour of the development. The proposal therefore represents an unsustainable location for residential development contrary to the provisions of West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies H4, H10 and BE3, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies OS2, H2, T1 and T3, and the relevant provisions of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 17, 32 and 34.
2. The proposal represents extensive remodelling and modifications to the external elevations and roofs of the existing modern farm buildings on the land, which is tantamount to new build, together with the proposed new build and creation of residential curtilages. The site is located in an open countryside location adjacent to the A361. By reason of the design, which does not reflect the existing built form on the site or local precedents, the development will appear highly incongruous and out of character within the rural landscape, failing to enhance the immediate setting of the site and adversely affecting the immediate landscape and countryside of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty within which the site is located. By reason of the scale, form and layout of the proposed development, together with the associated curtilages to provide gardens and off street parking and turning areas, the proposal will result in an unacceptable urbanising impact on the rural character and appearance of the area.

As such the proposal is considered contrary to West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies BE2, H2, H10, NE1, NE3 and NE4, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies OS2, OS4, EH1 and EH1a, and the relevant provisions of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 17, 55, 58, 64, 109 and 115.

48 18/00605/FUL Wiggalls Corner, The Green, Kingham

The Senior Planner presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Colston indicated that, whilst the design was not to his taste, he could see no reason to refuse consent and proposed the Officer's recommendation. In doing so, he made reference to the Parish Council's request that the stone of the new building visible from the road should be carefully matched with the existing stone. The Senior Planner advised that this could be addressed through the proposed boundary treatment condition.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Simcox.

Dr Poskitt questioned whether the points raised by the neighbour over the height of the boundary wall could be accommodated and it was confirmed that these could be addressed by the same route. In response to a further question from Dr Poskitt it was confirmed that the roofing material was to be zinc sheeting.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted

98 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined under delegated powers together with an appeal decision was received and noted.

99 UPDATE AS TO PROGRESS AND REASSESSMENT OF PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 17/01082 LONG HANBOROUGH NORTH OF A4095 UP TO 170 DWELLINGS WHICH IS SUBJECT TO A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE BUT WHERE A DECISION HAS NOT AS YET BEEN ISSUED

The report of the Head of Planning updating Members with regard to progress and the planning merits of the above application was received and considered. The report invited Members to reconsider the planning balance in light of the new prevailing circumstances and following receipt of the Local Plan Inspector's recent letter and archaeological dig.

The Development Manager summarised the points raised in opposition to the development in the 37 further representations received since publication of the report and reported

receipt of the further observations submitted by the applicant's agent. He reminded Members that the application was in outline and related to the means of access only. All other plans and drawings submitted were for illustrative purposes only.

Mr Philip Reese, accompanied by Dr Stuart Brooks, addressed the Meeting in opposition of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

Mrs Neils Chapman then addressed the Meeting on behalf of the Freeland and Hanborough Parish Council. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix G to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Roger File, Chief Operating Officer and Property Director of the Blenheim Estate, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix H to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented the report and advised that a thorough archaeological investigation had already been undertaken and the County Archaeologist had no objection to the proposed development subject to some further investigative work.

He advised that, as the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply, the 'tilted balance' continued to apply and emphasised that the density of the development was not an issue for consideration at outline stage but a question to be addressed during the determination of a reserved matters application.

Many of the objections received had been raised previously and none had been thought sufficient to warrant refusal. The bar to overturn the previous decision to approve the application had to be set high. Whilst Members could not disregard the further objections received, many of these had been addressed previously and the Sub-Committee had to concentrate on any new matters and consider if these gave greater weight to the harms occasioned by the scheme.

The Development Manager highlighted three key issues; the recent archaeological evidence; the probable existence of a five year housing land supply and the current status of the emerging Local Plan. He stressed that, whilst the Council was content that it had a five year housing land supply, it could not demonstrate this as fact.

Given the new material considerations and, in particular, the housing land supply and emerging policy issues set out in the report, the decision was now more finely balanced. However, on balance, and mindful in particular of the need to demonstrate a five year housing land supply rather than merely infer one, Officers considered that the benefits of the development continued to outweigh the harm. Accordingly, the merits still lay with a recommendation for approval subject to the additional conditions requested by the County Archaeologist.

The Chairman made reference to letters sent to Members by Karen Gosford, Kenneth Field, Penelope Marcus (on behalf of the Hanborough Action Group) and Roger File.

He indicated that, when the Sub-Committee had previously considered the application in December, Members had been under far greater pressure to grant consent. The Council

did not have a five year housing land supply and it had not received confirmation that its emerging Local Plan was capable of being found to be sound. A number of significant appeals had been allowed and there was a danger that the Government could withdraw the power to determine such large scale applications.

The position was now very different in that the Inspector had confirmed that emerging Local Plan was capable of being found to be sound and the Plan itself was now closer to adoption. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF enabled greater weight to be given to an emerging local plan the closer it came to adoption.

With regard to the housing land supply, whilst the Council could not demonstrate a five year supply, a recent appeal decision accepted that there was, as worst, a 4.9 year supply. The emerging Local Plan, which had been endorsed by the Inspector, included a 5.9 to 6 year supply and Mr Haine indicated that he was personally confident of the Council's position. Mr Haine also made reference to the results of the archaeological survey.

Mr Cotterill enquired whether there was any indication of the presence of a Roman grave site or villa mentioned by the objectors. In response, the Development Manager advised that there was no confirmation of these or any other scheduled remains. The County Archaeologist was content for the development to proceed subject to further investigative work. Mr Cotterill asked if the number of new properties to be built in Long Hanborough had changed since the application was considered in December and the Development Manager confirmed that these were approximately the same.

Mr Postan made reference to a recent appeal in relation to land in Shilton and Brize Norton in which the Planning Inspector had placed great significance on avoiding coalescence of settlements and the impact of light pollution. He also noted that, as the Local Plan process was coming to a conclusion, the Council was not under such pressure as it had been in December.

Mr Postan proposed that the application be refused. In seconding the proposition, Mr Cottrell-Dormer indicated that he would prefer to see consideration of development in this location deferred pending the outcome of the Local Plan examination.

Mr Haine advised that deferral would be inappropriate without sound planning reasons. He reminded Members that this development did not contribute to the housing numbers put forward in the Local Plan.

Mr Bishop indicated that he had struggled with this application in December and considered that, as the pressure upon the Council to approve the application had been lessened by the progress of the Local Plan, he was now inclined to reach a different conclusion and refuse the application.

In response to a question from Mr Simcox, the Development Manager confirmed that the site was not included in calculating the Plan's housing numbers as no sites approved after April 2017 had been factored into the figures. However, there was an implicit need for additional development as the housing target was also reliant on development on windfall sites. Whilst grateful for the confidence in the Local Plan expressed by the Sub-Committee, the Development Manager reminded Members that previous plans had been subject to

legal challenge prior to their final adoption. Whilst he believed that the plan was sound, there was no guarantee that its adoption was imminent.

Mr Saul indicated that the application had been approved on the basis of the tilted balance as the harm it occasioned was not thought to outweigh the benefits. The provision of 50% affordable housing, and the manner in which it was to be delivered, were undoubted benefits. However, if the Council was able to rely upon having a five year housing land supply, it could rely on the emerging Local Plan and Policy H2 making it difficult to approve the application in the absence of an identified housing need.

The Development Manager acknowledged that, if the Council could demonstrate a five year housing land supply, policy H2 would be applicable. However, the Plan was yet to be adopted and the recent appeal decision only accepted a 4.9 year supply. He advised that the application could not be reasonably refused unless significant and demonstrable harms were identified.

Mr Postan suggested that the issues of coalescence, light pollution and the impact upon the archaeology of the site represented such harms but the Development Manager advised that the position in relation to these matters remained unchanged from the time the application was first considered. The Development Manager also reminded Members that there was no technical objection from the County Archaeologist.

Mr Haine suggested that, given that progress towards the adoption of the Local Plan lessened the pressure for development, the impact of the application on the character and landscape of the area rendered it contrary to policies EH1, EH7, EW2 and OS2 of the emerging Local Plan.

Dr Poskitt questioned the impact upon the archaeology of the site and Mr Haine advised that further investigation would be required to assess this. The Development Manager advised that the County Archaeologist had sought further investigation in order to assess and identify what had been found. Dr Poskitt suggested that if this feature was part of Grim's Ditch, it may have enclosed the settlement. The Development Manager advised that the County Archaeologist believed it to be a mediaeval enclosure and was seeking further dating evidence in an attempt to confirm this theory.

In response to a question from Mr Postan, the Development Manager advised that the applicants would have a period of six months within which to submit an appeal against refusal. Whilst he anticipated that the Local Plan would be adopted by June of this year, there was every likelihood that it would be subject to legal challenge.

Mr Colston indicated that he could not support the application.

The recommendation of refusal was then put to the vote and was carried.

Refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed site is located in the countryside beyond the existing settlement edge of Long Hanborough and lies adjacent to the Millwood End Conservation Area. It would represent an unacceptable incursion into the countryside that provides a rural setting for the village and Conservation Area and would not represent an appropriate addition to the settlement. It would be highly prominent and visible in public views from Witney Road and public rights of way. There would be a substantial impact on the character and appearance of this location, and the countryside would be urbanised and its tranquility disturbed to a harmful degree. There would be less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area's setting and significance. The effect on buried archaeology is not yet fully understood and the proposal could be harmful to undesignated heritage assets. The proposal is therefore contrary to West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies BE2, BE4, BE5, BE12, NE1, NE3, and H2 (emerging), West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 policies OS2, H2, EH1, EH7, EH8, EH14, and EW2, and the relevant policies of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 17, 58, 132, 134 and 135.
2. The applicant has not entered into legal agreements to ensure that the development adequately mitigates its impact on community infrastructure, secures the provision of affordable housing, secures the provision and appropriate management of landscaping and open space, makes an appropriate contribution to public transport services and infrastructure, and public art. The local planning authority cannot therefore be satisfied that the impacts of the development can be made acceptable. Consequently the proposal conflicts with West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 Policies BE1, TLC7 and H11, emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 Policies OS2, OS5, and H3, and paragraphs 17, 50, 69, 70, 72 and 203 of the NPPF.

100 APPLICATION NUMBER 18/00325/POROW – PROPOSED DIVERSION OF PART OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY 156/6 AT THE SPORTS PAVILION, CHARLBURY

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing which sought authority for Officers to make a Public Path Diversion Order under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and carry out the required statutory consultation upon it.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to make the Order and carry out public consultation, consistent with the drafted Order attached to the report.

101 PLANNING APPLICATION 17/03745/OUT – THE DRIVING CENTRE, ENSTONE AIRFIELD, ENSTONE – CONSTRUCTION OF MUSEUM BUILDING, SHOW LANE BUILDING, CORPORATE HOSPITALITY BUILDING, ENERGY CENTRE/STORE BUILDING, WORKSHOP BUILDING. FORMATION OF CAR EXERCISE ROAD, CONSTRUCTION OF 28 HOLIDAY LODGES, FORMATION OF LANDSCAPED GROUNDS, ASSOCIATED SITE SERVICES AND EXTERNAL WORKS. DIVERSION OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing seeking consideration as to whether it would be expedient to undertake a formal site visit prior to the likely consideration of an 'issues' report at the meeting on 4 June.

RESOLVED: That a site visit be held at 9:15 on Thursday 31 May 2018.

The meeting closed at 5:00pm.

CHAIRMAN