



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/W/22/3297610

Land to the east of Northford, Shrivenham SN6 8BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Albright Dene Ltd against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P21/V0503/O, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is outline application for the provision of 5no. Self Build and/or Custom Housebuilding plots, with all matters reserved except access from Faringdon Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the provision of 5no. Self Build and/or Custom Housebuilding plots, with all matters reserved except access from Faringdon Road, at land to the east of Northford, Shrivenham, SN6 8BX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P21/V0503/O, dated 16 February 2021, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the application form includes the words "Outline application for", but I have omitted these as they are not an act of development. Furthermore, the application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved, except for access. I have had regard to the layout plan (Drawing Ref A-02-100), but have treated each element of it as indicative, apart from the point of access to the site and circulation routes shown.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be suitably located, with regard to development plan policies, including its effect on the physical and visual separation between Shrivenham and Watchfield; and
 - the benefits of the proposed development.

Reasons

Location

4. The appeal site lies between Shrivenham and Watchfield, which are both designated in the Council's Settlement Hierarchy as Larger Villages. It concerns

- a rectangular parcel of land adjoining Faringdon Road to its south and a group of residential and commercial buildings in Northford Close, to its west.
5. As shown in the visuals contained in the appellants' *Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment*, development in Shrivenham generally consists of densely arranged buildings, which become more loosely spaced towards its eastern side. In particular, houses north of High Street and east of Faringdon Road are set within mature landscaped grounds, against the backdrop of woodland. There is a small cluster of housing to the northeast, just south of Northford Close, which continues the looser grouping of properties and bleeds into the adjacent countryside.
 6. Northford Close is separated from the southwest of Watchfield by Shrivenham Park Golf Club, land within the site and to either side of access to the water treatment works. The buildings therein are arranged in a dense grouping resembling the predominant pattern of development in Shrivenham. Like my colleague for the appeal at the Old Surgery¹, a short distance west of the site, I therefore consider Northford Close to be within the existing built-up area of the village, so it could not be considered to be within open countryside.
 7. Given the presence of mature planting, including trees, at the boundaries of the site and its undeveloped form, it shares more characteristics associated with the open countryside between the villages. However, unlike the site at the Old Surgery, it shows no signs of having been previously developed, as the remains of any permanent structure that may have been present during the 1930s and 1940s has blended into the landscape. The appeal at Steventon² concerned land enclosed on three sides by built form, whereas the appeal site shares a boundary with Northford Close, so they are not comparable.
 8. Accordingly, the site is not within an existing built-up area and is not allocated for development in the development plan or the Shrivenham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2031 (SNDP). The proposed development is also not specifically supported by other development plan policies or national policy relating to the countryside. Moreover, Development Policy 1 (DP1) of the Local Plan 2031: Part 2 – Detailed Policies and Additional Sites³ (LP2) supports the provision of plots for sale to self and custom builders. However, its supporting text outlines that this should be in compliance with the Council's settlement hierarchy and the strategy for housing delivery, a point acknowledged by the Inspector for Steventon appeal.
 9. The Decision Notice refers to SNDP Policy DS1, Figure 4.1 of which identifies a settlement gap between Shrivenham and Watchfield. The site is shown to be outside the notation on the map so I have not found in relation to this policy. Similarly, there is no substantive evidence before me that LP2 Development Policy 29 (DP29) specifically defines gaps between settlements and its supporting text seeks to protect further against the loss of physical or visual separation between settlements.
 10. Turning to this matter, the site forms part of the open and undeveloped land between the settlements, situated in the countryside, and is bound by mature tree planting. However, parts of its east and north boundaries are marked by

¹ Appeal Reference: APP/V3120/W/19/3225150.

² Appeal Reference: APP/V3120/W/20/3265465.

³ Adopted October 2019.

lower planting which enable views into the site. A new view would also be created from the south, through the proposed access. While the proposal would therefore be experienced from those directions, it is likely to be seen against the backdrop of the existing planting within the site. This would reflect the characteristics of built development to the east of Shrivenham. The settlement gap defined in the SNDP and further land to the east of the site would remain and the physical and visual separation they provide between the villages would therefore not be unacceptably diminished.

11. Despite my findings regarding the physical and visual separation between Shrivenham and Watchfield and compliance of the proposal with LP2 Policy DP29, for the above reasons, I conclude that it would not be suitably located. It would therefore conflict with the Council's settlement hierarchy and the strategy for housing delivery as set out in Core Policies 3 and 4 (CP3 and CP4) of the Local Plan 2031: Part 1 – Strategic Sites⁴ (LP1), which brings further conflict with the intention of LP2 Policy DP1.
12. I have not found in relation to LP1 Core Policy 1 (CP1) as it refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which I discuss in the Planning Balance below.

Benefits of the Proposal

Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding

13. The Council has a duty under the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act) (the Act) to keep a register of persons who are interested in acquiring a self-build or custom-build plot, and to also grant enough suitable development permissions for serviced plots to meet identified demand for the district. LP2 Policy DP1 and paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) are generally supportive of the provision of plots for sale to self and custom builders. I have also had regard to the updated planning guidance produced by Right To Build but afforded it limited weight given that it is not the latest expression of government policy in respect of such matters.
14. The Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2020/21⁵ (AMR) confirms the number of persons added to the register in each base period, the demand for which must be met by 30 October, 3 years after the end of that period. The evidence contained in the AMR demonstrates that the Council has not yet granted enough suitable permissions to address demand arising from any base period, including the fifth base period. Moreover, the AMR suggests 33 permissions of the 89 required to meet demand have been granted.
15. The proposal would therefore help to meet demand arising from the fifth base period, as there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that other schemes are either being or likely to be considered or determined by the Council before the end of October 2023. The provision of five self-build and/or custom housebuilding plots would therefore amount to a benefit of considerable weight, given the length of time remaining for the Council to meet the demand for the fifth base period.

⁴ Adopted December 2016.

⁵ Published March 2022.

16. Even if it were the case that the Council has met its requirement for the fifth or sixth base period, I am mindful of the approach discussed in the Steventon appeal. Moreover, there is no legislation, planning policy or guidance to demonstrate how undersupply of plots from previous base periods should be addressed. In that appeal, the Inspector reasoned that it would be illogical to not account for past under delivery of this type of housing given the statutory duties imposed by the Act and the overall support for it in local and national policies. He also referred to two of the appeals to which I have been referred, in North West Leicestershire⁶ and South Cambridgeshire⁷. If I were also to take the unmet demand into account, it would not diminish the weight that I have afforded to the proposal. Rather, it would underline the importance of the provision of this type of housing.
17. In addition, LP1 Policy CP3 states 'unallocated development will be limited to providing for local needs and to support employment, services and facilities within local communities.' In the case of self-build and custom housing, the Shrivenham Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Survey Report⁸ identifies the lack of self-build plots as a reason preventing people from moving, which suggests there is a need for such development in the plan area.

Other Benefits

18. As I referred to above, Shriveham and Watchfield are Large Villages, which have a more limited range of employment, services, and facilities. While the proposal would be relatively close to these, I ascribe negligible additional benefit in respect of this matter, as I consider it to be an absence of harm.
19. However, occupants of the houses in the site would be likely to contribute to supporting the services and facilities. There would be shorter-term employment benefits through the construction phase, particularly as the evidence before me suggests construction is one of the highest employers in the locality and it is likely that more would be spent locally, including the procurement of materials than for mainstream housebuilders. These would all constitute benefits in social and economic terms, but would be limited in scale and kind, so would only attract limited weight.
20. The housing target set out in LP1 Policy CP4 for 20560 dwellings to be delivered over the plan period and the development 'North of Shrivenham' for 500 dwellings would provide housing for the village, but the overall figure is not a maximum. The proposal would therefore add to the overall supply of housing in the district and greater choice on a small site, which the Framework recognises as being more likely to be built-out relatively quickly. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the contribution to overall supply in the district would be modest, so would attract limited weight in this regard.

Other Matters

Heritage

21. There are several listed buildings within the locality of the appeal site. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duty referred to in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

⁶ Appeal Reference: APP/G2435/W/18/3214451.

⁷ Appeal Reference: APP/W0530/W/19/3230103.

⁸ Final version - April 2017.

22. To the west of the site is Swiss Cottage, a Grade II listed timber-framed house constructed in a Swiss Chalet-style, with brick nogging and a gabled thatched roof. It is likely of mid-19th Century origin and was built by Lord Barrington of Beckett Park as a summerhouse and playroom when the land it is situated within was adjacent to stabling for the Beckett Estate. It is a striking building with refined architectural detailing in its glazing and timbers. Despite requiring repair, it remains of architectural and historic interest for these reasons.
23. The land within the site, at the golf course and Northford Close, including the cottage, was likely separated from Beckett Hall in around 1936, when its Estate was broken up. They have long since had no association with the Hall. The setting of the cottage has therefore altered considerably since, with houses and businesses introduced adjacent. Despite this, its garden still enables the listed cottage to be appreciated, which makes a small contribution to its significance.
24. The Hall and China House are grade II and grade I listed buildings respectively. Given the proximity and physical relationship of the proposal with them, their direct settings would be preserved and the proposal would not detract from them. Moreover, both are some distance to the south and separated by mature vegetation and intervening buildings. However, there are curtilage listed buildings to the Hall at Beckett Lodge, the gatehouse southeast of the site, at the junction of Beckett Drive and Faringdon Road, and the estate boundary wall to Faringdon Road, opposite the site. Their settings include Faringdon Road and the land and buildings adjacent to it.
25. The garden of the cottage currently extends to the southeast corner of the site, but would be foreshortened to provide the proposed access and the houses that would be built would be situated north of the end of the remaining garden. Despite the indicative location of the proposed houses and the landscaping between, it is unlikely that their presence would be harmful to the setting of Swiss Cottage given the amount of garden retained. Their presence is likely to be similar to the effect of Fairview, built in part of its garden, which is not harmful to its setting. Nevertheless, the Council would be able to ensure the setting of the cottage is not harmed through control over the scale of the proposed houses and landscaping of the site, which would be agreed through subsequent applications for reserved matters.
26. The closest part of the proposal to the curtilage listed buildings would be the new access formed from Faringdon Road. There are other similar accesses found to the north side of the road and indicative planting within the site would be likely to soften its visual affect. Views of the houses beyond the access would also be filtered by planting to the east and could be added to with new landscaping. The proposal would also therefore be unlikely to have a harmful effect on the setting of these curtilage listed buildings.

Highway Safety and Accessibility

27. The speed limit for Faringdon Road is 40mph, but the appellants' *Transport and Highways Technical Note* (THTN) contains a speed survey, which includes both average and 85th percentile recorded speeds. This demonstrates that vehicles travel lower than the speed limit within the vicinity of the site. I note that several accidents have been recorded to the east and west of the site in the THTN and others are referred to by interested parties. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that highway safety would be compromised by the visibility requirement for the proposed access, including that vehicles would

not be able to enter and leave the site safely. The appellants proposal would therefore be reasonable and proportionate to the scale of the development proposed and could be secured by planning condition.

28. At present there is no pedestrian footway to the north side of Faringdon Road, serving the proposed access to access Watchfield or Shrivenham, where public transport and services and facilities are to be found. A plan accompanying the THTN indicates there would be sufficient land to the frontage of Swiss Cottage, within the Local Highway Authority's ownership (LHA), to accommodate a footway toward that existing in Northford Close. The main parties are both receptive to this concept.
29. With cognisance of the guidance outlined in the NPPG⁹, a negatively-worded condition could be utilised that would prohibit development from taking place until a scheme of such works has been completed. A condition, with respect to land outside the appellants' control, would not create unacceptable uncertainty since there is nothing to compel the appellants to implement the development.
30. The LHA also raised concern regarding the ability for refuse vehicles to turn within the site and how visitor parking would be accommodated. The circulation route shown on the application drawing suggests space for turning would be made available halfway into the site. While refuse vehicles may need to reverse part way along the road, this would not be of great inconvenience and would be only likely to affect a small number of vehicles serving the site. Parking for visitors can also be addressed through the submission of the remaining reserved matters, as access in the only matter for consideration at this time.

Ecology and Biodiversity

31. Natural England (NE) recently updated the conservation status of the River Lambourn Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and has provided updated advice with a new generic methodology. Accordingly, I sought the views of the main parties and NE as to the likely effect associated with the proposal. In response, it was confirmed that the site lies outside of the Nutrient Neutrality catchment area for the SAC. As such NE advised that likely significant effects can be excluded and I am able to conclude there are no pathways that could lead to such effects. No further action is required in the context of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
32. Tuckmill Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is approximately 500m to the northwest of the appeal site. I am mindful of my duties imposed by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981¹⁰ but, in this instance, there is no evidence before me to suggest the proposal would be likely to damage the features for which the SSSI has been designated.
33. The appellants' *Ecology Technical Note 2 – Biodiversity Net Gain*¹¹ (ETN) indicates that planting of the areas outside of the land occupied by the shared access road and houses and their gardens with a mosaic of scrub and grassland would deliver a biodiversity net gain of 7.85%. There is no substantive evidence before me to dispute that this would be realistic or achievable, but a condition would be necessary to ensure its inclusion at reserved matters.

⁹ National Planning Practice Guidance, Reference ID: 21a-009-20140306, Revision date: 06/03/2014.

¹⁰ As amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

¹¹ Dated June 2021.

34. The ETN also suggests the appeal site is situated within an area of moderate suitability for Great Crested Newt habitat and the proposal has been evaluated by NatureSpace, as part of the Council's District Licensing Scheme. While their response suggests no further compensation actions are required, a condition would be reasonable to ensure development commences in accordance with the Scheme and submitted impact plan.
35. The works associated with the proposed access and circulation route would require the removal of a number of trees. While these are of limited quality, a planning condition would be necessary to secure an arboricultural method statement and tree protection plan. It would not be necessary to secure replacement planting at this stage, as landscaping is a reserved matter.
36. The appellants' *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation*¹² (PEA) was carried out by an experienced ecologist with credentials to survey bat roosts. It suggests the site is likely to be part of a wider foraging and commuting resource for local bat populations, but is unlikely to be a key or significant foraging resource in its own right. The site would not be sterilised by development and the proposals to improve its biodiversity value would be likely to maintain the site as a resource, including through opportunities for bat boxes. For similar reasons, the biodiversity enhancement scheme is likely to be beneficial to species of reptiles, amphibians and birds present in the locality, particularly the river corridor.
37. Interested parties have also suggested the site would be habitat for other species but this is not borne out in the PEA and, in any event, there is no firm evidence to suggest that they would be a constraint to the development.

Living Conditions

38. Several interested parties are concerned regarding proximity of the nearby sewage treatment works to the site. However, the Council's Environmental Protection did not raise concern in this regard and there are already houses situated in closer proximity. On this basis, there is no firm evidence before me that odour from the treatment works would amount to a constraint to the proposal which would justify withholding permission. Furthermore, layout and scale of the proposed houses are not yet known, so potential implications for living conditions of nearby occupiers are matters for future consideration.

Flooding

39. The evidence before me demonstrates only a slither of land along the eastern boundary of the site would not be within Flood Zone 1, the proposal would therefore be at lower risk of flooding, but mitigation measures outlined in the application documents and requested by the Environment Agency would still be required. These can be achieved without raising land levels within the site and any floodplain compensation storage associated with this.

Contamination

40. The land contamination report submitted with the application demonstrates there would not be a risk to the proposed development from contamination.

¹² Dated December 2020.

Planning Balance

41. The development plan for the area includes LP1 and LP2. While these predate the current Framework, it is clear that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to its publication. Due weight should be given to policies according to their consistency with the Framework.
42. There is no disagreement between the main parties that the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, so LP1 Policies CP3 and CP4 appear to be fulfilling their purposes. Furthermore, together with LP2 Policy DP1, they support self-build or custom build housing schemes or elements thereof where in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and the strategy for housing delivery.
43. There is a clear rationale for focusing growth within built-up areas of designated settlements, so the underlying objectives of these policies are generally consistent with the principles of sustainable development advanced in the Framework. However, there is not a specific exception to these policies that allows self-build or custom housing to come forward beyond built-up areas and the Council has not met its responsibilities for the number of suitable permissions. Unlike the Inspector for the Steventon appeal, based on the evidence before me, sufficient time has now passed for me to be able to determine that the mechanics of policy or the application of it are not yielding the number of suitable permissions required. Accordingly, I am only able to afford moderate weight to the conflict of the proposal with these policies.
44. I have outlined that the public benefits of the appeal scheme are considerable in respect of the contribution they make towards the provision of self-build and custom build houses, and limited weight to the social and economic benefits associated with contributions to the overall supply of housing and from the construction and occupational stages of development.
45. In terms of harm, the proposed development would not comply with the development plan in respect of its location, having regard to the settlement hierarchy and strategy for housing delivery. Moreover, despite my finding in relation to settlement gap, the appeal scheme would not accord with the development plan, when considered as a whole, but the adverse impact of the proposal is a matter of moderate weight against granting planning permission.
46. The benefits afforded to the proposal, not least meeting the requirements of the Framework and Act in relation to plots for self-build and custom housing, are material considerations that indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with development plan. The proposal would therefore not conflict with LP1 Policy CP1 in this respect.
47. This leads me to an overall conclusion that material considerations indicate the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. This would therefore justify the grant of planning permission.

Conditions

48. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the submission and timing of reserved matter applications and the commencement of development. It is necessary to require compliance with the submitted plans, but only in relation to the access as this not a reserved matter. This includes visibility splays from

the proposed access, but a further condition is required in relation to access to the service road within the site for each of the plots therein.

49. I have already outlined above the need for conditions in relation to pedestrian access, tree removal and achieving biodiversity net gain and mitigation for species using the site as habitat, including compliance with the Council's District Licensing Scheme. I also set out that replacement tree planting and visitor parking should be addressed at reserved matters, so such conditions are not necessary.
50. In order to provide adequate flood protection to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and other land and persons (including in relation to floodplain compensation), conditions are required regarding control over the finished floor levels and further detail of site levels.

Conclusion

51. The proposal would conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole, but there are material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The application(s) for the reserved matters shall be accompanied with a Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP), which shall be based on the details outlined in the document entitled 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation' (December 2020), except where updated in 'Ecology Technical Note 2 – Biodiversity Net Gain' (June 2021) and the new pond should be sited clear of the root protection area of any trees. This shall include:
 - a. Details of habitat creation or enhancements (cross referencing 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 etc. 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. Full details of a biodiversity metric assessment to demonstrate a biodiversity net gain.
- 5) Except where indicated elsewhere by other conditions, the access for the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A-02-100 and 210432-01 Revision D, prior to any dwelling being occupied, and thereafter retained.
- 6) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for a pedestrian footway to the west of the site to the existing footway in Northford Close, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved footway has been constructed in accordance with the approved details, and thereafter retained.
- 7) No dwelling shall be occupied until that part of the service road which provides access to it shall have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The service road as constructed shall be retained thereafter.
- 8) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a biodiversity mitigation strategy, with particular emphasis on reptiles, amphibians and birds, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. It shall detail the working methods, precautions and measures to be followed on site to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity. Thereafter, the development shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the approved strategy.
- 9) No development shall take place until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum of the land within the site, in relation to existing ground levels, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.
- 10) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and accompanying Tree Protection Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The AMS shall include the following:
- a. A specification of any pruning or tree surgery works to any trees to be retained, to prevent accidental damage by construction or demolition activities;

- b. The specification and location of temporary tree protective fencing and any ground protection required to protect all retained trees in accordance with the current edition 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 reinstatement of the area currently occupied thereby;
 - e. The route and method of installation of drainage or any underground services in the vicinity of retained trees (avoiding the Root Protection Area (RPA) of all retained trees, except where no alternative location is available and methodology for any installation works is included and follows best practice in 'Guidelines for the planning and installation and maintenance of utility apparatus in proximity to trees');
 - f. The details and method of construction of any other structures such as boundary walls and patios in the RPA of retained trees and how these relate to existing ground levels;
 - g. The details of materials and method of construction of any roadway, driveway, parking, pathway or other surfacing within the RPA, 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 is appropriate for the type of roadway required in relation to its usage.
- 11) The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA): 'Land East of Northford, Shrivenham, Flood Risk Assessment, Water Resource Associates, January 2021, version 3' and the following mitigation measures it details. The proposed dwellings shall have:
- Finished Floor Levels no less than 87.98 metres Above Ordnance Datum (mAOD), as detailed in Section 4-2 of the FRA; and
 - Finished Floor Levels no less than 0.15 metres higher than the surrounding finished ground levels.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements and retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

- 12) The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Council's organisational licence (WML-OR28-2020-1) and with the proposals detailed on plan 'Land North of Swiss Cottage, Shrivenham: Impact Plan for great crested newt district licensing' (Version 1), dated 15th June 2021.

End of Schedule