



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 2 August 2023

Site visit made on 3 August 2023

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/23/3320428
Culham Hill, Culham, Oxfordshire OX14 3DT
Easting 450874 Northing 195830

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Allen against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P20/S1988/FUL, dated 9 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land from agricultural land to farm park, wildlife and outdoor activity centre, associated buildings and outdoor play structures, mountain bike trail, formation of a new vehicle / pedestrian access off the A415, associated engineering works, drainage and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header is from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, although it omits reference to additional information and plans. The description is slightly different to that on the application form but it reflects changes made to the scheme before the Council's decision. I have based my assessment on this description.
3. Several of the appeal submissions were not before the Council at the time it determined the planning application. These include an energy report, a BREEAM NC pre-assessment report, an otter survey report and a document entitled "reduced scale of development – drainage and flooding implications". The Council and interested parties have had an opportunity to comment on these submissions through the appeal process and they do not fundamentally change the proposal. As such, I am satisfied that no injustice would be caused by taking these documents into account.
4. A copy of a completed agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted prior to the commencement of the hearing. This is between Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), the freehold owners of the appeal site and a lessee company. It sets out planning obligations that include:-
 - a requirement for contributions to be paid to OCC towards public transport infrastructure, public transport services and travel plan monitoring;

- a requirement on the landowners to monitor the number of vehicular trips to the development as well as associated turning movements and queues;
 - a requirement for works to provide traffic signals at the proposed new access on the A415 if found necessary by OCC or a contribution in lieu of such works;
 - limitations on the opening times of the development until identified improvements to the wider highway network are completed;
 - a requirement for a strip of land to the west of the appeal site to be set aside and transferred to OCC on request so as to provide a cycle route; and
 - the need to carry out various works associated with the proposed A415 access and nearby footways and cycleway as well as improvements to the existing access to High Lodge Farm on Thame Lane.
5. I have had regard to these planning obligations in my assessment.
6. The Council has provided copies of policies from the referendum version of the Culham Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The referendum has taken place and the NP was made by the Council in July 2023. As such, it now forms part of the development plan along with the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2020 (the LP). I have taken account of the NP policies referred to me, although none are included in the refusal reasons on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

7. The submitted energy report sets out how the development would achieve building performance standards and incorporate low or zero carbon energy generating technologies. In light of this report, the Council has lifted its objection to the development in these respects. Also, the Council has withdrawn its fifth refusal reason in light of the other report and its objections in respect of flood risk following the further report on drainage and flooding implications. The aforementioned planning obligations have addressed the Council's seventh refusal reason. As such, the main issues in this appeal are:-
- whether the proposal would incorporate inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and LP policies;
 - its effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - whether the development would be in a suitable location having regard to LP policies; and
 - if the proposal would include inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

The site and the proposal

8. The appeal site forms part of a larger agricultural holding to the north of the village of Culham. Its southern edge adjoins the A415 where the new access would be located. A new driveway would lead northwards and then eastwards

from the access, across and around the edge of existing fields to a new car park and overflow parking area. These would be on land that currently forms part of a field to the north of Thame Lane and to the south of the High Lodge Farm complex of buildings. Dwellings and the Europa School lie on the opposite side of Thame Lane to the field. An emergency vehicular access would be provided off a bend in the road to link with the driveway.

9. To the north of the proposed car park would be an admission office and bike hire facilities. To the north and west of this public entrance are established wooded areas containing tracks. These would provide a route through to the main "orientation plaza", where currently there is a large area of grass with woods on 3 sides. On my visit I saw a series of posts to delineate camping pitches as well as toilet and other associated features, although no camping was taking place. The appellants indicate the camp site is being operated on a temporary basis and only at weekends in accordance with permitted development rights (PDRs).
10. The play barn with play area, party rooms, café and toilets as well as 2 animal shelters would be located next to the plaza. To the north would be paddocks and play equipment with paths across the grassland. In the northern part of the site the land slopes steeply down towards a watercourse called The Swift Ditch, which runs across a bend in the River Thames as it flows past Abingdon. The northwest part of the site is wooded. New bike trails would be created mainly through the treed areas as well as a tractor route around the western part of the site. A path would also be provided down the slope towards The Swift Ditch.
11. At the hearing, the main parties agreed the proposal would be made up of 3 elements – the erection of new buildings, the change of use of the site to farm park, wildlife and outdoor activity centre and engineering operations such as the creation of the access drive and car park area as well as the bike trails, paths and tractor route. My assessment recognises these different elements.

Whether the proposal would include inappropriate development in the Green Belt

12. The whole of the appeal site lies in an area of designated Green Belt that stretches beyond the appeal site to the north and west to the River Thames and the edge of Abingdon. To the south the Green Belt goes across Culham village and to the land beyond. The Green Belt boundary runs close to the eastern edge of the appeal site. The adjacent land to the east is undeveloped field but it is allocated under LP policy STRAT9 for 3,500 new homes as well as employment land and supporting services and facilities (hereafter referred to as the STRAT9 site).
13. LP policy STRAT6 states the Green Belt will be protected from harmful development. Only the types of development deemed not inappropriate by the Framework would be permissible, unless very special circumstances exist.
14. Paragraph 149 of the Framework indicates that the construction of new buildings would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, although a list of exceptions is provided. Of relevance to this appeal is the exception at paragraph 149(b). This states that facilities in connection with a change of use for outdoor sport or recreation would not be inappropriate development provided they preserve the openness of Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

15. The appellants acknowledge that the erection of the play barn building would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. While the café and toilets would be used by all visitors to the site, the majority of the building would be dedicated to indoor rather than outdoor play. As such, its main purpose would not be connected with outdoor activities.
16. Also, the play barn would be a sizeable building, measuring about 50m wide at the front and 40m deep in parts. It would be single storey but with a maximum height of 11.14m. The building would be on land that is currently open and so it would reduce spatial openness by virtue of its volume. It would have only a localised visual effect as it would be screened by woods on 3 sides. Even so, it would be clearly seen by visitors to the farm park. The agricultural style of the building would not address nor overcome the reduction to both spatial and visual aspects of Green Belt openness.
17. At the hearing, the appellants' representatives advised the animal shelters would not be agricultural buildings. However, they would be used in connection with the farm park and so paragraph 149(b) of the Framework is relevant. Again, these 2 buildings would be sizeable, each measuring some 40m long, 16m wide and 8.4m high. They would have a typical agricultural appearance but this would not prevent the buildings from eroding the spatial openness of the grassed area. Like the play barn they would reduce the visual openness of the Green Belt, albeit that this would be a localised effect not appreciated from public vantage points.
18. The appellants suggest the admission office would be a facility connected to outdoor recreation. At 4m in height, it would be lower than the play barn and animal shelters. However, it would still be quite wide and it would have a volume that would lead to a loss of spatial openness. Visitors arriving at the development are bound to see the admission building as it would be next to the car park. Also, I saw that the field where the admission office would be sited is visible from upper floor windows to the houses on the opposite side of Thame Lane. It would seem unlikely that existing and proposed planting would prevent all views of the field from these windows, particularly during times of leaf fall. As such, the admission building would erode spatial and visual openness.
19. The appellants' landscape/visual and historic environment response to South Oxfordshire District Council document refers to a building swap that would lead to a net benefit to the openness of Green Belt. At the hearing it was confirmed that these comments relate to an earlier proposal where existing buildings at the High Lodge Farm complex were to be demolished. The scheme before me includes no demolition works that would offset the harm to openness caused by the proposed buildings.
20. Therefore, I find the play barn, animal shelters and admission office would not preserve openness and so they would not fall within the exception at 149(b) of the Framework. The buildings' overall effect on visual openness would be limited as, in the main, they would only be seen from within the appeal site by visitors to the farm park. However, the loss of spatial openness would be more harmful, particularly given the scale of the play barn and animal shelters. Overall, the proposed buildings would cause a moderate level of harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
21. The purposes of Green Belt are listed at paragraph 138 of the Framework. The introduction of new buildings on vacant land would not assist with safeguarding

the countryside from encroachment. Accordingly, this element of the proposal would conflict with purpose (c). However, the general absence of public views of the buildings would avoid any meaningful merging of towns, even if the STRAT9 site is developed. The lack of visibility and the position of the buildings would ensure no harm would be caused to the setting and special character of Abingdon. Therefore, I find the buildings would not conflict with purposes (b) and (d) as claimed by the Council.

22. Paragraph 150 of the Framework is relevant in considering the proposed change of use of land and engineering operations. Such forms of development are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
23. It is fair to expect that most visitors to the farm park, wildlife and outdoor activity centre would travel by motorised vehicle. Associated parking would reduce the spatial openness of part of the site that is currently an open field. The effect of parking on openness would vary depending on the number of visitors at any particular time. When there are no visitors, parking would not affect openness at all. However, the extent of the main and overflow car park areas indicates there will be occasions when significant numbers of vehicles would be on the site. Despite existing and proposed planting, it is likely that such parking would be noticeable from upper floor windows of some of the housing on Thame Lane. Having regard to the size of the parking areas and its transitory nature, a moderate level of harm would be caused to openness.
24. The parking of vehicles particularly at busy times would represent a form of encroachment into the countryside. Accordingly, the proposed change of use would conflict with the Green Belt purpose at paragraph 138(c) of the Framework. However, the proposed use would not lead to any sense of towns merging and would not harm the setting of Abingdon.
25. The creation of the access drive, the car park and tracks and paths, would not harm spatial or visual openness as they would be works at ground level. Also, by reason of their low key nature and visual impact, the proposed engineering operations in themselves would not represent encroachment into the countryside. Furthermore, they would not conflict with the other purposes of Green Belt. Therefore, I find the engineering operations would accord with the provisions of paragraph 150 of the Framework and so would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
26. However, the proposed play barn, animal shelters and admission office as well as the parking that would be associated with the proposed change of use would not preserve openness and would conflict with the purpose of Green Belt policy to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Accordingly, I find the proposal would include inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Effect on character and appearance

27. No public rights of way cross the site but there are views from the A415 and from Thame Lane of the fields and wooded areas. Overhead wires and pylons mean the southern part of the site is not unspoilt. Even so, the site provides attractive rural views from the roads and nearby properties to the south, with the woods being a particularly prominent feature.

28. Intervening buildings and vegetation prevent views of the site from Culham village and land further to the south. Also, it is not easily seen from the River Thames to the west, north and east. Roadside vegetation partially screens the site from the A415 to the west. However, to the north is a lane, referred to in the appellants' landscape, townscape and visual impact assessment 2017 as Andersey Island public right of way. This lane serves a few properties and provides uninterrupted and attractive views across fields to the woods and grassed slope on the northern part of the site. Reference is made to views of the site from within Abingdon but these tend to be from taller buildings and from a significant distance away.
29. Under the South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment, the site is defined as falling within an area of Wooded Hills and Valleys landscape type in the Nuneham Courtenay Ridge landscape character area. Key characteristics identified for this landscape include the large scale farmland and fields, mixed land use and blocks of woodland to create an attractively diverse landscape, albeit of a predominantly rural character with few detracting influences. The features of the appeal site as it stands strongly represent these characteristics.
30. The proposed buildings, car park and the various tracks and trails would all result in a change in the appearance of the site. The play barn and animal shelters would have an agricultural appearance that would be appropriate to the rural nature of the local area. Also, the tracks and trails would not stand out as being unusual within a countryside context.
31. However, the admission building and adjacent car parking would stand out as unusual features within the rural landscape. Moreover, the development is bound to lead to significantly more people coming to the site. Rather than fairly quiet farmland and woods with no meaningful public access, the site would be subject to frequent activity associated with both outdoor and indoor recreation. The increase in people and vehicles on the site would go against its current quiet rustic feel. In these regards, the change of use would detract from the site's contribution towards the rural qualities of the area.
32. From public vantage points, the most visually prominent element of the proposal would be the access and the first stretch of the driveway. Even with planting on either side, these would be noticeable from the A415 when directly in front of the access and from a short distance away to the east and west. Even if the driveway is surfaced to appear as a rural track, the introduction of the access and the coming and goings of vehicles would have a harmful effect on views from the A415 towards the woods.
33. From Thame Lane, existing and proposed planting would largely obscure visibility from ground level into the site. The exception to this would be at the emergency vehicle access on the bend in the road. From here there would be views of the drive and vehicles coming and going. This would cause a minor distraction from the rural qualities of the southern part of the site.
34. The access drive, vehicular parking and the admission office would undermine the rural attractiveness of views from the upper floor windows of houses on Thame Lane. Additional planting is proposed that would provide a degree of screening and soften the visual impact of the development from these vantage points. Nonetheless, I am unconvinced that planting would totally obstruct visibility onto the site from upper floor windows, particularly during times of leaf fall. The information provided fails to convincingly show that parking would

be totally integrated with the landscape as claimed. Furthermore, it seems likely that lighting would need to be provided to assist users of the car park during times of darkness and there would also be light emission from the vehicles themselves. The introduction of new light sources would stand out amongst the unlit background of the woods.

35. The path and bike trail across the slope down to The Swift Ditch would be visible from the Andersey Island public right of way. Even so, they would not be particularly prominent and would not unduly spoil the visual qualities of this part of the site. However, as well as cyclists, it is likely that visitors to the farm park would be drawn to the northern part of the site due to the elevated views it provides of the wider area. As such, I would envisage that the increase in human activity would be appreciated from the Andersey Island lane.
36. The bike trails through the wooded areas would be concealed by trees so they would not be readily evident from outside the site. Also, the animal shelters and the play barn would be away from the site boundaries and shielded by woods so they too would not be seen from off the site. Proposed tree planting would also strengthen the woodland structure and in these regards the proposal would deliver an enhancement.
37. In summary, the development would change the character of the site, most notably through an increase in visitors and vehicular movement. The access, driveway, parking and admission building would all be visible from highways and private properties to the south and additional planting would only soften and not obscure their visual effects. The proposed activities and features would be unsympathetic to the countryside nature of the site. Also, the increase in human activity on the open areas to the northern part of the site would be appreciated from Andersey Island and would diminish the attractiveness of such views. The trails through the woods and new buildings in the centre of the site would not cause visual harm and additional tree planting would enhance the landscape. However, the enhancements as a result of the proposal would not address nor override the detriment to the rural qualities of the site.
38. For these reasons, I conclude the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. In these regards it would not accord with LP policies ENV1, DES1 and DES2. Amongst other things, these look to ensure development avoids harm by enhancing and respecting landscape character.

Location of development

39. LP policy STRAT1 sets out an overall strategy, which in broad terms looks to direct development to allocated sites and existing towns and villages. Part ix) of the policy seeks to protect and enhance the countryside, particularly those parts in the Green Belt. I have already found the proposal would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of part of the countryside. In these regards, it would conflict with this part of the LP strategy.
40. However, part ix) of LP policy STRAT1 does not totally preclude development in the countryside but looks to ensure such schemes relate to very specific needs, such as agriculture. Moreover, part (ii) of LP policy EMP10 says the Council will promote diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. This policy support is unequivocal and it does not just apply to the re-use of buildings or when there is a demonstrated need for diversification. As such, there is support for development in the countryside within the LP,

notwithstanding the provisions of LP policy STRAT1 part (ix). There is no dispute the proposal would represent agricultural diversification and so it gains support from LP policy EMP10.

41. The Council's refusal reason also refers to LP policy EMP11, which relates specifically to tourist attractions. The appellant accepts that the appeal proposal is not small scale but in exceptional circumstances the policy allows larger development in rural areas that advances the visitor economy. None of the examples of exceptional circumstances cited in LP policy EMP11 apply in this case but this is not a closed list.
42. To my mind, the proposal when considered as a whole is bound to require a rural location. It is difficult to envisage how the keeping of farm animals together with the provision of walking and cycling trails to the extent as proposed could be accommodated within a built up area. It is common for indoor play centres to be found within settlements and so a play barn on its own would not need to be in the countryside. In this case however, the play barn would supplement the farm park and outdoor activities by providing an indoor facility. Without such an option to fall back upon, it is fair to expect that people would be less likely to visit the farm park, particularly given the vagaries of the weather. As such, there are good reasons why the proposal including the play barn needs to be located in the countryside.
43. Also, I am mindful that the proposed development would be within a reasonable walking distance from Culham and would be a short drive away from Abingdon and from the housing on the STRAT9 site when delivered. There are pedestrian and cycle route connections along the A415 that would provide opportunities for visitors to travel to and from the development by means other than the private car. Also, the aforementioned planning obligations would lead to improved public transport links to the site. As such, the development would not be unduly remote or inaccessible from local towns and villages.
44. For these reasons, I conclude the development would be in a suitable location when considering LP policies STRAT1, EMP10 and EMP11 together. Acceptability in these respects is a neutral factor in my overall assessment of the appeal.

Other concerns raised

45. There has been correspondence from interested parties both in support of the development and raising concerns over and above those highlighted by the Council. The coming and going of visitors associated with the farm park and activity centre would be noticed by nearby residents. However, given the separation distances I am satisfied that there would be no detrimental effects on living conditions at nearby dwellings. Drainage facilities would be provided to ensure surface water run off and foul water from the site is dealt with appropriately.
46. Objections are raised over the impacts of traffic on local highways, particularly in light of current traffic issues associated with the nearby Europa School. However, the time restrictions on public use of the development would avoid a significant clash between visitors coming to and leaving the appeal site and school drop off and pick up times. The planning obligations would require works to the highway to ensure trips to and from the development would not prejudice highway safety. Also, they would require on-going monitoring of traffic movements and signalisation of the proposed access if deemed

necessary. Consequently, OCC as highway authority advise that the development would avoid an unacceptable impact on highway safety and capacity. I find no reason to arrive at a different view to OCC on this matter.

47. Culham Brake Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is an area of semi-natural broadleaved woodland just outside the appeal site. Natural England raise no objections to the proposal as it would not damage the features of interest for which the site has been notified. As such, I am satisfied the development would not cause harm to the SSSI. Also, in light of the appellants' evidence on the issue, I consider suitable measures can be introduced to ensure the development does not cause disruption to otters in the locality.
48. As such, the above factors do not provide reason to refuse planning permission. Acceptability in all of these regards is a neutral factor in my assessment.

Other considerations

49. The planning obligations would address the development's effects on highway safety and capacity and ensure it would have an acceptable level of accessibility by means other than the car. The planning obligations are necessary to ensure the development would accord with LP policies INF1, TRANS2, TRANS4 and TRANS5. Also, they relate to the proposal and are reasonable in terms of scale. As such, the planning obligations meet the relevant tests as set out at paragraph 57 of the Framework. Acceptability in these respects is a neutral factor in my assessment.
50. The bus stops and enhanced bus services secured through the planning obligations would serve not just visitors to the development but the general public. However, there is little evidence to demonstrate the extent of this wider benefit and so this factor attracts limited weight.
51. At the hearing, the appellant and the Council suggested the cycle route planning obligation should attract great weight. However, the obligation secures just the safeguarding of land and its potential transfer to the OCC, not the actual provision of the cycle route. This would come forward only if funding were found for its provision. Within this context, I attach only modest weight to the wider public benefits of the cycle route planning obligations.
52. In support of the appeal, the appellants have referred to other proposals for farm parks and similar developments that have been granted planning permission on Green Belt sites. These include appeal decision reference number APP/F5540/W/16/3160453 that relates to a site in Hounslow. While these other decisions involve consideration of similar Green Belt issues to those relevant to this appeal, they also relate to different sites and proposals that would have their own specific effects and benefits. Given the differences to the appeal scheme and those referred to me, these other decisions have limited influence on my overall assessment.
53. If allowed and implemented, the proposal would take land out of agricultural use so that agricultural PDRs would not apply. I am advised that if the appeal is dismissed the appellants would seek to erect an agricultural building to serve the land. This fallback position would harm the openness of the site, although it is noteworthy that agricultural buildings are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt under the terms of paragraph 149 of the Framework.

54. In any event, the appellants would still maintain a significant area of agricultural land surrounding the site. If the appeal is allowed, the erection of agricultural buildings under PDRs may still occur on this land. The removal of PDRs by a planning condition as suggested could only affect the appeal site. Accordingly, there would be no advantage in terms of protecting the openness of Green Belt by granting planning permission subject to a condition that removes PDRs. In effect, it would simply increase the likelihood of agricultural buildings being erected elsewhere on the holding. For these reasons, the fallback position provided by agricultural PDRs and the potential to attach a condition that removes them attracts limited weight in my assessment.
55. The creation of the bike trails would require tree and undergrowth clearance within the appeal site but new tree planting and enhanced woodland management measures are proposed. The Council accepts these measures would result in a biodiversity net gain for the site, particularly in the long term. Given the evidence on existing and proposed biodiversity values, this factor attracts moderate weight in favour of the scheme.
56. The appellants have suggested the proposal would serve an educational need, particularly in terms of enhancing children's knowledge about farm animals and wildlife. I am sure that some visitors would learn from their experiences at the farm park. However, there is little evidence such as supportive letters from schools to show the proposal is required to meet formal educational requirements. As such, the education benefits attract only moderate weight in support of the scheme.
57. The proposal would represent agricultural diversification as supported under LP policy EMP10 and paragraph 84 of the Framework. The appellants' evidence highlights how diversification can ensure farms and other land-based rural businesses remain viable. The appellants have provided no financial information in support of their claim that there is an urgent need for the proposal to become established in order to ensure the viability of their farming business. Also, I note the appellants have held various events and provide camping facilities under PDRs which already create additional income. Even so, it is fair to expect the proposal would generate more consistent and certain revenues over and above that of the holding as it exists. There is no substantive evidence to indicate the loss of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use would have any negative economic effects.
58. In addition, the appellants' Green Belt Note indicates the proposal would generate 30 full time equivalent jobs after 5 years. Also, there would be employment generated during the construction of the built elements of the development. Furthermore, it is reasonable to expect a level of expenditure by the farm park and activity centre business itself and from visitors at local services. The Council's economic development officer is supportive of the proposal for these reasons. Overall, the economic benefits of the scheme attract significant weight.
59. The proposal is supported by the Council's leisure officer as the bike trails and the outdoor activities would increase the opportunity for exercise, healthy lifestyles and social interaction. Over and above this, the proposal would provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt, and so it gains support from paragraph 145 of the Framework. These social benefits are afforded significant weight.

Green Belt and planning balance

60. The Framework states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework dictates that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt in weighing the detriment caused by a proposal against its benefits and other considerations.
61. As well as harm by reason of inappropriateness, the development would erode the openness of the Green Belt and so it would go against the fundamental aim to keep land open. The identified harm to the character and appearance of the site and the area also counts against the scheme. Overall, the harm caused by the proposal attracts very substantial weight.
62. The development would bring benefits as identified in the other considerations section of this decision. When considered together, these also attract very substantial weight so that the harm caused by the proposal and its benefits are finely balanced.
63. However, paragraph 148 of the Framework says that for very special circumstances to exist, the potential harm caused by the proposal must be clearly outweighed by other considerations. It follows that in a finely balanced case such as this, very special circumstances do not exist. As such, paragraph 147 of the Framework dictates that planning permission should not be approved. Also, for these reasons, I conclude the proposal would be contrary to LP policy STRAT6.

Conclusion

64. I have found the proposal would be contrary to development plan policies when read as a whole. The benefits of the scheme and other considerations provide insufficient justification to grant planning permission contrary to the development plan. Accordingly, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Josh Lambert	RPS
Nick Laister	Laister Planning Limited
Nayan Ghandi	Laister Planning Limited
Damian Ford	Transport Planning Associates
Emily Allen	

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Emma Bowerman	South Oxfordshire District Council
Cathie Scotting	South Oxfordshire District Council
Peter Radmall	Consultant
Michael Dedman	Oxfordshire County Council, Highways

INTERESTED PERSONS

Caroline Baird	Objector
Sarah Sheldon	Objector
Dr John Ward	Objector
Peter Kirby	Objector
Alan Greenway	