



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 8 March 2022

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert (Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D3125/W/21/3274197

Land to the rear of Brock Cottage, Burford Road, Brize Norton OX18 3NR

- 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 Mr Joe McDermott (Albright Dene Ltd) against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01915/OUT, dated 20 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is "outline application for the provision of Self-Build and/or Custom Housebuilding plots for 2 detached dwellings, with all matters reserved except for access."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for "outline application for the provision of Self-Build and/or Custom Housebuilding plots for 2 detached dwellings, with all matters reserved except for access" at Land to the rear of Brock Cottage, Burford Road, Brize Norton OX18 3NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01915/OUT, dated 20 April 2020, subject to the following conditions on the attached schedule A.

Procedural Matters

2. This outline application has access to be determined at this stage, and all other matters reserved for future consideration. During the Council's determination of the application, the width of the long access drive was altered as shown on plan drawing number: A-02-101 Rev B. This plan also shows access onto Burford Road and an internal access drive leading to rear parking and turning areas, and the access matter has been considered on this basis.
3. Block and layout plans, drawing numbers A-02-100 Rev B and A-02-102 Rev A show the indicative plotting of two dwellings to the rear of the site at the end of the long access and beyond the internal parking and turning areas. A site section plan, drawing number A-04-110 shows indicative one and half storey dwellings sunken down below surrounding land levels. Topographical, existing structure and aerial photographic plans are considered for information purposes only.
4. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 21 March 2022 has obligations relating to Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding (SBCH). In relation to the UU, further comments by the Council and the appellant have been taken into account in this decision. Prior to the Hearing, evidence of title, the West Oxfordshire

District Housing Land Position Statement 2021-2026 and a Statement of Common Ground was submitted.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the area and (b) whether adequate provision has been made for the delivery of SBCH in accordance with policy and legislative requirements.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is irregularly shaped given its long narrow access from Burford Road. The rear wider area is located behind frontage dwellings along the road, including a group of three grouped cottages at Brock Cottage, Reynand Cottage and Poplar Cottage. The site has remnants of buildings and a partially sunken area below cliffs associated with previous horticultural and quarrying uses. There are many well-established trees within the site, mainly close to boundaries. There are two attractive large trees visible from the public domain within the rear wider part of the site, closest to the road.
7. The site is located at one end of a stretch of ribbon housing where the typical pattern of development is frontage dwellings set back from the road with long rear gardens. There are examples of backland development along Burford Road but these are the exceptions to the prevailing development pattern, and in any case, are located further along the road. On one side of the appeal site, there is landscaped land, including an embankment for the B4477 "Brize Norton" bypass, whilst on the other side, there are the extensive rear gardens of the properties at Malt House and Chelford House. Opposite the site, there is open land and beyond the new estate housing at Carterton.
8. Policy OS2 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (LP) 2031, adopted 2018, states that development in small villages, hamlets and open countryside will be limited to that which requires and is appropriate for a rural location and which respects the intrinsic character of the area. Amongst its general principles, all development should form a logical complement to the existing scale, pattern of development and character, and be of a proportionate and appropriate scale to its context. Under LP Policy H2, new dwellings in areas identified above will only be permitted in certain specified and justified circumstances, and where they meet the general principles. LP Policy H5 states that proposals for SBCH should be approved in suitable, sustainable locations subject to compliance with LP Policies OS2 and H2.
9. The plans show indicative siting of two detached dwellings within the rearmost part of the plot and within the cliff faces of the former quarry. Plot site levels are generally between 3 and 5 metres lower than the higher surrounding land. Indicative plans show how the site might be developed. However, the access matter details would strongly indicate a form and siting of development as indicatively shown.
10. Frontage ribbon housing does prevail within the area and the dwellings would be a significant distance from this, including the grouped cottages. The residential development would not be a logical complement to the pattern of development within the area, conflicting with a general planning principle under LP policies. Even if only a single dwelling was located behind the carparking

and turning areas (instead of the two shown) and one dwelling located further forward in relation to the road, this would still not be a logical complement.

11. Nevertheless, the dwellings, hard surfacing and associated domestic paraphernalia would be discretely located due to the sunken nature of this part of the site. The cross-section plan shows only the roofs of dwellings visible from surrounding adjacent land to the side and rear. For the closest residential property at Brock Cottage, there is additional vegetation, including an evergreen hedge, separating it from the new development. There would also be little visibility of the new housing from Burford Road and properties along it, due to separation distance. Furthermore, the large size of the appeal site would give rise to a spacious nature of development in keeping with that along Burford Road.
12. There is no guarantee that existing screening vegetation would remain indefinitely, despite the appellant's clear intentions, because, for any number of reasons, such as storm damage and disease, vegetation can disappear. During winter, the largely deciduous nature of vegetation would expose more of the site to view. A dwelling positioned forward of the existing parking and turning area would be closer to Burford Road. However, much of the screening is provided by the quarry cliffs and although reserved for further consideration, provision could be made for additional landscaping, including evergreen.
13. In a 2008 decision¹ for housing on the site, the Inspector dismissed an outline proposal for housing despite the previous commercial use, the lower rear ground levels due to the quarrying, the screening provided by trees and hedgerows, and the secluded nature of the location. Along with this decision there have been appeal decisions on this and along Burford Road², where Inspectors have additionally referred to the rural character and appearance of the area.
14. However, the appeal proposal is for two dwellings with greater detail of site levels and on the land on the other side of Burford Road, there is new housing, Brize Meadow, part of the expansion of Carterton. Although there is a gap between this housing and the road, the dense and elevated nature of this housing is a significant intrusion into the area and change in circumstance. Many of these appeal decisions were also considered against previous local and national plan policies. Such considerations demonstrate that every proposal must be considered on its particular planning merits. For these reasons, limited weight is given to these appeal decisions. The widening of the access drive would result in the removal of a low-level stone boundary wall and replacement with a post and rail fence, but its removal would not be a significant loss given its lack of prominence within the street scene.
15. In summary, the proposed development would not be a logical extension of the pattern of development along Burford Road and would not respect intrinsic character. Nevertheless, the adverse impact would be small and localised. There would be conflict with Policies OS2, H2 and H5 of the LP.

¹ APP/D3125/A/08/2079575 Rear of Brock Cottage dated 29 October 2008.

² APP/D3125/A/09/2112011 (2009 Malt House appeal), APP/D3125/A/12/2185848 (2013 Quarry Dene appeal), APP/D3125/A/12/2184939 (2013 St Ives appeal), APP/D3125/A/12/2189413 (2013 Apple Acre appeal), APP/D3125/A/13/2209002 (2014 Rocky Banks appeal), APP/D3125/W/14/2328840 (the 2014 Cottage Garden appeal), APP/D3125/W/17/3168524 (2017 Quarry Dene Appeal), APP/3125/W/W/21/327244 (2021 Quarry Dene appeal).

Self-build and Custom Housebuilding

16. To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.
17. The SBCH Act 2015 introduced a duty on local authorities to keep a register of individuals, and associations of individuals, who wished to acquire serviced plots of land to bring forward for SBCH projects. Councils are required to have regard to those registers when carrying out planning functions. The Housing and Planning (HP) Act 2016 provided a duty that Councils must give 'suitable' planning permissions to meet the demand for SBCH. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)³ states registers are likely to be material considerations in decisions involving proposals for SBCH.
18. In accordance with the statutory duties, entries of SBCH interest have been collated for different 12 month base periods; 254 for First Base Period (30 October 2016), 163 for the Second Base Period (30 October 2017), 82 for Third Base Period (30 October 2018), 193 for Fourth Base Period (30 October 2019), 76 for Fifth Base Period (30 October 2020) and 109 for the Sixth Base Period (30 October 2021). At the end of each base period, relevant authorities have 3 years to permit an equivalent number of "suitable" permissions for SBCH, as there are entries for that base period.⁴
19. The Council has detailed issues of double counting in the entries and lack of scrutiny over whether the entries are genuine. However, as part of the registration process relevant authorities can request applicants to provide additional information, local connection and financial viability tests. A charge for entry onto the list can also be made. The Council introduced the local connection test in the Sixth Base Period. In the absence of any detailed and compelling evidence to the contrary, the recorded entries are the best evidence before me of demand.
20. There are not enough 'suitable' planning permissions to match the SBCH register entry demand. There is disagreement over the extent of shortfall. LP Policy H5 also requires all housing developments of 100 or more dwellings to provide to provide SBCH plots. The Council also considers that replacement dwellings, conversion and available plots with permissions in general would contribute to meeting this demand.
21. The legislation also does not define 'suitable' planning permissions but the SBCH in the Framework definition states, housing built by an individual, a group of individuals, or persons working with them or for them, to be occupied by that individual. The PPG⁵ provides further explanation, that relevant authorities must be satisfied that the initial owner of the home will have primary input into its final design and layout. This reflects the definition within HP Act sections 1(A1) and 1(A2).

³ Paragraph:014 Reference ID: 57-014-20105008.

⁴ Paragraph:023 Reference ID: 57-023-201760728.

⁵ Paragraph:016 Reference ID: 57-016-201707208.

22. HP Act section 2.A(6)(c) states that a planning permission is suitable development if it could include SBCH. Although this is looser definition, a lack of meaningful assurance about SBCH provision would run counter to the aims of providing such housing. To ensure SBCH provision, there has to be certainty that the owner or buyer occupies the house for themselves and has had principal control over the plans and specifications of the house. As the Council has not adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy, exemption certificates by SBCH cannot be considered.
23. In terms of supply, there were 0, 7, 61, 13 and 0 planning permissions for SBCH in the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Base Periods based on central government published data but there is no detailed evidence by the Council showing which permissions may be suitable. The appellant's analysis of the Council's Annual Monitoring Reports shows suitable planning permissions in the Second and Third Base Periods to be 67 and 24, higher than the published data. Such an assessment takes an optimistic view of suitability for counting as SBCH permissions, that includes potential SBCH developments and replacement dwellings. On the balance of evidence before me, the appellant's is more compelling, and it can only be concluded that there is a substantial shortfall in provision during the different periods. In summary, two SBCH dwellings would make a small, albeit valuable contribution, to meeting demand, if it was secured by the UU.

Unilateral undertaking

24. The UU seeks the approval of an 'appropriate' Marketing Strategy (MS) to secure the construction and the first occupation of each residential unit as SBCH. If the SBCH MS is unsuccessful for one or both plots, there is a Release Procedure mechanism that would enable the applicant/owner to offer the plots to the Council or at the Council's discretion, a housing provider. Failure to reach agreement would result in the owner/applicant being released from their SBCH obligations.
25. Within the UU, there is no dispute resolution mechanism to consider the pricing of the plots. Over-priced plots could result in SBCH development not coming forward. As well as a lack of a dispute mechanism, the obligation indicates the deemed approval of the MS of the SBCH plots within specified time periods and there is no explicit provision to accommodate the scenario of the Council refusing the MS scheme.
26. However, the schedule requires the construction of each residential unit to be for SBCH and that first occupation of each residential unit shall be by a Self Builder. The definition of SBCH is set out in the interpretation part of the UU where it must be constructed by a self builder who intends to live in the residential unit. Additionally, prior to the legal purchase of a residential unit, the self builder shall submit details and contact addresses, and the name of the architect and/or custom builder which the self builder proposes to commission in relation to the design and development of the SBCH dwelling. Whilst such requirements are subject to the provisions of the schedule, development of the plots for general residential could only take place if the 24 month MS for SBCH was unsuccessful and there was no agreement by the Council or provider in purchase of the plots or site.
27. UU also specifies that the 'appropriate' MS would be for SBCH with plot passport details, with a reputable estate agent in Oxfordshire and a national

online property sales website, under the 'Interpretation' part of the UU. Furthermore, the Release Procedure mechanism, enabling the offer of plot(s) to the Council or housing provider, shall include sale terms at open market value in accordance with the valuation of not less than two RICs qualified surveyors of not least than 10 years' experience. This mechanism would ensure that the plots are being offered fairly to the Council or provider, and this would in turn deter the over-pricing of the plots for SBCH during the initial 24 month marketing of the plots. In this regard, an owner/applicant would be strongly deterred from over-pricing the plots during the extensive time period of the MS, if there is a corrective mechanism (the Release Procedure mechanism), after this, which would ensure the offer of the plot(s) to the Council or provider at a realistic market price.

28. A SBCH occupier could occupy their dwelling and then sell it onto another occupier shortly afterwards, but such a scenario would be unlikely. The attractiveness of SBCH is that occupiers invest time and expense in construction and designing their homes themselves for permanent occupation. Importantly, there is no evidence that this scenario occurs based on other SBCH schemes. Whilst the Council has numerous objections to the UU, it has to be read as a whole and for all the reasons indicated, the obligation requirements would ensure provision of SBCH based on the evidence before me. Accordingly, the obligation would meet the statutory tests of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2012 (as amended) and paragraph 57 of the Framework. In particular, the requirements are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it.

Other matters

29. The Council has an undisputed 5 year housing land supply and it has a housing Delivery Test result of 100%, January 2022, but such targets are not maximum quotas for housing. The contribution of two dwellings would make a small contribution to boosting supply. Such small-scale housing would be likely to be built quickly and would provide a wider choice in housing. It would also provide a boost to the local economy through its construction and local spend of residents. New residents would improve social cohesion through the expansion of the community. Such economic and social benefits would weigh in favour of the proposal.
30. Brock Cottage has a rear garden and swimming pool to the rear which would be adjacent to the main part of the appeal site. This amenity area would also adjoin the access drive leading to the proposed dwellings. To the side of this neighbouring dwelling and its neighbours, there would also be a passing area on the access drive. However, the dwellings would be likely to be a significant distance away from this property and whilst there would be traffic associated with the development, the frequency and level of vehicle movements for two dwellings would be small. Consequently, there would be no significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
31. Under Articles 8 and 1 (of the First Protocol) of the European Convention on Human Rights, as enshrined in Human Rights Act 1998, there would be interference with the occupier's rights in respect of private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of possessions respectively. These are qualified rights whereby interference may be justified in the public interest but the concept of

proportionality is crucial. Legitimate and well-founded planning policy requires the planning system to provide living accommodation for future generations and for the above reasons, the loss of privacy to the neighbours would not be significant. In the circumstances, the interference is therefore necessary and proportionate, and there would not be a violation of the residents' rights under Articles 8 and 1.

32. Based on the latest revised plans, there would be a turning area, within the main part of the site to be developed for the housing, and a widening of the access drive. Given this, the turning and passing areas would be acceptable. Any construction hindrances due to a telegraph pole and well would be matters for any developer of the site. There have been many proposals for housing in the area. However, proposals are considered on their particular planning merits, taking into account their particular nature, and therefore, if permission was to be granted, this decision for SBCH would not create a precedent for proposals elsewhere in the area.

Planning Balance

33. There would be harm to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies OS2, H2 and H5 of the LP, and the LP's strategy of directing development to settlements with greater facilities and services. There would be conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework makes clear that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led.
34. However, the Council has fallen well short of granting suitable planning permissions to meet the identified SBCH demand. Although the contribution to SBCH supply would be small, the extent of the shortfall, the statutory SBCH duty, and the identified economic and social benefits would cumulatively amount to substantial weight in the balance. For the reasons indicated, the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be small. As a result, material considerations would be of sufficient weight to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan and planning permission should be granted.

Conditions

35. Suggested conditions have been considered in light of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance. Some have been amended, shortened and amalgamated in the interests of clarity and precision taking into account the guidance. There are pre-commencement condition requirements for the approval of details where they are a pre-requisite to enable the development to be constructed. The appellant has raised no objection to these.
36. Conditions are attached limiting the life of the planning permission and set out the requirements of the submission of reserved matters in accordance with the Act. As access is a matter to be considered, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the plans is necessary in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt. A design code condition requirement is necessary to ensure satisfactory Plot Passport details as part of the MS contained in the UU, and the provision of SBCH. To safeguard trees on the site, a protection plan during works is necessary.

37. In the interests of biodiversity, conditions are required to prevent harm to wildlife during development works, provision of bat and bird wall integrated features, lighting details and ecological management of site features. Such conditions have been simplified and tailored proportionately given the scale of the development. In the interests of health and well-being of people, and the environment, a contamination condition is required to prevent pollution if found on the site. To prevent surface water flooding, a condition is necessary to secure acceptable drainage. In the interests of highway safety, conditions are necessary to require the provision of access, parking and other related matters, and a construction traffic management plan.
38. A ground/slab level condition is not necessary as this relates to the scale reserved matter. In the absence of any compelling evidence, it is not necessary to impose a condition requiring further details on sewage connection, electricity, foul water disposal and capacity. Public utility connections are essential living condition requirements that developers have to secure as a matter of course and, in this case, the provision of this is a technical matter between them and the utility companies. The satisfactory provision of broadband is a matter for future residents. A condition requirement relating to the provision of boundary treatments relates to the landscaping matter and therefore, it is not necessary. A condition requiring the occupiers of the dwellings to meet the definition of SBCH is not necessary given this is contained within UU.

Conclusion

39. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR

Schedule A

- 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 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A-01-001 Rev A; A-02-100 Rev B; A-02-101 Rev B and A-02-102 Rev A (in so far as they relate to the means of access).
- 5) No development shall commence until a Development Design Code has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Development Design Code shall set out the guiding principles to be applied in the design of any dwelling, associated structures, hard surfaces and landscaping to be constructed pursuant to this planning permission. The code shall include maximum building height, built form, appearance, materials, plot coverage, set back from plot boundaries, boundary treatment, access and parking facilities, protection of existing trees and hedges. The design of each dwelling the subject of this permission shall be developed in accordance with the approved Development Design Code.
- 6) No development shall commence until details of ecological protection measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The measures shall specify details that seek to prevent the killing or injuring of small mammals, nesting birds, reptiles and amphibians when the site is developed. All works, including demolitions and site clearance, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved measures.
- 7) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of retained trees, including fencing and appropriate working methods, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be strictly adhered to during the course of the works on the site. No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other materials shall take place inside the fenced tree protection area of the approved scheme.
- 8) No external walls shall be erected until details of integrated bat roosting and nesting bird nesting features within the walls of the new buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall include drawings showing the type of features, their locations within the site and their positions on the elevations of the buildings. For each dwelling, the approved details shall be implemented before first occupation and retained thereafter.

- 9) No external walls shall be erected until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations within the approved details, and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details. No other external lighting shall be installed without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
- 10) Before development is commenced, details of an landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such a plan shall include:
- (i) Description and evaluation of ecological features to be managed, including locations shown on a location plan;
 - (ii) Management aims and objectives;
 - (iii) Management Scheme, including details of how aims and objectives are to be achieved;
 - (iv) Maintenance regimes, including a work schedule (i.e. an annual work plan or matrix/table) capable of being rolled forward over a 5 to 10 year period);
 - (v) Details of how the management aims and objectives of the LEMP will be communicated to the occupiers of the development.

All works, including demolitions and site clearance, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved LEMP. The site shall thereafter be managed in accordance with LEMP.

- 11) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the permitted development, it shall be reported in writing immediately to the local planning authority. Thereafter, no further works shall take place on the site and until an investigation and risk assessment has taken place. Where remediation is necessary, no further works shall take place on the site and no dwelling shall be occupied until details of a Remediation Scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the development, hereby permitted, shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Remediation Scheme.
- 12) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until a full surface water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. A management plan shall set out how the drainage asset is to be maintained. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall be maintained in accordance with the management plan thereafter.
- 13) No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular accesses, driveways, car and cycle parking spaces, turning areas and parking areas to serve that dwelling have been constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in

accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 14) Occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted shall not take place until the means of access onto Burford Road has been constructed in accordance with the approved details. The visibility splays shown on the approved plans shall be kept free of any obstruction to visibility above 0.9m in height.
- 15) No development shall take place until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved CTMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period of the development.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

K Cooksley	W Legal
M Grimshaw	W Legal
C Bellinger	Consultumhome
J Mcdermott	Allbright Dene Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

C Wood	West Oxfordshire District Council
R Riding	West Oxfordshire District Council

THIRD PARTY

T Merriman	Local resident
H Merriman	Local resident
Councillor L Gobles	Brize Norton Parish Council
T Hinchly	Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT OR AFTER THE HEARING

1. Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Forms (Fourth to Sixth Base Periods).
2. Draft_S.106_Deed_Brock_Cottage_Land_042022_A3 Layout (002) 08.03.2022.docx
3. Draft_S.106_Deed_Brock_Cottage_Land_1024988-V4.docxs.
4. Draft_S.106_Deed_Brock_Cottage_Land_1024988-V4-clean.docx.
5. Draft_S.106_Deed_Brock_Cottage_Land_04222_A3 Layout (002)08.03.022.docx (another version).
6. West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2021, adopted June 2018.
7. Local Planning Authority Decision notice 08/0276/P/OP -Change of use from nursery to residential, dated 31 March 2008.
8. Dismissed appeal decision APP/D3125/A/08/2079575, reference Local Planning Authority decision 08/0276/P/OP, dated 29 October 2008, with plans.
9. Draft_S.106_Deed_Brock_Cottage_Land_1024988-V5-CLEAN (002).pdf.
10. Attendance List for Hearing, submitted 11 March 2022.

11. Completed Unilateral Undertaking dated 21 March 2022 with Obligations relating to Self-Build and Custom Build Dwellings.
12. West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) comments on the UU dated 4 April 2022.
13. Appellant's comments on WODC comments, dated 14 June 2022.