

John Ashton Consultancy

'Always thinking outside of the box'



Orchard House, 4a Wootton Village, Boars Hill, Oxford. OX1 5JL

PLANNING POLICY ANALYSIS
REGARDING PROVISION OF BRIDGE OVER RIVER TO LINK
AGRICULTURAL LAND AND ANIMAL SANCTUARY AND CREATE NEW
DRIVEWAY

LAND AT THE RETREAT & TIME OUT FARM MILL LANE ALVESCOT
OX18 2QJ

FOR Mr R. RHODES

NOVEMBER 2023

**PLANNING POLICY ANALYSIS REGARDING PROVISION OF BRIDGE
OVER RIVER TO LINK AGRICULTURAL LAND AND ANIMAL
SANCTUARY AND CREATE NEW DRIVEWAY LAND AT THE RETREAT
MILL LANE ALVESCOT OX18 2QJ**

(1) INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The Development Plan (DP) for the area is The West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 which was adopted 27th September 2018 (LP). It sets out the overall planning framework for the district from 2011-2031.

This document examines the Development Plan Policies relevant when considering the suitability of the site to accommodate a driveway and new bridge over the Shill brook to access the animal sanctuary (Time Out Farm) from The Retreat, Mill Lane, Alvescot. Both parcels of land are owned by the applicant.

This planning policy analysis must be read in conjunction with (1) The Heritage Appraisal produced by Worlledge Associates who have carefully studied the impact the development will have upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of any listed building, (2) the Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Edenvale Young to assess any risk from the development of any harmful increase in flooding, (3) Preliminary Ecology Appraisal prepared by Austin Foot Ecology, (4) Explanatory statement from John Welch and Stammers, solicitors summarising the background and the reasons for the bridge and (5) The Design and Access Statement.

The individual Reports mentioned above identify the policies relevant to their disciplines and therefore, to avoid repetition, not all those policies have been identified within this Report.

(2) THE MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

It is felt the main issues which will be raised from a planning perspective are :-

- Whether the site is an appropriate location for a driveway and bridge across the river having regard to planning policy;

- The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area including the character and appearance of the conservation area in which the site is located, and,
- The effect of the proposed development upon the setting of any nearby listed building
- Whether the development will have any demonstrable harmful impact upon flooding or ecology in the area.

(3) MATTERS OF FACT ALONG WITH MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

(3.1) The existing use at the site will not change

It is important to note that the animal sanctuary has existed at the site for twelve years via planning permission 11/0167. This use will not change as a result of the application proposal. The use will simply be accessed via The Retreat than Mill House.

(3.2) An earlier planning appeal granted planning permission for a bridge across the Shilbrook in a very similar location to the application proposal

It is also important to note that planning permission was granted at appeal by the planning inspectorate for a bridge in 2008 via appeal reference APP/D325/A/07/2058655 (local planning authority reference number 07/1012). The planning permission was never implemented and has therefore lapsed. **The Appeal Proposal crossed the river at a very similar point.** The driveway, however, was taken through the grounds of Mill House, which is the nearest listed building to the proposed development the subject of the planning application.

At the time of the earlier appeal, the inspector was never concerned about the setting of the listed building. The driveway was in fact, in 2007, proposed within the grounds of Mill House, which is the nearest listed building to the development. The driveway with the current planning application proposal is much further away from the listed building and consequently cannot have a harmful impact having regard to the inspector's view highlighted in 2007. Notwithstanding this, Worledge Associates have thoroughly assessed the impact upon the setting of the listed building and concluded and confirmed there is no harmful impact upon the setting of the listed building.

The bridge crosses the river in a very similar location to the 2007 proposal, it is now positioned slightly further west which is further away from the listed Mill House and usefully where there is a natural gap in the landscaping along with river so, no major trees are removed as a result of the proposal.

The inspector at the time of the earlier appeal identified as the main issue-

‘whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Alvescot conservation area’

He also stated within his consideration of the proposal –

“The appeal site is located on the edge of the Alvescot Conservation Area and is part of a small, isolated group of buildings set within riverside meadows, paddocks and gardens. In my opinion , this mixture of traditional buildings and open spaces contributes substantially to the overall character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed driveway would be within the Conservation Area whereas the bridge structure would be mainly outside. The driveway would be served by an existing vehicular access and gate in the stone, roadside wall and would wind across open land to a gap in the trees on the riverbank. I consider that the driveway would have little effect on its surroundings. Although it is likely to appear relatively stark when first laid, the gravel surface would soon mature and would blend into the background. The space which it crosses would remain open and views towards the river would not be obstructed.

The bridge would cross the widest part of the river. However, as a single deck without railings, it would substantially be hidden amongst the existing trees on the river bank. The local planning authority raises no objection to the materials employed in the construction of the deck and I agree that they would be appropriate in this setting. I have neither seen nor read any evidence which persuades me that the bridge would harm views into and out of the Conservation Area.

In these circumstances, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would, therefore, comply with Policies BE2, BE5 and NE1 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011.”

Whilst it is now a new adopted local plan the heritage policies are the same or similar. The trees and landscape generally around the site have matured considerably since the earlier appeal and as a result the application proposal will still be virtually hidden in the wider landscape.

(3.3) Other Consultant Reports

Both Edenvale Young and Austin Foot have carefully considered the environmental, flooding and ecological consequences for the proposed development and concluded that no demonstrable harm which warrants refusal of planning permission exists should the application proposal be implemented.

Positive pre application discussions with Officers at WODC

Pre- application discussions were held with Officers of WODC and careful regard has been had to those discussions. The Officers were encouraging regarding the proposals. They believed there was broad policy support for the proposal. The conservation team said 'there are no huge objections from our point of view'. A summary of their letter is detailed below:-

“Officers at this stage consider that there is broad policy support for the proposed works, however this is subject to other elements and considerations of the proposal. Officers would require a justification as to why the proposed works are going to make a positive contribution to the diversification and would continue to add value to the estate business.

Officers also acknowledge that there is a current access to Time Out Farm but there have been current legal battles with the access and Officers would recommend the submission of either letter summarising the case or the documents which can be submitted in confidence which would then be kept sensitive but are a material consideration of the application.

As the proposed works are within the Alvescot Conservation Area it is important to gain views from the Conservation Officer. They were in attendance to the meeting and have the below comments of the proposed scheme:

I think that the existing access doesn't really work for either landowner. I also think that the new bridge, whilst visually heavy around the deck, is nonetheless fairly low-lying, and shouldn't be too obtrusive in the wider scene.

So, there are no huge objections from our point of view

There will need to be further consideration of the Conservation Area and the proposed bridge and in particular the cutting through the open countryside and the undeveloped land from the existing access and the river in which the bridge will go over. It will need to be considered as to whether there is harm had to the Conservation Area and if so, whether the public benefits of the new bridge would be outweighed by any potential harms the works could have. Details of the proposed materials would need to be provided as part of any application and importantly the current use of the field and how it is proposed to be used going forward.

Whilst the existing access is already in place and the bridge is going over private road, OCC Highways will still need to be consulted and it is important that the application demonstrates that the current access is difficult to be used and why it cannot be used and why the alternative access is necessary.

As part of the pre-application, as the bridge is to go over the Shill Brook and there are records of protected species in this area, Officers have deemed it appropriate to gain their comments during this application as per below:

The applicant has already confirmed a PEA will be undertaken and submitted with any future planning application. Whilst this assessment will provide an overview of the habitats present and the species that are likely to exploit these habitats, given the sensitivity of the site, phase 2 surveys may be required. The PEA along with any phase 2 surveys should be submitted to the LPA as an ecological impact assessment report (EclA), all survey work should be completed by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist following best practice guidelines. It is likely mitigation will be required, this can be submitted with the

planning application or dealt with via a condition however, this would need to be a prior to commencement condition and would need to be discharged prior to Natural England granting any licences which many need to be obtained in order for works to proceed lawfully.

Officers acknowledge that the applicants have engaged in initial communication with the Environment Agency and they have advised informally that the principle is broadly acceptable. Officers would however strongly encourage the applicants to enter into discussions with the final bridge design in place. The Environment Agency are experiencing significant delays and should there be any objections to the proposed scheme, this would elongate the process even further. Officers would also be required to consult with the WODC Flood Risk Engineers in respect to this application and they have not yet been consulted.

No consultations with the Landscape and Forestry Officer has been had at this stage, and Officers do not warrant an LVIA at this stage, however it would be important to detail if there are any trees to be removed and the Officer would be consulted during a full application.”

The Environment Agency (EA) have confirmed that the principle of a new bridge is acceptable. As a result, Edenvale Young have worked up the detail of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which they are confident meets all the EA requirements

(3.4) Applicants legal advisors’ summary note expounding the issues resulting since 2016 and the applicants use of the only access to Time Out Farm

The applicants’ legal advisors John Welch and Stammers (JWS) have acted for the applicant since 2019 however, they have been able to detail matters (described by JWS as ‘legal battles’) which have resulted over access way issues between the two parties.

These details are submitted at the request of WODC to provide some background and context to the application proposal. It is the Officers intention to keep the information confidential. However the content of the letter would be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application.

The current owners have owned the access, and Mill House since 2016. The owner of Time Out Farm (currently the applicant) has been granted under legal conveyance in 1973 an unrestricted right of way over the road ‘at all times and for all purposes with or without motor vehicles’.

JWS confirm Time Out Farm has, as a working farm, and then an animal sanctuary had long standing use of long and heavy vehicles using the accessway such as tractors and trailers and delivery vehicles.

The JWS letter details the obstructions and difficulties the applicant had to deal with using the accessway. It then provides a brief chronology of the dispute itself.

(4) THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES OF RELEVANCE

The local planning authority have identified a number of policies which it feels might be relevant in the determination of the application proposal, these are OS2, OS4, E2, EH3, EH7, T2, EH10, EH11, OS1. The applicant has looked at each of those policies below and commented upon the planning merits of the development having regard to each of those policies.

OS2- locating development in the right places –

Alvescot is a village as defined by this policy. The policy is mainly concerned with the delivery of housing by the conversion of existing buildings or the building of new housing. The application proposal is not proposing any new housing at the site. The policy does support limited development in villages like Alvescot where it respects the village character and local distinctiveness. **The heritage assessment prepared by Worlledge Associates along with the appeal history relating to the site and adjoining sites confirm that a new bridge development would not be harmful.. The inspector considered that the driveway at the time of the appeal would have little effect on its surroundings. The bridge the inspector felt would be substantially hidden amongst the existing trees on the river bank. Both these statements apply with regard to the application proposal today.** The inspector confirmed the local planning authority raises no objection to the materials employed in the construction of the deck at the time of the appeal and the inspector agreed that the driveway and bridge would be appropriate in this setting. He confirmed that he had neither seen nor read any evidence which persuades me that the bridge would harm views into and out of the Conservation Area. **The conservation team at WODC have confirmed that *the new bridge, whilst visually heavy around the deck, is nonetheless fairly low-lying, and shouldn't be too obtrusive in the wider scene.*** As a result of the above it is possible to advance the application proposal accords with this local plan policy.

OS4- high quality design-

Worlledge Associates have included reference to this policy within their heritage analysis report. Please refer to their analysis and report for the result of this policy assessment. The Design and Access Statement includes a summary of the Worlledge Associates Heritage Report and Impact Assessment.

The Design and Access Statement explains the bridge makeup, materials used along with the reasons why the particular location was chosen for the bridge to cross the river.

E2- supporting rural economy-

The planners have suggested that this policy maybe a key policy relevant to the application proposal. However, the application proposal is not a new employment site. There are no new or replacement buildings proposed. The existing use at the site

will not change in any way and the proposal is not a diversification of a use. There is not a farm shop proposed. The applicant does not consider this policy a main policy associated with the development.

It is possible to say that without this development, the subject of the application proposal, the current use at the site may well struggle to keep providing the valuable service it does. As a result, it can be said the application proposal accords with this policy.

EH3- biodiversity-

This policy is addressed specifically in the ecology report prepared Austin Foot. A summary of their report is below:-

Austin Foot ecologists were appointed in order to gather baseline information on the existing ecological conditions within the site. The detailed report is attached to the planning application submission. An Ecological Assessment (EA) was commissioned by the applicant, including a desk study and field survey comprising a UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) survey and an initial water vole survey. This provided information on the range of habitats currently present within the site along with any features of ecological interest, or potential interest, including the possible presence of protected or otherwise notable habitats and species. This information was used to highlight potential ecological constraints and opportunities associated with the proposed bridge and access road construction works.

The main aims of the report was to:

- Confirm the outcome of the review of biological records obtained during the desk study;
- Describe the habitats present within the site;
- Assess the potential for the site to support protected or notable species;
- Set out the legislative and/or policy protection afforded to any habitats present or and species potentially associated with the site;
- Present an assessment of any potential ecological impacts of the proposed works based on the survey findings and current proposals;
- Provide recommendations for any further surveys if considered necessary; and
- Provide recommendations for potential mitigation, compensation and/or enhancement measures to ensure that the proposed works will remain acceptable in planning terms and maximise benefits to biodiversity where possible.

The conclusion of the field survey and desk top is-

The field survey in conjunction with the desk study indicates that, with the application of appropriate mitigation measures, there are no significant issues which would prevent the proposed bridge construction.

Considerations which need to be taken into account include the potential presence of water voles, otters, common reptiles, amphibians, common nesting birds, foraging/commuting bats, potential presence of non-native crayfish and the presence of a non-native invasive plant species. The Shill Brook is a habitat of principal importance. The works are also situated within a Conservation Target Area and a Local Key Area for water vole conservation. However, **as the extent of works is limited to a small footprint, and the bridge is not expected to significantly alter the character of the stream or adjacent habitats, there should be no substantive change to the ecological function of these habitats or the local area.**

They consider the proposal in the context of the NPPF and the local planning authority policy (E3) and having regard to their conclusions referred to above the proposal accords with local plan policy and the NPPF. If the Local authority feel that reasonable planning conditions can be attached to any planning permission specifically relating to ecology then the applicant would not have an in principle problem with this. He would however like to discuss these in advance..

EH7- flooding

This policy is addressed specifically in the detailed flood risk assessment prepared by Edenvale Young along with the requirements of the NPPF.

The flood risk assessment has prepared alongside it a hydraulic model as no modelling existed for this section of the watercourse. The extent of modelling was agreed with the Environment Agency (EA) in advance.

Pre application advice was sought with the EA who confirmed"-

' We have no objection in principle with a new proposed bridge in this location. However, you will need to demonstrate that the new bridge does not increase flood risk or negatively impact the ecology of the Shill brook."

The EA confirmed the soffit height of the bridge should be 300mm above the Central (climate change) allowance.

In conclusion Edenvale Young say within their report-

The results of the hydraulic modelling have been used to determine soffit levels for the bridge and evaluate the risk for a 1% AEP event with a 30% allowance for climate change, as well as 5% and 1% AEP events. Based on this work, the following conclusions have been made:

- The proposed bridge will span the Shill Brook and is therefore located within the 1 in 20 year flood extent, equivalent to the Flood Zone 3b.
- Bridges are Water Compatible development and are acceptable within Flood Zone 3b.
- On the assumption that there will be a ramp on the floodplain leading to the bridge, and that the river cross section at the bridge location is not reduced, then there will be no noticeable impact on flood risk at the site or elsewhere.
- The flood risk from surface water, sewer, tide, groundwater, and reservoirs are not considered significant or relevant to this site of interest.

- Upstream sources of debris should be borne in mind although the elevation and clear span construction-type of the proposed bridge means that risk of blockage or debris strike is low.

By setting the bridge soffit at the recommended elevation (see below), the bridge deck will not interact with flood flows. Additionally, the modelling has shown that the ramp to the bridge will have no influence on water levels and does not impede flows or increase flood risk elsewhere. As discussed earlier, final bridge design has been undertaken after conclusion of the modelling exercise, which means that alignment and gradient of the bridge ramp vary slightly from the configuration that has been modelled. It is considered that the variation in design is sufficiently minor that this would cause negligible difference in results and the conclusions of the modelling exercise would still stand.

Edenvale Young's recommendation is-

Based on hydraulic modelling and review of other flood risk related information, the following recommendations are made:

- The bridge soffit should be set at an elevation at least 300mm above 81.43m AOD which is the peak water level for a 1% AEP plus 30% allowance for climate change. This equates to a design soffit level of 81.73m AOD.
- There is no change to the existing channel geometry. On the basis of the above recommendations, it is considered that the proposed structure meets the requirements of the NPPF.

It is considered the EA will agree with the Edenvale Young report along with their conclusions and recommendations and it will be shown that the bridge proposal complies in all respects with flooding requirements identified in planning policy including that in the NPPF.

T2- highway improvement scheme.

Regarding highway matters, there is no change to the level and type of vehicles which currently use the site and have used the site for a considerable number of years. Please see the supporting statement from John Welch and Stammers, the applicant's solicitor. There is no expansion of the use, it is simply a new bridge and access to replace the existing.

EH10 Conservation Area

This policy is addressed specifically in the heritage appraisal prepared by Worlledge Associates. The reader is advised to study the heritage report and it will be shown that the application proposal accords with the heritage policies in the local plan and the NPPF. The Design and Access Statement includes a summary of the Worlledge Associates Heritage Report and Impact Assessment.

EH11- Listed Buildings

This policy is addressed specifically in the heritage appraisal prepared by Worlledge Associates. The reader is advised to study the heritage report and it will be shown that the application proposal accords with the heritage policies in the local plan and the

NPPF. The Design and Access Statement includes a summary of the Worlledge Associates Heritage Report and Impact Assessment.

OS1- Sustainable Development-

There are no policies in the local plan which speak against the application proposal. There are a number of policies identified above which speak in favour of the application proposal. A number of the material considerations identified in this statement are significant and speak in favour of the application proposal, namely the planning history at the site including the adjoining site where a similar bridge was approved, plus the conservation team at WODC have confirmed that the proposal would not be too obtrusive in the wider scene. The applicants' lawyers statement is also a material planning consideration which speaks in favour of the application proposal. The application proposal can therefore be seen as sustainable development and supported accordingly.

(5) PLANNING POLICY CONCLUSIONS

The main issues to have regard to from a planning perspective are identified early within this report, they are :-

- Whether the site is an appropriate location for a driveway and bridge across the river having regard to planning policy;
- The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area including the character and appearance of the conservation area in which the site is located, and,
- The effect of the proposed development upon the setting of any nearby listed building
- Whether the development will have any demonstrable harmful impact upon flooding or ecology in the area.

The existing use of the site will not change and, this exists by way of an authorised planning permission granted under planning reference number 11/0167. As a result, there will be no increase in size and number of vehicles servicing the site.

An earlier planning appeal reference APP/D325/A/07/2058655 was granted for more or less the same development on an adjoining site serving Time Out Farm. The appeal was granted planning permission however it was never implemented, and the permission has since lapsed.

The bridge crosses the river in a very similar location to the 2007 proposal, it is now positioned slightly further west which is further away from the listed Mill House and usefully where there is a natural gap in the landscaping along with river so, no major trees are removed as a result of the proposal.

The bridge would cross the widest part of the river. However, as a single deck without railings, it would substantially be hidden amongst the existing trees on the

river bank. The local planning authority raises no objection to the materials employed in the construction of the deck and the inspector at the time of the earlier appeal agreed that they would be appropriate in this setting.

On the first issue therefore a thorough assessment was undertaken, at the time of the earlier appeal, of the environment and the impact the bridge and driveway may have. The landscape around the site has matured considerably since then and the proposal now will be even more hidden by natural landscape. As a result, the application proposal would be an appropriate location for the development in line with planning policy and therefore accords with the first main issue.

On the second issue, the appeal site is located on the edge of the Alvescot Conservation Area and is part of a small, isolated group of buildings set within riverside meadows, paddocks, and gardens. In the opinion of the earlier inspector, this mixture of traditional buildings and open spaces contributes substantially to the overall character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The previous inspector said the proposed driveway would be within the Conservation Area whereas the bridge structure would be mainly outside. The driveway would be served by an existing vehicular access and gate and would wind across open land to a gap in the trees on the riverbank. The inspector considers that the driveway would have little effect on its surroundings. Although he felt it is likely to appear relatively stark when first laid, the gravel surface would soon mature and would blend into the background. The space which it crosses would remain open and views towards the river would not be obstructed.

The inspector confirmed the bridge would cross the widest part of the river. He confirmed it would substantially be hidden amongst the existing trees on the riverbank. He also confirmed the local planning authority raised no objection to the materials employed in the construction of the deck and he agreed that they would be appropriate in this setting. He said he had neither seen nor read any evidence which persuades me that the bridge would harm views into and out of the Conservation Area.

In these circumstances, he concluded on the main issue that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would, therefore, comply with Policies BE2, BE5 and NE1 of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011."

The reader is asked to study the Heritage Report and Impact Assessment accompanying this planning application, a summary of the Report is included in The Design and Access Statement. This report assesses the current application proposal having regard to contemporary planning policy including Central Government Policy.

Whilst it is now a new adopted local plan the heritage policies are the same or similar. The trees and landscape generally around the site have matured

considerably since the earlier appeal and as a result the application proposal will still be virtually hidden in the wider landscape. As a result the applicant believes the application proposal accords with the second main issue.

With regard the third issue, at the time of the earlier appeal, the inspector was never concerned about the setting of the listed building. The driveway was in fact in 2007 within the grounds of Mill House, which is the nearest listed building to the development. The driveway with the current planning application proposal is much further away from the listed building and consequently cannot have a harmful impact having regard to the inspectors view highlighted in 2007. Notwithstanding this, Worledge Associates have thoroughly assessed the impact upon the setting of the listed building and concluded and confirmed there is no harmful impact upon the setting of the listed building.

The bridge crosses the river in a very similar location to the 2007 proposal, it is now positioned slightly further west which is further away from the listed Mill House and usefully where there is a natural gap in the landscaping along with river so, not major trees are removed as a result of the proposal. As a result the application proposal accords with the third main issue

The reader is asked to study the Heritage Report and Impact Assessment accompanying this planning application, a summary of the Report is included in The Design and Access Statement. This report assesses the current application proposal having regard to contemporary planning policy including Central Government Policy.

With regard to the fourth main issue this has been visited in detail by Edenvale Young with their flood risk assessment and their hydraulic modelling for the river along with the ecology report prepared by Austin Foot. Both reports conclude the application proposal accords with the relevant planning policies identified . if necessary reasonable planning conditions can be attached to any planning permission. **The applicant therefore believes the proposal fully accords with the fourth main issue**

(6) OVERALL PLANNING SUMMARY /CONCLUSION

The Design and Access Statement along with this Planning Statement shows:-

- (1) Why the planning application is submitted and illustrates the process which led to the application proposal
- (2) What the planning application includes
- (3) The relevant planning history at and near to the site which is material. A previous planning appeal was granted for a bridge and driveway in a very similar location to where the bridge is now proposed. The inspector at the time did not consider the bridge would harm the setting of the nearby listed building, neither would it harm the character and setting of the conservation area in which it is partly located.

- (4) The significant material considerations which speak in favour of the application submission. The applicant's lawyer has confirmed the applicant has the right of unrestricted access the lawyer has also produced compelling evidence by way of a statement to explain the battles the applicant has had with the owner of the access road to prevent the applicant from properly using the access legitimately and why the new bridge and driveway is so desperately required.
- (5) The design principles and the concepts which have been applied.
- (6) The information submitted with the planning application and explained above and within The Design and Access Statement is clear, that the use of the site will in no way change. The existing animal sanctuary use at the site will in no way change to what currently exists at the site via a lawful planning permission under planning reference 11/0167. There will be no change in vehicle movements from and to the site. The size and function of the vehicles which visit the site and service the site will not change. The development proposal is simply a new bridge and driveway. The driveway will extend the existing hard surface area at the Retreat and the extended gravel drive will be laid at the Retreat. The existing access for the Retreat will be used by those vehicles which current service the Sanctuary. The existing access to the Retreat already serves agricultural and paddock land along with a commercial and agricultural storage building used by the applicant.
- (7) Following a detailed impact assessment and heritage appraisal the bridge and driveway will not affect either the heritage significance of the listed building or the special character of the Alvescot Conservation Area.

The Planning Policy assessment shows the application proposal fully accords with the four main issues identified, the application proposal accords with development plan policies of relevance to the proposal.

The application proposal will ensure the continued safe and long-term use of the animal sanctuary and ensure the applicants long term wellbeing is preserved by removing unnecessary conflict each time the applicants try to access or egress the sanctuary. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that planning permission should be granted for the application proposal.

