

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Individual comments C Gray; M S Jones; P King; M El-Masri; A Bowdery; M Devitt and W Knowland; N Billson; L Beetham; J P Robinshaw; Mr & Mrs Robins; M Kainth; C A & R Smith; G and G Paton; M Wise; P J Little; D Palmer; P and C Russell; U Vickers; G Thomson; E Doleman; L Sloan; C Murison and P Lusica; M Foxtan; I Thomson; J Mattingley; Mr & Mrs Hellel; F Hancock; Mr & Mrs Bowdery</p> <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for 50% affordable housing • Object to this site being allocated for housing • Return to First Deposit plan proposal for 60 dwellings. Local need can't have changed from 60 to 400 in such a short time. • Affordable housing is not addressed by SPG for Faringdon as is the case for Grove • Given Faringdon existing social structure it is considered the maximum level of social rented should be 20% and 20% on low cost housing to buy. • 50% affordable housing does not represent the socio-economic mix of the town • 50% social housing is too high. Faringdon already has a large number of flats and affordable sized property. • The high proportion of social housing will alter the structure of the town. Concentration will lead to a ghetto style estate in a small rural town • 50% affordable housing should be replaced with a percentage determined according to circumstances of each site • Object to the large number of social housing as it will lead to added pressures on services • Clarification is needed on exact nature of affordable housing and who it is for • Local housing requirements should be met and not Abingdon's or Oxfords • Affordable homes should not be distributed evenly; there is room to ensure the affordable housing is not adjacent to existing private homes. Purchasers of private homes on new development will be able to choose to purchase adjacent to affordable homes. • There is no guidelines on how the affordable housing should be split between low cost/shared ownership/social housing • Faringdon is short of private and shared ownership homes and the % should be increased • Object to 50% of housing being 2 bedroom or less • If 50% of new homes are 2 bedrooms or less this will result in started home which will harm the ambiance and value of my home • What social services provision is to be made for those from poorer areas of Oxford and Abingdon who have moved away from families and friends 	<p>Recommendation: Para 2.3 bullet point 3 first line delete 50% and insert 40%.</p> <p>The amount, location and type of housing proposed at Faringdon is not a matter for Supplementary Planning Guidance. These issues are dealt with by policies in the Local Plan. Supplementary Planning Guidance cannot revisit local plan policies but must be prepared within the policy context it sets. The purpose of Supplementary Planning Guidance is to provide additional detail on how the local plan policies will be applied to this particular site.</p> <p>Many of the more detailed comments on housing received from individuals and summarised in this schedule, relate to also policy issues dealt with in the Local Plan e.g. the number and location of houses, the amount and distribution of affordable housing, the density of development and the number of one and two bedroom units. The Supplementary Planning Guidance must be consistent with the local plan on these issues and cannot change or vary the policy context.</p> <p>The type of affordable housing on the site e.g. the split between shared ownership and rented will be set out in more detail in the revised Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing. An assessment of housing need which will be carried out at the time a planning application is submitted will also be relevant. To be consistent with the proposed modifications to the Local Plan, the level of affordable housing on the site referred to in para. 2.3, bullet point 3 will need to be reduced from 50% to 40%.</p> <p>Of all the sites on the edge of Faringdon assessed for development this site was considered the most sustainable and had the best linkages to services and facilities.</p> <p>The Health Authority have been consulted on the proposed development at Faringdon and whilst current indications are that no land needs to be allocated for additional health facilities, they may require contributions to enhance their services at the development stage. No information has yet been received from the Health Authority on the contributions they will be seeking to cope with additional demand.</p> <p>Lifetime homes standard, is a design criteria which ensures that homes are designed flexibly enough to meet the needs of most householders with a minimum of</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>and social support to Faringdon eg social workers, educational psychologists and other support groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the majority of the housing is for low income or disabled and the site is on the edge of town, the distance into town may prove prohibitive for disabled people or those with small children, use of cars would increase traffic and people on low income would find car parking fees prohibitive. • What are lifetime homes! • Objection to the large number of houses • Developments should be spread to other sites in the town • A density of 25 dwellings per hectare would be more appropriate, on a rural site overlooking a park • Housing proposal is 666% increase on original proposal in the First Deposit Local Plan • Additional dwellings proposed on this site should be deleted and redistributed to land north of Grove, as the scale of development is neither appropriate or sustainable in this location • Density is too great and even with best efforts will have a highly urban to hard edge • Arrival of 2000 people will unbalance the town <p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape buffers and tree belts will only affectively reduce the impact of the housing development in the summer months • The land proposed for housing should be protected on environmental grounds as it is home to badgers and voles • Housing extension will be very visible and destroy the character of and be environmentally damaging to Folly Hill • Object to para 5.6 as the hedge along Berners Way and to rear of Spinage Close and Wessex Close has not been included as a hedgerow to be retained, it is a habitat for a wide variety of wildlife • Urgent ecological impact survey is required especially on the effects on toads • Para 3.5 does not include the significance of existing flora and fauna • The site is of great natural wealth and beauty which should be available to existing residents and visitors. Pond had a unique and picturesque setting which should be available to all 	<p>adaptation.</p> <p>400 homes represent an approximately 15% increase in the number of dwellings in the town. This is a proportionate increase comparable with the other main towns in the District.</p> <p>Recommendation: i) after para 3.6 add new para as follows “A detailed ecological study of the site should be carried out in May. The study should identify important features which should be retained and or any mitigation measures which will be necessary.”</p> <p>ii) amend plan attached to SPG to include the hedge behind Spinage Close as an important feature to be retained.</p> <p>It is accepted that in Winter planting is less effective than in summer at helping screen the impact of development on the landscape. Nevertheless this site has many landscape features which should be retained as part of its development, as this will help to reduce the impact of the development on the landscape and assist in giving the new development a sense of identity.</p> <p>With regard to any ecological interests on the site it is proposed to add an extra paragraph to the Supplementary Planning Guidance after para. 3.6 requesting the submission of a full ecological study in May. The study should identify any important features on the site which should be retained and/or any mitigation measures which may be necessary.</p> <p>It is agreed that the existing hedge to the rear of Spinage Close should be retained as an important landscape feature in the development. It is proposed to amend the plan attached to the SPG accordingly.</p> <p>The existing lake in Folly Park will be retained and access will continue to be available to the public. The</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Design & Layout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New houses on the boundaries of the development adjacent to Spinage Close, Berners Way, Wessex Close, Tuckers Park and Nursery View should face into the development to ensure existing residents maintain maximum privacy • Boundary of new development should be 100m or more from boundary of Nursery View • Will existing residents have a say on the layout and how boundaries are formed • As the development will be visible from the A420 the design and layout of the development should be to a high standard • The extension of housing up the hill will be very visible and will destroy the character of the general view of Folly Hill. It is important this area is kept green and planted with trees to soften the line of Nursery View • The urban grain of the area should be identified so the relevant urban design criteria can be accommodated when planning the area • Additional reference to layout should mention traditional street patterns and town layout principles as have historically existed in the town. Historic street patterns may be replicated or given regard to in the creation of a distinctive and new area of Faringdon • How will a parking standard of 1.5 space per property be achieved on a development for first time buyers and affordable housing – parking is a huge problem in Faringdon • Buildings greater than 2 storeys would be entirely out of keeping with historic Faringdon. The number of houses to be built should be reduced to ensure all new buildings are 2 storey • All new development should be in-keeping with existing skyline and storey height of surrounding properties. • Needs more specific details of the site rather than the sketches provided • Need to define 'sense of place' • Will work to drainage ditches cause disruption, how long will it take, what protection do existing home owners get 	<p>Supplementary Planning Guidance also envisages that the setting of the lake should be maintained by requiring the surrounding mature trees are retained.</p> <p>Recommendation: 1) para 4.1 second line after heritage add “including its traditional street pattern, delete “and”.</p> <p>2) Para 5.4 3rd line after buildings insert of ‘2½ storey’ and delete ‘some’ and insert ‘a limited number in’.</p> <p>The precise location and direction houses face will be one of the matters dealt with at the detailed planning application stage. However, it is important that the park, open spaces and footpath links are overlooked to ensure the public realm is enhanced and to help create a safe environment.</p> <p>As the land behind Nursery View is elevated it is proposed to include it within an extension to Folly Park. This will provide the opportunity to enhance the footpath link and also plant a buffer to reduce the visual impact of Nursery View in the landscape.</p> <p>Existing residents will have a chance to comment when the revisions to the Supplementary Planning Guidance are published, and also when the planning applications are submitted.</p> <p>The urban grain of Faringdon should be assessed as part of the contextual analysis required in paragraph 4.6 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance. A reference to historic street patterns could be added to the guidance at para 4.1. Car parking standards will need to comply with Oxfordshire County Council’s current standards.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the Supplementary Planning Guidance to make it more explicit that only a limited number of 2½ storey dwellings may be acceptable in less prominent locations on the site in order to give variety and interest in the development.</p> <p>‘A sense of place’ can be created by a development that has local identity where important features on the site have been retained or the new development includes details which are typical of the local area.</p> <p>As part of the background design work for the development of the site a drainage study will need to be prepared by the developers. The study should ensure any disruption to existing residents is kept to a minimum.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of this Supplementary Planning Guidance to prepare a detailed design for the site, but to provide guidance for the developers to take into account during the design process. Further consultation will be carried out on these details at the planning application stage.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Services & Infrastructures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detail is given on what improvements there would be in services or facilities to support the increase in population. • Development is too large for town's limited infrastructure. • There is no attempt to detail how an increase in population would be supported by a commensurate improvement in the town's facilities unlike for Grove. • Faringdon cannot cater for the needs of current residents and will not be able to cope with influx of new people. • There is no infrastructure in Faringdon to accommodate the number of houses in terms of education, health services, social services, community leisure and sports facilities. Town needs a skate board park, there is inadequate nursery provision, and shops will not cope. There is no NHS dentist. Doctors surgery will need enlarging schools will needs extra funding. Youth club should be set up for children of all ages. Current leisure facilities are inadequate leisure centre is dirty un-kept and badly managed and too expensive. Streets are dirty, recycling is inadequate no provision for youths leads to petty crime and loutish behaviour. Need full time police station working 24 hours a day. Bus service to larger towns is inadequate. Existing water pressure is low. Faringdon has no drug or alcohol rehabilitation services, lacks adequate physiotherapy and has no chiropody facilities. • No mention is made in para. 7.4 of pre-school or police provision, impact on medical, ambulance, nursing, health visiting services, social services, provision of teenage support services, postal services. Support provision of bus shelters but there is a limited bus service, no direct bus links to out of hours centre at Witney and Didcot or Social Services in Abingdon or Radcliffe Hospital. Bus services to surrounding towns with more and larger shops is inadequate. Consideration should be given for other healthcare providers as well as GP's for the increased population e.g. dentists and community nursing teams. Contributions to Oxfordshire County Council should be addressed first and not later. • What is meant by contributions towards the community bus and community centre in para 7.6? • Faringdon already has severe parking problems increased number of cars will have a huge impact on the town. The access to the site is a considerable distance from the shops therefore most residents will shop out of town, so the town will not regenerate. • Infrastructure should be put in place before development takes place. 	<p>As already mentioned above the scale of development proposed at Faringdon is not a matter for Supplementary Planning Guidance but is a policy matter dealt with in the Local Plan.</p> <p>As part of the background work on the Supplementary Planning Guidance all service providers have been contacted with a request for information on how the new development will impact on their services. No service provider has indicated that the additional development cannot be accommodated, but in many cases financial contributions will be required from the developers to augment existing services. The list of services to which contributions will be sought are set out in paras 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the guidance. Whilst details have been provided by Oxfordshire County Council, the District and Town Councils, no information has been received from the Area Health Authority.</p> <p>The Town Council are seeking contributions towards the Community Bus and Community Centre the details of which will be assessed at the time the planning application is submitted.</p> <p>Off all the land assessed on the edge of Faringdon this site was considered to have the best footpath and cycle links to the existing and proposed services. This should reduce the need to travel into Faringdon by car.</p> <p>The timing of contributions from the developer to enhance Faringdon's infrastructure will be set out in a legal agreement accompanying the planning permission for the site.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Extension to Folly Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any extension to Folly Park is supported. • Will existing car park be extended? • Folly Park on the map does not appear to be accurate. • Land between Nursery View and the Park is currently used by the public, paths form a circular walk. • Need to ensure park is looked after, existing park is overgrown and bins are not emptied. • Folly Park should be extended more than is shown on the map, to include the proposed housing land which is to intrusive to the park will greatly impact on existing residents. • The brief fails to strike a balance between new development and retained open land to form an extension to Folly Park, development should be deleted to retain more open space. • Park will be close to noise and pollution from A420. • Proposed housing is too intrusive and will impact on existing resident's view of the park and surrounding countryside. • The land up the hill towards Tuckers Road and Nursery View would make a better extension to Folly Park. It would act like a large village green and serve Tuckers Road. Nursery View and a lower density housing estate on the Old Nursery, Jespers Hill will require a lot more work to make a pleasant place, trees will take 15 years to have any impact. (Major drainage will be required). The land south of Nursery View contains specimen trees and is an important environmental site especially for toads who migrate across it. • Jespers Hill is geologically unsuitable for building and grass will not grow why not use the proposed housing site as a park. • Proposed extension to park is on flat, uninteresting land which is marshy in winter and cracked in summer. • Object because the extension to Folly Park will not serve the community as intended for 10 years due to its geology and location. • Park should be left on the hill and developed as a wetland environment. • The extension to the park already exists. • Objection to proposed extension of Folly Park as will incorporate dead land and deprive existing residents of an open green, should revert back to original plan for Folly Park. • Extension to park would remove a link to a built up area. • Paths already exist and would be destroyed by building work. • Involves destruction of ecologically sensitive site no consideration of serious environmental impact on wildlife. • Extension will not be adequate for youth, who 	<p>Recommendation: after para 5.9 add new para 5.10 as follows: "A noise survey to PPG24 and BS4142 standards and a contamination survey will be necessary at an early stage in the preparation of a design for the site."</p> <p>It is unlikely that the existing car park to Folly Park will need to be extended. However a new car park will be provided in association with the new cricket facility, off Stanford Road. The existing Folly Park is shown accurately on the plan attached to the Supplementary Planning Guidance. Land south of Nursery View which was part of the former nursery is privately owned and legally the public have no right of access. The existing paths that run across the land could be stopped up at anytime. However, it is intended that the layout of the new development will retain many of these paths and create new ones all of which will come into public ownership. It is agreed the new park should be maintained and contributions will be sought from the developers for this purpose.</p> <p>The extent and location of the proposed housing and extension to Folly Park were matters dealt with in the Local Plan and cannot be revisited in the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>As part of the detailed work required before a planning application is submitted, the developers will be expected to carry out a noise and contamination survey. A new para has been suggested for inclusion in the Supplementary Planning Guidance to cover this requirement.</p> <p>There is no intention to build on Jespers Hill. Because of its prominence in the landscape it is considered to be more suitable as an extension to the park rather than for housing. It is proposed that the cricket facility and extension to the park should be laid out before it is handed over to the Council.</p> <p>The developers will be expected to carry out an ecological study of the site at an early stage in the design process.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>will use Folly Hill which will become over-subscribed and eroded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the plans to extend the park were well received locally why did no one know about them. • Will the current access to Folly Park be enough for the new cricket ground. <p>Cricket Pitch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resiting the cricket pitch would cause problems in Stanford Road. Already difficult for cars to use due to collapsing banks and the growth of vegetation. • Increase in traffic in Stanford Road will compromise safety. • There appears to be no provision for parking at the cricket pitch. • Cricket ground will be close to noise and pollution from A420. • No housing should be built until 5 years after the new cricket pitch has been laid down as it takes this long for the surface to 'bed down' so there is no disruption to the Cricket Club. • Proposed site for cricket ground is not appropriate. It will be an unnatural looking field at the base of the Folly and have drainage problems. Suggest Cricket Club should move to the leisure centre area where there are redundant fields. • Moving the cricket pitch will result in a cricket pavilion and parking which conflicts with plans aim of keeping buildings to a minimum. • Developers will take the view what is needed is a football pitch, which would be a very artificial feature and detract from the view of Folly Hill. • Cricket pitch would be better sited on the land allocated for employment. <p>Access & Permeability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can it be confirmed that there will only be one main access into the site and no access from Nursery View and Tuckers Road. Access via these routes would be strongly opposed by local residents. • Support for main access point being off Park Road only. No other viable option for 400 dwellings. • Support deletion of proposed access suggested in First Deposit Draft Local plan for access via Spinage Close, and Berners Way. • Object to vehicular access from Stanford Road, Tuckers Road. Berners Way, Spinage Close and Nursery View to the new development, these roads are already busy additional traffic would lead to safety problems. • Objection to thoroughfare from Park Road to Stanford Road or through Tuckers Road or Nursery View will lower security. Stanford Road could not cope particularly the junction with 	<p>Oxfordshire County Council who are the Highway Authority have no objection to the proposed new cricket facility being accessed off Stanford Road. It is proposed that a new car park, to Oxfordshire County Council's standards will be provided for the cricket facility adjacent to Stanford Road. The new cricket ground may be closer to the A420 but it will have a better access, car park and pavilion than the existing. Development on the existing cricket ground will not be permitted until after the new pitch is playable.</p> <p>The only building associated with the new cricket pitch will be a pavilion and this will need to be carefully sited to have a minimum impact on the landscape.</p> <p>There are no proposals to build a football pitch on Jespers Hill, pitches already exist elsewhere in the town.</p> <p>The location of land allocated for employment and the extension to Folly Park are policy matters covered in the Local Plan and cannot be revisited in the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>Recommendation: Plan attached to Supplementary Planning Guidance delete proposed footpath/cycle link between development site and Tuckers Road.</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Guidance at para 4.8 states the main access to the site will be west of the Esso garage, on Park Road. If this access cannot accommodate all the development it may be possible to create a second access 120 metres west of the A420 roundabout. However, it is essential pedestrian and cycle linkages should be provided as shown on the plan on the Supplementary Planning Guidance, in order to ensure the development integrates with the existing community and has good access to services and facilities. Oxfordshire County Council may require that a vehicular emergency access is provided to the site.</p> <p>There is no intention to take vehicular access to the development site from any of the adjoining residential roads e.g. Nursery View, Berners Way, Tuckers Road or Volunteer Way.</p> <p>As there no longer appears to be a gap between the</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>London Street. Character of Stanford Road and Folly Hill would change with serious implications for safety, walkers would find it difficult to cross the road and the peaceful nature of the town would change,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification is needed on all access points to the proposed site. • Object to proposed vehicular, pedestrian / cycle access to Tuckers Road and Stanford Road from new development it would compromise the current high levels of security, safety and privacy of residents. Existing residents manage with the existing access to the park and have no requirement for new links. Extra cars would be parked in Tuckers Road by visitors to Folly Park. • Residents understand Faringdon Town Council would like vehicular access from Tuckers Road, access may cause vandalism and transforms the nature of a quiet traffic free road to a rat run. • Nursery View is already very busy with traffic, adequate provision should be made for cyclists if they are to access the park from Nursery View what is on a very steep slope. • No new pedestrian/cycle links should be put through from the existing housing to the new development or the park. New links to the park should be from the new housing only. Existing residents manage with the existing access to the park and have no requirements for new links. They should only be provided if they are 150 feet from existing houses. • Support for pedestrian/cycle access to Tuckers Road. • There are no safe cycle tracks out of Faringdon. • Network of paths across Folly Park (page 6.6) already exist and would be destroyed by building work. • Current access to new cricket ground is unsuitable. • Access to new cricket ground is unclear, increasing traffic on Stanford Road could lead to serious injury. • Access from Park Road should include a roundabout to make it safe. • Suggestion for two new roundabouts onto A420 at London and Coxwell Road junctions. • Objection to opening up Stanford Road at the A420 roundabout. <p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support employment opportunities on site north of Esso garage provided it does not detract from the amenity value. • Object to land allocation as B2 general industry. • B2 use is too close to the park and housing. • The site should be restricted to B1 development given its proximity to residential development and visibility to A420. • B2 use will be close to the park which already suffers pollution and noise from A420. 	<p>houses on to Tuckers Road it is recommended that the proposed footpath/cycle link is deleted from the plan contained in the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>Folly Park has its own car park and there is no reason therefore for visitors to park on adjoining residential roads. Furthermore residents on the new development will be in easy walking distance of Folly Park.</p> <p>Improvements to the cycle network out of Faringdon cannot be required as part of this development. This issue will need to be taken forward by Oxfordshire County Council and considered as part of its cycling strategy.</p> <p>The existing network of footpaths on the former nursery site are not public rights of way and could be stopped up at any time, whereas the proposed extension to Folly Park will be available to the public at all times.</p> <p>A new access and car park for the cricket facility on Jespers Hill will need to be provided by developers before it is handed over to the Council.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council do not consider it appropriate to require a roundabout on Park Road to access the new development, as it would delay traffic, take up more land and involve land not in the ownership or control of the developers.</p> <p>Roundabouts on the A420 would only be considered necessary by the County Council if there is a recognised safety problem. Even if roundabouts were considered necessary their provision would not reasonably relate to the development of this site.</p> <p>There is no proposal to open up Stanford Road at the A420 roundabout.</p> <p>A noise survey to PPG24 and BS4142 standards will be required at an early stage in the preparation of a design for the site.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance is comprehensive and well produced. • Providing SPG with pages missing is particularly unhelpful. • It is considered premature before the local plan inquiry to publish SPG. It has caused confusion to local residents who do not understand the weight given to such documents. • Object to SPG being issued at this stage as it makes it seem a foregone conclusion development will be approved. • Will we get our voice heard people in Faringdon have very little voice. The Council seems to be able to do what ever it pleases. We pay one of the highest Council taxes in Oxfordshire and get little in return. • Every house on Berners Way, Tuckers Road, Nursery View should have had a leaflet through the door about the plans as should local schools, medical teams and emergency services and businesses. • Will the people of Faringdon get a chance to voice their objections? • News of the proposals were spread by word of mouth. Many locals have never heard of plans. • Was informed it was not possible to put houses on Jespers Hill as would spoil approach to Faringdon this patch of ground is unsuitable for a cricket pitch or extension to park. Suggest putting commercial units to area around Canada Lane and putting cricket pitch at the end of Park Road. 	<p>It is always a dilemma when to produce Supplementary Planning Guidance to expand on policies contained in the Local Plan. In the Council's experience most consultees welcome some detail on how a site may be developed at an early stage as its content can influence their view on the suitability of the site for development.</p> <p>The revised draft Supplementary Planning Guidance will be published for comment for a six week period from 23rd March. Furthermore, when a planning application is submitted for the site further consultation will be carried out.</p> <p>The location of the proposed housing and extension to Folly Park is a matter for the Local Plan and not the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>
<p>General</p> <p>Martin Grant Homes do not consider it is appropriate to produce the SPG as additional dwellings over and above those in the First Deposit Draft Local Plan should be redistributed north of Grove.</p> <p>Para 2.2 – Pinecrest Land and Property Ltd</p> <p>Would like the reference in this paragraph to Policy H4 changed to a 'comprehensive scheme' and not developed comprehensively, as the later may not be achievable as the adjoining employment site is in separate ownership.</p> <p>Para 2.3 – Pinecrest Land and Property Ltd</p> <p>Object to bullet point 3 re-affordable housing and would like it replaced with extract from their proposed amendment to Policy H16.</p>	<p>The distribution of housing across the district is a matter dealt with by policies in the Local Plan. Supplementary planning guidance cannot vary this policy context, but must be consistent with it.</p> <p>Recommendation: Para 2.2 5th line delete 'developed comprehensively' and insert 'planned in a comprehensive manner.'</p> <p>It is agreed that the allocation should be planned comprehensively rather than developed comprehensively. The later may be difficult to achieve because of the different land ownerships.</p> <p>This is a policy issue and not a matter for Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The land covered by Policies NE7 and NE10 has been amended in the Local Plan to take account of the development proposals.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Paras 3.1 to 3.6 Site Description Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd state no mention is made of Policy NE7 Area of High Landscape Value on NE 10 Important Open Land.</p> <p>Paras 4.1 to 4.7 Design and layout Oxfordshire County Council would like para 4.3 to refer to achieving the BRE Ecohomes standards of “very good”.</p> <p>Westbury Home (Holdings) Ltd state no explanation is provided of the need for the development in order to justify the harm to the open and rural character of the land between Faringdon and the A420.</p> <p>Para 5.7 – Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd state landscape buffers will only effectively reduce the visual impact of development in summer months.</p> <p>Para 5.9 – Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd consider this para to be contradictory, development that overlooks the park is likely to present a hard urban edge.</p> <p>Para 5.14-5.15 – Paddock adjacent to A420 Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd state the design objectives stated cannot be reconciled with the introduction of large industrial buildings in such a sensitive location.</p> <p>Para 5.17 – Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd state the proposed landscape buffer will have little impact and will not mitigate the harm caused.</p> <p>Para 6.3 Extension to Folly Park Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd state the brief fails to strike an appropriate balance between new development and retains ion of open land to form a park. Development should therefore be deleted or reduced to retain open land.</p> <p>Paras 7.4 to 7.6 Contributions Oxfordshire County Council suggest the list of infrastructure is amended as follows:</p> <p>Faringdon Community College (additional accommodation and infrastructure improvement which may include the provision of an all weather sports pitch), library (improved facilities which may include extension/alteration of library building and additional bookstock), waste management. (Contributions towards traffic and storage management at Stanford</p>	<p>Recommendation: Para 4.3 add to end; ‘The Eco Homes environmental rating for new dwellings is a flexible and independently verified environmental assessment method. It rewards developers who improve environmental performance through good design rather than high cost solution. The Council will expect all new dwellings on the site built to Eco Homes ‘very good’ rating as a minimum.</p> <p>It is agreed that the amendment suggested by Oxfordshire County Council should be incorporated in to the guidance at the end of para. 4.3.</p> <p>This is a policy issue dealt with in the Local Plan and not a matter for Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>It is agreed that landscape buffers will be less effective in winter at reducing the impact of development in the landscape, but there is no need to change the SPG in response to the objection.</p> <p>The purpose of para 5.9 in the Supplementary Planning Guidance is to ensure a potential hard edge is soften with landscaping and the way homes are orientated.</p> <p>The Council agrees that the development of this site will be highly visible but the purpose of paras 5.14 to 5.15 is to ensure the development creates a favourable visual impression.</p> <p>The purpose of this landscape buffer is not to hide the development but to provide a soft edge to Faringdon and retain views of Folly Park to the north.</p> <p>This is a policy issue dealt with in the Local Plan and not a matter for the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>These paragraphs of the Supplementary Planning Guidance have been amended to take into account new information provided by Oxfordshire County Council.</p> <p>A letter has been sent to health authority requesting details of the services to which they will be seeking contributions, but no reply has been received.</p>

**SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
LAND BETWEEN THE A420 & FARINGDON, NORTH OF PARK ROAD, FARINGDON.**

Summary of Representations	Observations & Recommendation of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>WRC).</p> <p>South West Oxfordshire NHS. There are no provision outlined for health. Although there may not be a requirement for additional GP provision, consideration should be given for other healthcare providers for this increased population e.g. dentists and community nursing teams.</p> <p>Inventures, innovation for healthcare on behalf of NHS Estates Current indications are that no land should be allocated for healthcare as part of this development but this does not mean that no financial provision will be required at the development stage. An assessment should be carried out by the local NHS Trusts and Strategic Health Authority.</p> <p>Pinecrest Land & Property Ltd comment the “shopping list” of contributors is accepted but should include reference to the criteria of Circular 1/97 and the potential ‘gift’ of the extended park so as not to mislead developers or members of the public with inflated expectations.</p> <p>Paras 8.1 to 8.4 Phasing & Implementation</p> <p>Pinecrest Land & Property Ltd would like para 8.4 deleted they object to the phasing and have separately objected to changes 8/17 and 8/34 in the Second Deposit Draft Local Plan. Contributions to the maintenance of the Country Park and Cricket Ground is not acceptable no other planning gain items require maintenance so why does leisure. Pinecrest suggest para 8.4 is deleted and a new para is included to read “agreed community benefits and other contributions will be incorporated in an appropriate Legal agreement.</p> <p>Unnumbered Plan</p> <p>Pinecrest Land & Property Ltd object to the plan because it is crude, unnecessary and contrary to good design, there is no site analysis no levels, no recognition of existing tree value. They request the plan is deleted and replaced by a requirement for the design of the comprehensive scheme to be based on thorough survey, site analysis and landscape framework proposals.</p>	<p>See comment above.</p> <p>Recommendation: Para 6.3 delete ‘the Council will require’ and ‘to provide’ and insert has offered the Council.</p> <p>A changed has been suggested to para 6.3 to cover this point.</p> <p>Recommendation: Para 8.4 delete ‘to agree the phasing of development, and’.</p> <p>To be consistent with the modification made to the local plan it is agreed the reference to phasing should be deleted. The issue of commuted sums to cover maintenance is a matter dealt with in Policy DC8 of the Local Plan and not a matter for the Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The plan is considered necessary to illustrate more clearly the guidance set out in the text.</p>