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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Great Coxwell Parish Council has instructed Richard Anstis to inspect, assess and report on the proposal. The parish council hereby objects to the proposal. This objection statement will set out the reasons for that objection and include other submissions on behalf of that council.

1.2 The site is a satellite location within the Great Coxwell parish boundary (see Appendix III) and that in itself is a significant reason why it cannot be considered a sustainable extension to Faringdon Town.

2.0 POLICY PRINCIPLES

2.1 The District Council policy team has included a policy statement on this application. An important omission in that statement though is that although the NPPF does indeed state in effect that ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing’ the other local plan policies that remain compliant and are up to date are still very much in force and indeed should be given considerable weight, especially given the additional scrutiny now required by the NPPF in terms of sustainability, deliverability and on whether the shortfalls in the scheme present insurmountable barriers to development.

2.2 The issues that govern sustainability in this case are broad and significant and, just as in the proposed site South of Abingdon recently refused by this council, if the issues are significant enough, the council must have the strength to refuse the proposal and have the confidence to defend any appeal.

2.3 The site south of Abingdon essentially had one weakness – no bypass – and that was sufficient to trigger a refusal, but here, with this proposal, the issues are more numerous. The landscape impact is significant, but all the shortfalls taken together represent a sufficiently strong case for this application to be refused with confidence. The council must not lower standards during this short window of policy vulnerability. There were good and sound reasons why this site was not selected in the preferred options stage in 2009 and those reasons remain. Indeed, they are of greater weight and others are now apparent too.

2.4 Of course, in 2009 the NPPF did not exist to place a great deal of weight, more weight than before, on sustainability tests. The application of those local plan policy tests other than housing should be applied more vigorously now, not less. The reasons given in 2009 and new issues are of more significance now than they were then. The intrusive nature of the proposed development upon the wider landscape is self evident and entirely contrary to the NPPF core principles.
3.0 THE MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Sustainability:

3.1.1 In the introduction to the NPPF, Mr Clark (albeit with interesting grammar) defines it:
“Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don’t mean worse lives for future generations.”

The development of this site is surely unsustainable.

Some issues have been raised as objections from the statutory consultees.

The Conservation Officer reminds us that:

a. An archaeological investigation has yet to be carried out. This is required as part of the application submission to allow a full assessment.

b. The site area of the proposal does not include the green field to the north west, without which a comprehensive understanding of the scheme cannot be obtained.

c. A good quality access from the site onto Fernham Road is essential to ensure that there is a sustainable access to the school and leisure centre. This is not demonstrated.

d. A footpath will need to be provided along the eastern side of Coxwell Road to link up with the existing network. This is not shown.

e. Because of the need to retain existing landscape features on the site, to mitigate against noise from the A420 and to reduce the impact of the development on the landscaping setting of Faringdon, the developable area of the site has become very densely developed for an edge of town location. The scheme is unsustainable.

f. Evidence that housing can be built as close to the A420 as indicated on the plans without external noise mitigation measures being provided has not been shown. Indeed, it cannot be shown.

g. Most of the open space to be provided on the site is either part of the noise buffer to the A420 or will accommodate drainage measures, neither of which will count as useable open space. The usable amenity space is not sufficient.

Thames Water states that “the existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development”

3.1.2 This is a site of significant landscape value and the outline proposal will represent an unsustainable intrusion into that landscape. The full impact on the
landscape cannot be determined without a full application and without a
detailed Landscape Impact Assessment.

3.1.3 The proposal relies on a single access point onto Coxwell Road. A footpath is
introduced to the north of the access point, but does not link to the network.
The reason for that may be because it if did (and being outside the 30mph limit
it must), the scheme would not comply with the required standards in terms of
visibility distances in either direction (particularly the north). The junction
from Coxwell Road onto the A420 is inadequate and since no agreed
improvements are proposed, the proposal is not deliverable unless it is
correspondingly unsustainable.

3.1.4 The village of Great Coxwell has 102 houses. The proposal is for up to 200
houses, dwarfing the village and representing a satellite development in open
countryside. This is not sustainable and represents a coalescence between the
village and the town of Faringdon, contrary to fundamental development
policies that remain in force.

3.1.5 The site and adjacent road has suffered from recent flooding. The proposed
flood amelioration measures are not detailed enough and are accompanied by
no accurate costs to establish whether they are deliverable. Please see
Appendix I for flooding evidence.

3.1.6 The proposed dwellings near the A420 would suffer unacceptable noise
nuisance and would have inadequate amenity to be sustainable. Any noise
amelioration measures would be inadequate and would themselves represent
an intrusive impact on the landscape.

3.1.7 The matters reserved are too extensive to allow a proper assessment of the
impact of the scheme and are inappropriate. A full application is required.

3.1.8 The local school is over-subscribed, but no measures are included in the
proposal, which is therefore unsustainable and the measures undeliverable.

3.1.9 The NPPF describes a sequential test of preference, from the town centres
outwards, requiring active choices to be made by the officers to consider the
most sustainable sites first and (paragraph 27) “Where an application fails to
satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one
or more of the above factors, it should be refused.” This site certainly fails that
sequential test and must be refused.

3.2 **Deliverability:**

3.2.1 No junction improvement measures are proposed, without which a sustainable
highway solution cannot be accommodated, let alone considered.
3.2.2 No road noise amelioration measures are proposed.

3.2.3 No additional school provisions are proposed, without which the scheme would place an unsustainable strain on existing services.

3.2.4 The scheme has an unusually high density which cannot be delivered with any appropriate amelioration measures, would have an unsustainable impact on the existing road network and cannot therefore deliver the number of affordable housing units proposed.

3.3 **Insurmountable barriers to development:**

3.3.1 As an outline application, this proposal cannot demonstrate that the flooding amelioration measures would be sufficient to offset the danger to existing property and to the proposed dwellings. It cannot demonstrate fully the extent of light pollution, noise nuisance, the impact on the character of the area, the street scene, the landscape. As an outline application, the full impact cannot be assessed from the submitted information. The proposal seeks to reserve such matters, but these are not matters to be met by later conditions. In all probability a reserved application would be made after the five year supply has been reached, but by then it will be too late. Further information should be required to allow a full assessment, or it should be refused because of the lack of that information.

3.3.2 The A420 is a constant and no amount of landscaping will remove its impact on occupiers, if the proximity of the nearer houses remains as drawn. A successful scheme cannot be delivered based on the submissions. If the scheme is to be substantially altered to address this issue, it must be re-submitted and re-advertised to allow a full consultation.

3.3.3 Junction improvements are not included in the scheme and putting aside all other issues, a successful scheme cannot be delivered without those improvements. If they are now to be considered, the whole scheme must be re-advertised.

4.0 **CONCLUSIONS**

4.1 The proposal must be refused.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Great Coxwell Parish Council has instructed Richard Anstis to inspect, assess and report on the proposal. The parish council has already objected to the proposal and this Statement should be read in conjunction with the first Statement of 25th March 2013.

1.2 This Statement will be focussed on the amendments to the application made and to the developer contributions, so all other earlier objections stand.

1.3 The scheme was amended in April, but that amendment is superseded by the amendments dated 18th July 2013, to which this response is directed.

2.0 POLICY PRINCIPLES

2.1 Consultation between the District Council and County Highways continues, including on the interplay between this application and that of The Steeds in terms of highway improvement provisions. It is of course completely inappropriate to link the two applications in any way, informally or otherwise and if there is any interdependency, or even any agreements that are subject to permission being granted on a different scheme, then this needs to be openly declared on each application and both would need to be re-published for consultation. This application for example offers alterations to the junction, but no roundabout. £200,000 would not cover the cost of a roundabout.

2.2 The developer contribution schedule shows that the vast majority of financial offering at parish level is directed to Faringdon Town Council, rather than to Great Coxwell Parish Council, despite the fact that the site falls entirely within the boundaries of Great Coxwell. This is not a matter of contest between neighbouring parish and town councils competing for resources, but it is a clear demonstration of the fundamental policy flaw of presenting this scheme in this location.

2.3 The site is presented as an extension to Faringdon, but it is isolated from it, being an alien satellite development, separate and in a different parish. The impact of it will be felt most deeply in the host parish of Great Coxwell, which would bear the brunt of the traffic liability, the loss of landscape, environment, increased risk of flooding etc, but even the proposed new residents of the development itself are not offered adequate amelioration measures under the parish into which they would arrive. No, the contributions are offered primarily to Faringdon, because otherwise it would highlight this juxtaposition, a principle reason why this application must be refused.

2.4 There can be no clearer demonstration of why this scheme is both inappropriate and unsustainable and does not meet either NPPF or local plan requirements.
2.5 This District council is moving rapidly towards meeting the five year supply that would give greater weight to the extant housing policies, but even before that supply is met elsewhere, this scheme fails on a number of other policy requirements which are up to date are still very much in force.

3.0 THE MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Sustainability:

3.1.1 Since this amended application essentially returns to the original submission, it is perhaps no surprise that the consultees have not altered their earlier comments.

The Conservation Officer reminds us that:

a. An archaeological investigation has yet to be carried out. This is required as part of the application submission to allow a full assessment.

b. The site area of the proposal does not include the green field to the north west, without which a comprehensive understanding of the scheme cannot be obtained.

c. A good quality access from the site onto Fernham Road is essential to ensure that there is a sustainable access to the school and leisure centre. This is not demonstrated.

d. A footpath will need to be provided along the eastern side of Coxwell Road to link up with the existing network. This is not shown.

e. Because of the need to retain existing landscape features on the site, to mitigate against noise from the A420 and to reduce the impact of the development on the landscaping setting of Faringdon, the developable area of the site has become very densely developed for an edge of town location. The scheme is unsustainable.

f. Evidence that housing can be built as close to the A420 as indicated on the plans without external noise mitigation measures being provided has not been shown. Indeed, it cannot be shown.

g. Most of the open space to be provided on the site is either part of the noise buffer to the A420 or will accommodate drainage measures, neither of which will count as useable open space. The usable amenity space is not sufficient.

Thames Water states that “the existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development”

3.1.2 This is a site of significant landscape value and the outline proposal will represent an unsustainable intrusion into that landscape. The full impact on the landscape cannot be determined without a full application and without a detailed Landscape Impact Assessment.
3.1.3 The proposal relies on a single access point onto Coxwell Road. A footpath is introduced to the north of the access point, but does not link to the network. The reason for that may be because it if did (and being outside the 30mph limit it must), the scheme would not comply with the required standards in terms of visibility distances in either direction (particularly the north). The junction from Coxwell Road onto the A420 is inadequate and since no agreed improvements are proposed, the proposal is not deliverable unless it is correspondingly unsustainable.

3.1.4 The village of Great Coxwell has 102 houses. The proposal is for up to 200 houses, dwarfing the village and representing a satellite development in open countryside. This is not sustainable and represents a coalescence between the village and the town of Faringdon, contrary to fundamental development policies that remain in force.

3.1.5 The site and adjacent road has suffered from recent flooding. The proposed flood amelioration measures are not detailed enough and are accompanied by no accurate costs to establish whether they are deliverable. Please see Appendix I for flooding evidence.

3.1.6 The proposed dwellings near the A420 would suffer unacceptable noise nuisance and would have inadequate amenity to be sustainable. Any noise amelioration measures would be inadequate and would themselves represent an intrusive impact on the landscape.

3.1.7 The matters reserved are too extensive to allow a proper assessment of the impact of the scheme and are inappropriate. A full application is required.

3.1.8 The local school is over-subscribed, but no measures are included in the proposal, which is therefore unsustainable and the measures undeliverable.

3.1.9 The NPPF describes a sequential test of preference, from the town centres outwards, requiring active choices to be made by the officers to consider the most sustainable sites first and (paragraph 27) “Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the above factors, it should be refused.” This site certainly fails that sequential test and must be refused.

3.2 Deliverability:

3.2.1 No junction improvement measures are proposed, without which a sustainable highway solution cannot be accommodated, let alone considered.

3.2.2 No road noise amelioration measures are proposed.
3.2.3 No additional school provisions are proposed, without which the scheme would place an unsustainable strain on existing services.

3.2.4 The scheme has an unusually high density which cannot be delivered with any appropriate amelioration measures, would have an unsustainable impact on the existing road network and cannot therefore deliver the number of affordable housing units proposed.

3.3 **Insurmountable barriers to development:**

3.3.1 As an outline application, this proposal cannot demonstrate that the flooding amelioration measures would be sufficient to offset the danger to existing property and to the proposed dwellings. It cannot demonstrate fully the extent of light pollution, noise nuisance, the impact on the character of the area, the street scene, the landscape. As an outline application, the full impact cannot be assessed from the submitted information. The proposal seeks to reserve such matters, but these are not matters to be met by later conditions. In all probability a reserved application would be made after the five year supply has been reached, but by then it will be too late. Further information should be required to allow a full assessment, or it should be refused because of the lack of that information.

3.3.2 The A420 is a constant and no amount of landscaping will remove its impact on occupiers, if the proximity of the nearer houses remains as drawn. A successful scheme cannot be delivered based on the submissions. If the scheme is to be substantially altered to address this issue, it must be re-submitted and re-advertised to allow a full consultation.

3.3.3 Junction improvements are not included in the scheme and putting aside all other issues, a successful scheme cannot be delivered without those improvements. If they are now to be considered, the whole scheme must be re-advertised.
4.0 NEW ISSUES

4.1 Developer Contributions: The requests for developer contributions have largely been ignored, but it is worth highlighting the reasons behind some of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Coxwell Parish Council</td>
<td>£585,000.00</td>
<td>£52,500 (non specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Contributions Secured by public bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path between Gr. Coxwell Park and F’don</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path between Coxwell Road, Golf Course and Annabelle’s</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading and clearing of ditches</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faringdon schools**</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Buffer</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Contributions secured on behalf of Parish Council in discussion with other public bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Shelters**</td>
<td>£12,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>£25,437.00</td>
<td>£8,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Contributions Parish Council would like to secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community facility and parking</td>
<td>£222,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking at Great Coxwell Park</td>
<td>£5,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurface Path in park</td>
<td>£8,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information board at Tithe Barn</td>
<td>£2,010.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Heating in Church</td>
<td>£15,000.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GREAT COXWELL PARISH COUNCIL</td>
<td>£253,010.00</td>
<td>£28,408.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 The Path between Gt Coxwell and Faringdon. There is a reasonable hard surface path up to the roundabout (coming from Faringdon) but it gives way to a dirt track at the riding school, one third of the way to the park. The Parish Council wants to encourage use of the Park in Gt Coxwell by foot or bike.
(there is only a small amount of on street parking at the park). Anyone wanting to use the park from the proposed development will travel this way and the existing surface is inadequate to satisfy that need.

4.1.2 Annabelle's is a well established day care facility for children. To make an attempt to mitigate against the unsustainable proposal, access would be required to the nursery by foot and bike. There is no footpath whatsoever to Annabelle's from the Faringdon side of the village, only a grass verge around a steep corner, wholly inappropriate for parents and guardians and young children.

4.1.3 Grading and clearing of ditches. Ditches on Coxwell Rd overflow with rain and run-off water whenever there is heavy rain. Sometimes the road is impassable. The development will only make the situation worse.

4.1.4 Landscape buffer. The site is an Area of High Landscape Value. When Coleshill Drive (Land west of Coxwell Road, P97/V0818), the last development south side of Faringdon and on St Coxwell's boundary, was given planning permission it was granted with the proviso that a landscape buffer was put in place and a 30 m wide belt of trees planted on it, to:

"maintain and enhance the visual aspects of the southern build edge of Faringdon". This proposal has the same aspect as the Coleshill Drive site and the edge of the building line requires at least the same protection, with a 30m wide belt of trees running down the Coxwell Road side of the site. There are no street lights in St Coxwell and the Parish Council wants to keep down the light pollution.

4.1.5 Tennis Court. An offer of only £8,408 would not even cover the cost, even though the Parish Council would offer the land. The cost of building a tennis court is £25,437 according to Sports England code OS7 and there is no budget for any shortfall. There are no other adult sports facilities in St Coxwell.

4.1.6 New community building. As previously stated: "At present our village hall has a max number of 60 people allowed in it at one time and more importantly it has NO parking. It is positioned at the narrowest part of the village road in the middle of the village. It is not possible to enhance this building in any way to make it usable for an enlarged community such as FF would make St Coxwell. The proposed development represents a 172% increase in total number of dwellings in the parish area and a net estimated increase of 159% in the population in the parish. We require a new Community Village Hall to accommodate the whole parish on the FF site. As everyone coming from the old village would drive we ask that the developers provide parking for 30 cars. We wish to retain our small reading room as the church have no facilities and uses the room after services. We estimate the cost of building this to be £200,000 + £20,000 for the hard-surface access and parking areas."
This proposed development would not increase the number of residents of Faringdon. Every new occupier would be a new resident of Great Coxwell and parish meetings involving all the new members could not take place in the existing facilities. The proposal prejudices new and old residents alike.

4.1.7 Upgrading the heating in the church. As previously stated: "10% of the Gt Coxwell population are church goers. 10% of FF population is 58 and a third of these could look to Gt Coxwell for their church. Concerts and exhibitions are also held in the church. The heating is in dire need of upgrading. The cost would be £30,000 we would look for a half of that from the development." In the interests of localism and the sustainability of communities, the Parish Council would need to provide a welcome to churchgoers moving in to the proposed development. Gt Coxwell would be their parish and their nearest church.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The earlier objections all stand and the offered developer contributions merely highlight the isolation of the site from Faringdon, the prejudicial impact on the host parish of Great Coxwell and the unsustainability of a satellite and alien development in this location, which will result in both a reduction in proportional service to the parish and a potential financial liability to the parish council which it cannot meet.

5.2 The application must be refused.
Dear Sirs

Please note that the Town Council’s final decision was omitted from the previous email sent to you (see below). Town Council STRONGLY OBJECTS to the above planning application.

Hilary

Hilary Sherman - Deputy Town Clerk
Faringdon Town Council
The Corn Exchange
Faringdon
Oxfordshire SN7 7JA
Tel: 01367 240281
Fax: 01367 240303
Email: hilary@faringdontowncouncil.gov.uk

The information in this email and any of its attachments is intended solely for the addressees and is confidential. If you receive this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, destroy any copies and delete it from your computer system. The contents may contain information which is confidential and may also be privileged. Any part of this email may not be used, disseminated, forwarded, printed or copied without authorisation. Liability cannot be accepted for any statements, views or opinions made which are clearly the sender’s own and not expressly made on behalf of Faringdon Town Council.

---

From: Hilary Sherman
Sent: 22 July 2013 11:52
To: 'planning@whitehorsedc.gov.uk'
Subject: Planning Application P13/V0139/0-87

Dear Sirs

Although the above planning application is within the Parish of Gt Coxwell, due to the close proximity of this proposed development to Faringdon’s Parish Boundary, this application was considered at a recent meeting of our Planning & Highways Committee and its comments are as follows:-

**P13/V0139/0-87**

Outline planning application for residential development including extra care accommodation, public open space and associated infrastructure and new access

**Fernham Fields Land to the East of Coxwell Road,**
**Faringdon**
For: SGR (Faringdon) Ltd

1. This is not a sustainable development. It is 1.5 km from the town centre, hence, remote in terms of access to shops, police, fire station and junior/infant schools; walking/cycling is unrealistic for the majority of potential residents, particularly for journeys, at least twice daily, to the infant and junior schools; although it suggested that this is within a 25 min walking time (2 km) this is unrealistic for the majority of residents, particularly for journeys to the infant and junior schools, at least twice daily; hence it will encourage car traffic into the town. It is similarly distant from employment sites in the town. Evidence from ‘Analysis of travel patterns of people living in new homes built between 2001 and 2007 in the Vale of White Horse’
document, July 2008 indicates that new Faringdon residents travel the farthest to work and shop compared to anywhere else in the Vale. Hence, it is contrary to NPPF para 32 as it will encourage extra car movement and with the inclusion of the 40 bed Extra Care Home also contrary to NPPF para 35, last bullet point, considering the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

2. Located in an area where flooding of the road occurs; flood mitigation measures need to be adequate.

3. Overly obstructive in an area of significant landscape value;

4. Only one road leading into the site.

5. There appear to be no internal pavements. Shared surfaces have not been successful in the Folly Park View development and there have been several incidents of potentially serious accidents between vehicles and pedestrians, particularly parents with prams.

6. Egress from the site onto Coxwell Road difficult and potentially dangerous as it is beyond the current 30 mph speed limit. There are no mitigation measures for the impact of the extra traffic and queueing onto the A420.

7. Despite the noise survey, the proposed development would be affected by traffic noise from the A420, particularly the 40 bed Extra Care Home adjacent to the A420, and therefore quality of life for the residents would be impaired; this is supported by evidence from residents on Fernham Rd.

8. Sewerage: this location is the farthest from the sewage treatment plant; Thames Water state: The development may lead to sewage flooding unless new drainage strategy undertaken.

9. There are problems with water pressure at that end of Faringdon. Thames Water state: The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development.

10. The site is in the parish of Great Coxwell. The application is contrary to the VoWHDC Policy G2, 3.6 The Villages.

11. We support the National Trust’s view that due weight must be given to policy GS2.

12. This site, in a neighbouring parish, will result in no benefits to the town, which has already agreed to developments amounting to ~800 additional houses since 2010, i.e. a possible 2400 extra residents on a population of ~8000 (2009 estimate). This disproportionate, unwelcome and unplanned for development of a further 200 houses above the strategic allocation will place a severe burden on the town and will result in overloading of an already stretched infrastructure including schools and health care.

13. According to NPPF, para 14, the adverse impacts outweigh the benefits; the only benefits appear to be for the developer.

14. This development is contrary to the draft Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 4.1B: Residential development beyond the town boundary will only be permitted where it is consistent with the exception policies set out in Draft Vale Local Plan 2029 or the Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan. Any additional greenfield development that reduces green corridors to nearby villages will be resisted.

15. and section 4.10 Landscape; Any new development must take into account Faringdon’s historic relationship with its landform and landscape. It should contribute to improving the quality of the town/countryside interface as much as possible. As new development occurs in Faringdon consideration needs to be given to the distinct identities of the settlements beyond to avoid any potential for coalescence. Development should particularly not extend to the southwest along the Corallion Ridge where it approaches Great Coxwell and Little Coxwell; residential development would also be considered inappropriate to the south of the A420.

16. The landscape assessment ‘Advice on the landscape impact of further development at Faringdon’ undertaken in December 2008 for Vale of White Horse District Council by Martin Cobden BSc. Dip LA. MLI, Horseshoe Well, Bourton Close, Clanfield, Bampton, Oxon. OK18 2RU’ concludes: from a landscape character point of view only LCA 5 (Fernham Rd; i.e. proposed Fernham Fields site) is robust enough to accept the changes that would occur if residential development took place, as long as this included major woodland mitigation. However, development is undesirable here because it would fall outside the ridge that visually contains Faringdon. West Faringdon.

17. This site generates limited local employment prospects for the residents.

18. Extra traffic created would overload the town centre which is already affected with traffic issues;

19. Fully support comments from the National Trust, CCLr and Great Coxwell Parish Council and English Heritage.
Hilary Sherman - Deputy Town Clerk
Faringdon Town Council
The Corn Exchange
Faringdon
Oxfordshire SN7 7JA
Tel: 01367 240281
Fax: 01367 240303
Email: hilary@faringdontowncouncil.gov.uk

The information in this email and any of its attachments is intended solely for the addressees and is confidential. If you receive this message in error, please immediately notify the sender, destroy any copies and delete it from your computer system. The contents may contain information which is confidential and may also be privileged. Any part of this email may not be used, disseminated, forwarded, printed or copied without authorisation. Liability cannot be accepted for any statements, views or opinions made which are clearly the sender's own and not expressly made on behalf of Faringdon Town Council.
Dear Sirs,

Please find below the observations of Faringdon Town Council in respect of the following Planning Application which were considered by its Planning & Highways Committee at its recent meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P13/V0186/A</td>
<td>Faringdon Garage, 32 Marlborough Street, Faringdon</td>
<td>NO OBJECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13/V0162/LB</td>
<td>Pidnell Farm, Faringdon</td>
<td>NO OBJECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13/V0139/O</td>
<td>Fernham Fields, Land to the East of Coxwell Road, Faringdon</td>
<td>STRONGLY OBJECT on the following basis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. This is not a sustainable development. It is a long way from the town in terms of access to amenities such as shops, police, fire station and junior schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Located in an area with a serious risk of flooding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Overly obstructive in an area of significant landscape value;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Only one road leading into the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Egress from the site onto Coxwell Road difficult and potentially dangerous as it is beyond the 30 mph speed limit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The proposed development would be affected by traffic noise from the A420 and therefore quality of life for the residents would not be good;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Extra traffic created would affect the town centre which is already affected with traffic issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Sewage: this location is the furthest from the sewage treatment plant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. There would be problems with water pressure at that end of Faringdon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hilary Sherman - Deputy Town Clerk
Faringdon Town Council
The Corn Exchange
Faringdon
Oxfordshire SN7 7JA
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