

APPLICATION NO.	P15/V0663/O
APPLICATION TYPE	OUTLINE
REGISTERED	26.3.2015
PARISH	SHRIVENHAM
WARD MEMBER(S)	Elaine Ware Simon Howell
APPLICANT	Gladman Developments
SITE	Land off Townsend Road, Shrivenham, SN6 8HR
PROPOSAL	Outline application for a residential development of up to 116 dwellings, landscaping, public open space and associated works, with all matters except access reserved.
GRID REFERENCE	423105/188520
OFFICER	Adrian Butler

SUMMARY

The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of up to 116 dwellings. Only the principle of housing on this site and means of access are to be considered as part of this application with all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) being reserved matters for future consideration should outline permission be granted.

The main issues are:

- Whether the principle of development is acceptable
- Whether the site is a suitable location for new housing that can contribute to the five-year housing supply shortfall.
- The suitability of the access and whether the proposal will impact on highway safety or traffic flows.
- Implications for flood risk, foul and surface water drainage.
- Implications for ecology
- Adequacy of schooling to accommodate this proposal

This report seeks to assess the planning application details against the development plan, national and local planning policy framework where relevant and all other material planning considerations.

This is a greenfield site at the edge of Shrivenham. It is not allocated for development in any plan.

The principle of housing on this site is considered reasonable particularly in light of the lack of a 5-year land supply and Government advice in the NPPF which is considered more up to date and relevant in comparison to the housing policies in the adopted local plan and as the emerging local plan policies can only be given limited weight at this stage.

Landscape and visual impacts are local to the site with no adverse wider impacts due to the screening of the site. The benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the local impact.

Access to the site from Townsend Road is acceptable. Traffic flows through the village are considered reasonable. However, the highway authority consider this development will place additional pressure on traffic accessing the A420 and it should therefore, contribute towards junction improvements.

Thames Water reports confirm solutions can be implemented to accept foul water flows from the proposal and provide an adequate water supply. Drainage issues can be addressed by planning conditions, as confirmed by the drainage consultees.

The applicant has commissioned surveys of the land for its habitat and botanical interest, for roosting bats and Great Crested Newt (GCN). These surveys found the site has limited biodiversity interest and is unlikely to affect GCN.

Impacts for heritage assets are considered negligible.

Oxfordshire County Council as education authority has identified insufficient capacity at Shrivenham primary school to accommodate pupils likely to live in the new housing and therefore, object to the proposal. Officers note that planning application no. P13/V1810/O includes provision of land for a new primary school in Shrivenham. It has been resolved to approve that application subject to a legal agreement being completed. Completion of the s.106 is within the control of the County Council. This proposal could make a financial contribution towards this new school (as also acknowledged by the County Council) and officers consider this to be proportionate, reasonable and recognised approach to address and overcome the County Council's objection.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Shrivenham is defined as a large village by policy H11 of the adopted Local Plan. The village provides a range of services including shops, community facilities, a primary school, some employment opportunities and access to a regular public transport service serving larger towns including Oxford and Swindon.
- 1.2 This application relates to a greenfield site adjoining the western end of the village. The land is open in appearance consisting in part of a paddock and the remainder being in arable use. The site is presently 'divided' by a track leading from Townsend Road to a freestanding dwelling named Rhymes House which adjoins the site. The Townsend Road frontage is lined by trees and a hedge, as are the boundaries to the north, around Rhymes House and A420 frontage. A hedge forms the eastern site boundary separating the field from the housing in Greycourt Road.
- 1.3 The paddock part of the site is relatively level. To the west of the track crossing the site the arable field falls in level towards its south western boundary beyond which are dwellings including Swanhill Farm House. The dwellings are at a lower level to the site and vegetation on this boundary is relatively sparse.
- 1.4 The current vehicular access to the site is in the south eastern corner of the site and from Townsend Road. As mentioned above this access and associated track serve Rhymes House.
- 1.5 The site not within or adjoining a conservation area or within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). There are no listed buildings on site or adjoining it. The site is within the wider Lowland Vale landscape (Policy NE9 of the adopted Local Plan).
- 1.6 The application is presented to committee as the Parish Council object and more than

four letters of objection have been received from local residents.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 This is an application for outline planning permission seeking approval for up to 116 dwellings. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved matters for future consideration should outline permission be granted. Access is to be considered at this stage. Site Location Plan is **attached** at Appendix 1.
- 2.2 The existing access in the south east corner of the site would be closed to vehicular traffic. A new vehicular access is proposed from the Townsend Road frontage. Access to Rhymes House would be via the new access and through the site. The new access is proposed at a point some 30m from the western boundary of the site frontage and 60m from the eastern boundary of the site frontage. To form the access a section of existing hedge approximately 9m wide and two trees would need to be removed (an oak and field maple). The new access road itself will be 5.5m wide with 2m wide pavements either side. Vision splays of 2.4m set back by 43m in either direction are proposed. The vision splays will be across the existing grass verge and some trimming back of overhanging branches required to maintain vision splays.
- 2.3 Two bus stops are proposed on Townsend Road in front of the site. These would consist of painted lines on the road and bus stop poles although the highway authority is seeking bus shelters.
- 2.4 The application plans include a development framework plan. This does not show a housing layout but indicates the areas on which dwellings could be built, areas for open space which could follow the principle access and on the site boundaries. An attenuation pond is illustrated in the western corner of the site and a pedestrian link to Townsend Road via the existing access point.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by a number of supporting documents, including the following:-
- Design and Access Statement
 - Planning statement
 - Arboricultural assessment
 - Cultural heritage desk based assessment
 - Ecology appraisal
 - Great Crested Newt survey
 - Aerial assessment of trees for bat roosts report
 - Contaminated land survey
 - Archaeological desk based assessment
 - Flood Risk Assessment
 - Foul drainage analysis and update
 - Socio economic report
 - Statement of community involvement
 - Sustainability energy statement
 - Rural sustainability report
 - Transport assessment and update
 - Travel plan
 - Landscape and visual impact assessment & revised version
 - Landscape strategy plan
 - Noise assessment
 - Air quality assessment
 - Utilities report

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Below is a summary of the responses received to the proposals. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

<p>Shrivenham Parish Council</p>	<p>Object The Parish Council’s objections may be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sustainable development failing the social and environmental tests set by the NPPF • Increased traffic and congestion which will be detrimental to highway safety • Transport assessment content & claims are similar to other Gladman Development transport assessments the parish Council has seen • Cycling the A420 to Swindon is not a safe method of travel • The objective of reducing private car travel and encouraging healthier and more sustainable travel methods is undeniably desirable, the applicant’s objectives are irrelevant to the containment of the growing local traffic problems • Site is too distant from local facilities e.g. the school is some 1,000m away, shops 980m and GP surgery 1,200m, and there are few employment opportunities locally. Residents will commute • Discrepancies in the transport assessment including street names not found in Shrivenham & choice of transport modes varying significantly • Independent transport assessment indicates the Bourton Wharf junction is at capacity contrary to the applicants claims • Accident data is not comprehensive • The traffic survey was at an inappropriate time when the Defence Academy was operating at a reduced level • Speeding traffic and not proposals for traffic calming • Drainage is critical and should be investigated prior to determination of the application • Neighbouring houses have septic tanks and Rhymes House has a grey water outfall to the site • No foul water capacity – concern that sewage may back up causing flooding • Limited permeability of the site • Attenuation ponds can be a safety risk to small children • Grade 2 agricultural land which should not be built on (para 112 of the NPPF applies) • Western edge of the site acts as a rural buffer between the Parishes of Shrivenham and Bourton • Landscape impacts will be greater than the applicant suggests due to the topography of the site, low level and loose planting in the area and views from rights of way • The site formed part of the Stallpits Farm Estate contrary to assertions in the submitted heritage statement • Evidence of ridge and furrow in north eastern third of the site • Potential for overlooking of Rhymes House which could be
----------------------------------	---

	<p>detrimental to living conditions contrary to policy DC9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density at 31.27 dwellings per ha exceeds the density at Cleycourt Road which is about 20dph • The isolated character of Rhymes House and Swanhill Farmhouse will be lost • Visually detrimental in the approach to the village • Housing mix exceeds the SHMA expectation • Significant noise disturbance from the A420 and mitigation may not be appropriate design especially a 4.3m high noise barrier • Full air quality assessment should be undertaken • No public consultation event in the village. Instead residents were asked to post their comments via a web site which excludes those residents without access to a computer • Increased pressure on local services as some 410 dwellings have been permitted in Shrevenham with phase 2 of the 'strategic site' to follow. These developments will increase in population by 84%; an additional 1,886 residents. Swindon Eastern expansion of 8,000 dwellings is less than a mile away. • Cumulative impacts will destroy the character of the village <p>Their full comments are <u>attached</u> at Appendix 2.</p> <p>In response to amended access arrangements and the applicant's updated reports the Parish Council reiterate its strong objections and advise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transport assessment makes no reference to traffic queues on the A420 at peak time and which can stretch for 5 miles • Not convinced the road network can accommodate the traffic likely to be generated • Access improvements to the A420 recommended by OCC are not for the Townsend Road junction but in the vicinity of the strategic site identified in the draft local plan • Queuing traffic is not taken into account in the air quality assessment • Previous concerns relating to the site location, landscape, scale of development, density, sustainability, traffic and noise still stand <p>The Parish Council has also requested a series of financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements in the village. This is addressed later in the report.</p>
<p>Bourton Parish Council</p>	<p>Object. Their concerns may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council has already objected to the 500 dwellings allocated to Shrevenham in the draft local plan. 170 dwellings have also been granted planning permission all in a village that had fewer than 900 dwellings until recently and now has an 84% increase in housing numbers. The village does not have the infrastructure for this development e.g. roads, employment, schools, retailing, doctor's surgeries • Unsustainable development, unnecessary and unwanted • Set a precedent for other SHLAA sites to be developed • A detailed application ought to be requested

- Outside the village envelope
- Not a visually contained site and the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the landscape contrary to para 109 of the NPPF
- Inappropriate density
- 2.5 storey dwellings inappropriate
- Nuclear settlement pattern of the village would change with an adverse impact on the setting of the AONB
- Urbanise the western edge of the village
- Natural boundaries of the historic village will be lost
- Cumulative impacts of housing developments have an adverse landscape impact
- Erodes an important rural buffer between Shrivenham and Bourton which is more important given the 8,000 dwelling east of Swindon expansion
- Detrimental impact on the Lowland vale contrary to policy NE9 of the local plan
- Harm the settings of grade II listed buildings and detrimental to views from the Bourton conservation area and railway bridge at Lower Bourton.
- Swanhill Farmhouse adjacent to the site is presently remote and deserves protection
- No employment expansion proposed for Shrivenham and the proposal will not create jobs
- Inadequate local services including the primary school being at capacity and there is no secondary school
- Increased parking pressure in Shrivenham centre
- Most local services are beyond acceptable walking distances e.g shops at 980m, doctors surgery at 1200m
- A420 could not accommodate increased traffic which will also include traffic from new housing developments at Faringdon, those in Shrivenham and Watchfield and the 8,000 dwelling east Swindon expansion
- The applicant's transport assessment is inadequate having taken place when the A420 was closed, during a holiday period and fewer activities at the Defence Academy resulting in fewer vehicles through the village
- Land close to the site is safeguarded for a new junction to the A420. All the land north of Shrivenham along the A420 corridor should be safeguarded for transport infrastructure improvements
- The air and noise monitoring assessments are inadequate bearing in mind traffic growth on the A420 in the next 5-years and proposal for a new roundabout
- Inadequate vision splays to Townsend Road
- No traffic calming proposed
- Loss of grade 2 agricultural land
- Water pressure and sewer issues could be made worse and needs to be investigated before determination of the application

Their full comments are attached at Appendix 3.

	<p>In response to amended access arrangements and the applicant's updated reports the Parish Council confirm they do not wish to withdraw their objections.</p>
<p>Neighbours</p>	<p>33 letters of objection have been received. The concerns expressed may be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an unsustainable and unwanted speculative housing proposal on an unsuitable site on the edge of Shrivenham • Too many houses permitted in the village already which will overload the infrastructure e.g. drainage, electricity traffic, recreation space • With the expansion of Swindon to its east and this proposed extension of the village to the west, Shrivenham is in danger of merging with Swindon • Conflict with the draft local plan; this is not an identified housing site; the village has a large housing allocation in the draft local plan which will expand the population by 50% • Site is too distant from local facilities (over 1km to the centre of the village) which will encourage car journeys & additional traffic in the centre of the village for which there is inadequate parking • Increased pressure on the primary school • Density of development is out of keeping with the lower density housing adjacent to the site • Overlooking of adjacent dwellings • Loss of views from existing housing • Overbearing impact on existing houses • Potential for flooding of houses at a lower level to the site e.g. Swanhill House • Loss of grade 2 agricultural land contrary to the NPPF. There is sufficient lower grade land that could be made available for housing • Noise disturbance from the A420 • Too many large houses proposed when the village needs more smaller dwellings • Prominent site at the entrance to the village from the west; the proposal will be an eyesore • Insufficient sewerage capacity which could result in further backing up and sewer flooding • Lack of GP surgery capacity • Few job opportunities available in the village as staff turnover at the Defence Academy, Cranfield University and the business park limited leading to increased commuting and traffic generation • Visually prominent with the rising ground and unsympathetic, urbanising development contrary to the NPPF • 2.5 storey housing is out of keeping • Harms the setting of the AONB • Vital open space between Shrivenham, Bourton and the 8,000 dwelling east Swindon expansion. This proposal will lead to coalescence between the two villages • Adverse impact on the Lowland Vale landscape contrary to policy DC9 of the local plan • Harm the setting of the grade II listed buildings including the

	<p>railway bridge at Lower Bourton and the Bourton conservation area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic onto the A420 which struggles to cope with existing traffic • The applicant’s transport assessment is inadequate having been undertaken at school holiday time and when the Defence Academy has limited operations • An independent traffic assessment refers to the Bourton Wharf junction being at capacity • Could affect proposed junction improvements and a new junction to the A420 • Planned junction changes to the A420 could lead to traffic queuing on the A420 past the site exacerbating air quality and noise issues for potential residents • Increase traffic congestion in the village • Inadequate vision splays at the proposed access • Water pressure issues need to be investigated • Sufficient housing permitted and allocated to the village to meet its housing needs • The applicant’s transport plan is flawed and does not recognise local circumstances e.g. it is not safe to cycle to Swindon via the A420, there is no commitment to transport infrastructure improvements, and the modes of travel to work data bears no relation to Oxfordshire or the Vale of White Horse District • Proposal represents urban sprawl changing the image of Shrivenham in the approach from the west • Ridge and furrow exists on the top field east of the drive to Rhymes House • Exacerbate surface water run-off over Townsend Road • Increased light pollution at the edge of the village • A roundabout should be provided at the Bourton junction with a link road running east west parallel with the A420 to relieve traffic pressure and congestion in Shrivenham centre. This is supported by the Canal Trust • Open setting of Rhymes House would be completely lost • The glass enclosed elevator on the southern face of Rhymes House would allow views from proposed houses into a living room and bedroom • Detrimental impact on local wildlife • Factual inaccuracies in the application submission; there is a right of way across the site to Rhymes House; links to footpaths could not be created as there are no existing footpaths over the site or across adjacent land • Contradictory numbers are used for the population of Shrivenham • This site was considered for housing as part of the review of housing in the area and it was rejected in favour of other sites • Frogs and newts inhabit a pond in an adjacent garden; the applicant advises there are no water bodies within 500m
Ed Vaisey MP	Objects as the proposal is clearly overdevelopment of the site, and will represent an inappropriate burden on the community and

	<p>infrastructure in Shrivenham. It sits outside the area for development indicated in the emerging local plan and is thus opportunistic and inappropriate. The proposed housing density is more than 50% higher than in the surrounding area, and would be very much out of keeping with the context in which the development would sit</p>
<p>Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Overall Objection on primary school capacity grounds</p> <p><u>Transport</u> No objection subject to conditions requiring a travel information pack, travel survey, sustainable drainage scheme, location of bus stops and bus shelters. Also seek financial contributions towards bus services, a new access junction to the A420, travel plan monitoring revoking a traffic regulation order and for installing and maintaining bus shelters.</p> <p>Together with other major development proposals in Shrivenham, the proposed development would result in the need for improved junction access to the A420 and the highway authority has confirmed the need to seek a pro-rata financial contribution from this site. The applicant has confirmed his acceptance to this and has agreed that a fair financial contribution to a junction scheme would be made.</p> <p>The revised proposed site access confirms that the access onto Townsend Road would be located to remove as far as possible the potential for turning conflicts with the existing access to the commercial site on the opposite side of the road. The applicant confirms that, as requested by the highway authority, the development would implement changes on Townsend Road, comprising the removal of the existing double white line system, provision of new carriageway markings and the installation of speed cushions.</p> <p>The application has included a potential pedestrian connection from the south-eastern corner of the site on to Townsend Road. This connection would be beneficial in reducing the travel distance from the site to the village centre and should be provided in a form suitable to be used by cyclists as well as pedestrians</p> <p><u>Archaeology</u> No objection - recommends two planning conditions to secure an archaeological written scheme of investigation and a programme of archaeological evaluation as whilst there are no known archaeological features in the immediate area of the application site. This is however an area of archaeological potential with evidence of later prehistoric and Romano British settlement to the north.</p> <p><u>Education</u> Objection - the application should be refused on the grounds that there is insufficient primary school capacity to meet the needs of the proposed development and that there is currently no secured solution to providing the required capacity.</p> <p>Shrivenham Primary School would need additional capacity to accommodate the expected additional pupil generation. Due to site constraints, the school cannot expand on its current site. Until such time as suitable land has been secured by OCC for the expansion of</p>

	<p>Shrivenham Primary School, OCC objects to any further housing in the area.</p> <p>Shrivenham Primary School is on a constrained site; the area is not sufficient to allow expansion beyond 1 form entry (annual intake of 30). Pupil numbers are rising rapidly at the school as a consequence of recent housing development in the village, and an influx of MoD families. The school has a total capacity of 210 places; however, 30 of these are provided in a temporary classroom which has been installed to provide an interim solution to the need for school places ahead of a longer term, sustainable solution becoming possible. The latest data held by the county council shows that the school currently has 179 pupils on roll, compared to the 180 places in permanent capacity. Pupil numbers will rise further as the older, smaller, year groups leave the school.</p> <p>With its current accommodation, and on its current site, the school would not be able to accommodate the level of growth indicated by this proposal.</p> <p>In response to indications by VOWH of the level of housing proposed for Shrivenham, the county council has been working with the responsible academy trust to explore options for increasing primary school capacity in the village. The proposed solution is the provision of a 180 place (6-classroom) primary school building on a new site, within the land covered by application P13/V1810/O. This solution has been costed by the county council's Property consultants at £4,623,000 (@3Q12 values) excluding land, equivalent to £25,683 per pupil place. However, until such time as suitable land has been transferred to OCC, OCC cannot provide a solution to the demand for additional places that this development will place on Shrivenham Primary School.</p> <p>In respect of secondary school accommodation there is no objection subject to a financial contribution towards the phase 2 expansion of Faringdon Community College.</p> <p><u>Property</u> No objection</p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u> No objection</p>
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>No objection.</p> <p>Waste Comments Identify an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application, Thames Water would like a 'Grampian Style' condition imposed preventing development from commencing until a drainage strategy detailing any on and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved by the LPA.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of</p>

	<p>surface water it is Recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.</p> <p>Water Comments The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed Development. Thames Water therefore recommend a condition be imposed requiring development not to be commenced until and impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The study should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.</p> <p>Thames Water recommend an informative: They will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.</p>
<p>Health and Housing Team – contaminated land</p>	<p>No objection</p>
<p>Health & Housing – air quality</p>	<p>No objection. Have reviewed the applicant's air quality report which indicates that pollution levels at properties will be within acceptable limits. In response to Parish Council concerns relating to queuing traffic causing increased pollution an environmental health officer advises that <i>"idling traffic will emit more nitrogen dioxide relative to moving traffic. Most routes will suffer idling traffic sometimes, particularly during peak periods. Whilst traffic emissions will be increased over these periods they are unlikely to have a significant impact on overall air quality unless the congestion occurs for long periods of time. Typically it is idling traffic in town centres with narrow streets, tall buildings and poor dispersion where traffic congestion related air quality is a problem. The air quality objective limits as these are assessed as an average over a whole year and so I would not anticipate that short term congestion would have a significant impact on this"</i>.</p>
<p>Health & Housing team – environmental protection</p>	<p>No objection - This site is very noisy in parts, particularly where it is in close proximity to the A420. The submitted noise report is based on monitoring and some basic calculations to predict nominal façade levels. The noise report suggest the site suitable for housing with noise mitigation measures in place. The measures proposed include, bunding and fencing of parts of the site boundary to protect the site from noise from the A420, providing a suitable stand off distance between</p>

	<p>residential development and the A420, orientating living areas and bedrooms away from the noise source, provision of acoustic glazing and ventilation and boundary treatments to achieve suitable noise levels in outdoor living areas.</p> <p>The report suggests that the detail of the specific noise mitigation measures can be dealt with as reserved matters.</p> <p>Noise is a material planning consideration for the development of the site. If this development is dependant upon provision of acoustic bunding and fencing along the boundaries of the site then this is something which may need to be considered as part of the outline application in order to establish that the provision of bunds with fences on top will be acceptable in wider planning terms.</p> <p>The extent of the suitable area of this land for housing development will be heavily dependent upon the stand off, design and orientation of residential development along with any specific noise mitigation measures for each property. These will all be influenced by the degree of noise attenuation afforded by any acoustic bunding of the site boundary. I am happy for the detailed mitigation measures to be dealt with as reserved matters.</p> <p>We would not be minded to object to development where the noise levels at facades is not predicted to exceed 63dB LAeq during daytime hours and 55dB LAeq at night where suitable mitigation is in place to ensure that good internal noise levels can be met. In outdoor living areas we will not object where noise levels will not exceed 50dB LAeq for the majority of the properties close to the noise source. Where levels are predicted in the range 50-55dB LAeq these will be acceptable so long as part of the outdoor living area is predicted to be at or below 50dB LAeq.</p>
Waste Team	No objection - seek a contribution of £170 per dwelling towards waste collection services for this development
Countryside Officer	No objection – recommends a condition requiring enhancements for bats to be incorporated into the development as recommended by the applicants bat survey.
Housing Development team	<p>No objection</p> <p>46 affordable dwellings should be provided (40%). The affordable tenure mix should comprise 75% rented and 25% shared ownership</p> <p>As an outline application no unit type mix is currently proposed. The following is therefore recommended:-</p> <p>Rent</p> <p>1 bed flat x 6 (min 46m²)</p> <p>2 bed flat/house x 18 (min 72 m² flat, 76 m² house)</p> <p>3 bed house x 9 (min 88 m². To include 3 x 96 m² 6person in lieu of additional 4b provision)</p> <p>4 bed house x 2 (min 100 m²)</p> <p>The majority should be provided as houses. Flats should have individual entrances.</p>

	<p>Shared ownership 2 bed x 8 3 bed x 3 The affordable units should be integrated throughout the developments and indistinguishable from the market units. Parking courts should be avoided where possible, in favour of on plot parking. The council should secure the affordable housing by way of a S.106 Agreement, and not Condition, as proposed in the Planning Statement.</p> <p>The market unit mix should be broadly in accordance with the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 requirements, and provide a range of unit types including 1 and 2 bed homes for first time buyers, and households seeking to downsize</p>
Landscape Architect	<p>Makes some criticism of the applicant's landscape and visual assessment as it tends to concentrate on the western edge of the village whereas the site is read as part of the wider landscape. The proposed development site can be clearly seen in views across the Lowland Vale, and reads as part of the wider landscape field pattern. The development of this site would push the visible development edge of Shrivenham westward into an area which is currently viewed as part of the Lowland Vale countryside. Currently the western village edge of Shrivenham is not prominent in the majority of the views towards Shrivenham.</p> <p>DC1 Design and DC 6 Landscaping are relevant with regard to character of locality and protecting and enhancing the visual amenities. NPPF para 7, 9 and 17 are also relevant with reference to the protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment and recognising the character of different areas. However setting aside the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development, the Illustrative Development Framework, does seem to accommodate the retention of the existing mature vegetation on site, with properties facing onto rather than rear gardens to these areas of retained vegetation. As per the tree officers comments the location of the proposed SUDs ponds needs to take account of the existing vegetation.</p>
Environment Agency	No objection subject to conditions requiring surface water and foul water drainage schemes being agreed and implemented.
Drainage Engineer	No objection subject to conditions requiring surface water and foul water drainage schemes being agreed and implemented
Vale leisure	No objection. Recommends a series of financial contributions towards sports and leisure uses. These are addressed in this report.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P15/V0500/SCR - Screening opinion for a proposed development of 115 new dwellings with public open space and landscaping and access off Townsend Road. - EIA not required.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2011**

The development plan for this area comprises the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan 2011. The following local plan policies relevant to this application were 'saved' by

direction on 1 July 2009.

Policy No.	Policy Title
GS1	Developments in Existing Settlements
GS2	Development in the Countryside
DC1	Design
DC3	Design against crime
DC5	Access
DC6	Landscaping
DC7	Waste Collection and Recycling
DC8	The Provision of Infrastructure and Services
DC9	The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
DC12	Water quality and resources
DC13	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
DC14	Flood Risk and Water Run-off
H11	Development in the Larger Villages
H15	Housing Densities
H16	Size of Dwelling and Lifetime Homes
H17	Affordable Housing
H23	Open Space in New Housing Development
HE1	Conservation areas
HE4	Listed buildings
HE10	Archaeology
NE9	The Lowland vale

Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1

- 5.2 The draft local plan 2031 part 1 is not currently adopted policy. It has not been subject to Examination and policies remain subject to objections. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF. At present it is officers' opinion that the emerging Local Plan housing policies carry limited weight for decision making. The relevant policies are as follows:-

Policy No.	Policy Title
Core Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Core Policy 2	Co-operation on unmet housing need for Oxfordshire
Core Policy 3	Settlement hierarchy
Core Policy 4	Meeting our housing needs
Core Policy 5	Housing supply ring-fence
Core Policy 7	Providing supporting infrastructure and services
Core Policy 20	Spatial strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area
Core Policy 22	Housing mix
Core Policy 23	Housing density
Core Policy 24	Affordable housing
Core Policy 33	Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
Core Policy 35	Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
Core Policy 36	Electronic communications
Core Policy 37	Design and local distinctiveness
Core Policy 38	Design strategies for strategic and major development sites
Core Policy 39	The historic environment
Core Policy 42	Flood risk

Core Policy 43	Natural resources
Core Policy 44	Landscape
Core Policy 45	Green infrastructure
Core Policy 46	Conservation and improvement of biodiversity

5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Design Guide – March 2015
The following sections of the Design Guide are particularly relevant to this application:-
Responding to Site and Setting
 - *Character Study (DG6) and Site appraisal (DG9)**Establishing the Framework*
 - *Existing natural resources, sustainability and heritage(DG10-13, 15, 19)*
 - *Landscape and SUDS (DG14, 16-18, 20)*
 - *Movement Framework and street hierarchy (DG21-24)*
 - *Density (DG26)*
 - *Urban Structure (blocks, frontages, nodes etc) DG27-30**Layout*
 - *Streets and Spaces (DG31-43)*
 - *Parking (DG44-50)**Built Form*
 - *Scale, form, massing and position (DG51-54)*
 - *Boundary treatments (DG55)*
 - *Building Design (DG56-62)*
 - *Amenity, privacy and overlooking (DG63-64)*
 - *Refuse and services (DG67-68)*
- Open space, sport and recreation future provision – July 2008
- Sustainable Design and Construction – December 2009
- Affordable Housing – July 2006
- Flood Maps and Flood Risk – July 2006
- Planning and Public Art – July 2006

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012

5.5 National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)

5.6 Neighbourhood Plan

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF.

An application has been received for a neighbourhood planning designation area but to date a neighbourhood plan has not been submitted to the Council. Consequently no weight can be given to any policies that may be emerging in any draft neighbourhood plan.

5.7 Environmental Impact

The site area exceeds 5ha in size and is therefore, above the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015. As required by the above Regulations officers have undertaken a screening opinion. Taking into account government guidance on thresholds in paragraph 58 of the NPPG and having considered the potential for

significant effects of the proposal in accordance with Schedule 3 of the Regulations, it has been decided that in this case this proposal is not EIA development.

5.8 Other Relevant Legislation

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation Human Rights Act 1998
- Equality Act 2010
- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)

5.9 Human Rights Act

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

5.10 Equalities

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. Principle of the development
2. Use of Land
3. Locational Credentials
4. Affordable Housing and Housing Mix
5. Design and Layout
6. Residential Amenity
7. Landscape and Visual Impact
8. Open Space and Landscaping
9. Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage
10. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety
11. Protected Species and Biodiversity
12. Viability and Developer Contributions

The Principle of Development

6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan currently comprises the saved policies of Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

6.2 Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and NPPG and the emerging Vale of White Horse Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Sites and Policies and its supporting evidence base.

6.3 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to *"use their evidence*

base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area"... The authority has undertaken this assessment through the April 2014 SHMA which is the most up to date objectively assessed need for housing. In agreeing to submit the emerging Local Plan for examination, the Council has agreed a housing target of at least 20,560 dwellings for the plan period to 2031. Set against this target the Council does not have a five year housing land supply.

- 6.4 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites"*. This means that the relevant housing policies in the adopted local plan are not considered up to date and the adverse impacts of a development would need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal is refused. In order to judge whether a development is sustainable it must be assessed against the economic, social and environmental roles.
- 6.5 Policy GS1 of the adopted Local Plan provides a strategy for locating development concentrated at the five major towns but with small scale development within the built up areas of villages provided that important areas of open land and their rural character are protected. In terms of a hierarchy for allocating development this strategy is consistent with the NPPF, as is the intention to protect the character of villages. This site is beyond but adjacent to the village edge. It is not allocated for development in either the adopted or the draft local plans. The Council's Study of Village Facilities in the Vale (July 2009) ranks Shrivenham as one of the villages with the widest range of facilities and as one of the most sustainable locations for future development in rural areas.
- 6.6 This site was presented as a potential strategic site as part of the process in drafting the local plan Part 1 2031. It was rejected on the grounds that the site was not considered capable of accommodating 200 dwellings (a figure of 100 dwellings being deemed more achievable) (Topic Paper 3 strategic Sites selection November 2014).
- 6.7 The relevant housing policies of the adopted and emerging local plan hold very limited material planning weight in light of the lack of a 5 year housing supply. Consequently the proposal should be assessed under the NPPF where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through the decision making process. Having a deliverable 5 year housing supply is considered sustainable under the 3 strands. Therefore, with the lack of a 5 year housing supply, and this being mostly previously developed land adjoining a permitted scheme of housing, the proposal is acceptable in principle unless any adverse impacts can be identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of meeting this objective.

Cumulative Impact

- 6.8 The NPPF does not suggest that populations of settlements should be limited in some way or not be expanded by any particular figure. It expects housing to be boosted significantly. Many objectors including the Parish Councils consider the proposal will further overwhelm the village and its facilities, and that the village has provided sufficient housing and this proposal is unnecessary particularly considering the strategic site allocation and planning permissions granted for other housing developments in the village, plus the proposed east of Swindon expansion.

- 6.9 Planning permissions have been granted or resolved to be granted subject to completion of a s.106, for up to 421 dwellings in Shrivenham. There are also pending applications for up to 181 dwellings (P15/V1091/O and P15/V2222/O). If the remainder of the strategic housing site allocation (260 dwellings) and this current proposal are added to these figures it would amount to some 878 dwellings potentially being added to Shrivenham, The total increase in the population of the parish could be some 2,212 people (2.52 x 878 dwellings). This is a sizable increase to the population of the village which according to the village web site is currently some 5,500 residents and a sizable increase in housing for the Parish.
- 6.10 The NPPF does not suggest development should be prevented on grounds of adding dwellings to a settlement; it seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing (paragraph 47 of the NPPF) and the NPPF adds at paragraph 52 that the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through larger scale development such as new settlements.
- 6.11 The concerns of the Parish Council and local residents in regard to expansion of the village are recognised and it is acknowledged that the village has been subject to a number of planning applications for housing as mentioned above. In the absence of a 5-year land supply and considering advice in the NPPF it would not be prudent to refuse permission on the grounds of further housing being added to the village.
- 6.12 There will be increased pressure on infrastructure. None of the technical consultees with one exception, object subject to planning conditions being imposed or provided financial contributions are obtained for infrastructure improvements.

Use of Land

- 6.13 The NPPF identifies the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from development (paragraph 112). The Natural England agricultural land classification map unfortunately contains an annotation over part of the site but it seems the site could be part grade 3 and part grade 2 agricultural land. Presently part of the site is used for grazing horses and part given over to arable. The loss of some 5.1ha of grade 2 and 3 agricultural land which is relatively small set against wider areas of grade 2 and 3 land and this harm has to be balanced against the economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal including providing housing in the District.

Locational Credentials

- 6.14 The NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34).
- 6.15 The site is beyond the western edge of the village and many objectors are concerned that the distance from local facilities could encourage more traffic into the village centre where there is already considerable pressure for car parking. Shrivenham does have a good range of local facilities. The primary school is approximately 925m from the site access (the proposed new primary school is some 1,200m away), with the nearest shop and bank being some 820m away and the village hall and recreation ground approximately 680m from the site access. These distances are measured by road and not as a straight line. The walking distances to key facilities in the village are greater than 400m which is a desirable distance according to the Institution of Highways Transportation guidelines for providing for journeys on foot (2000) but which does also advise distances up to 800m are acceptable and up to 1200m are a preferred maximum. Bus stops are closer to the site with two new bus stops being proposed on Townsend Road in front of the site and which could be secured by condition. The bus service can provide an alternative means of travel to the village centre and employment opportunities including those in Swindon. Facilities and possible employment

opportunities at the Defence Academy and Shrivenham Hundred business park could be cycled using local roads. Alternatives to the private motor car are available for journeys and with distances to local facilities it is considered this site is reasonably accessible. The proposal may increase pressure on parking space in the village centre but with alternative forms of transport available and the facilities being within acceptable walking distances and no clear evidence that this proposal would unreasonably affect parking, this could not be reasonably advanced as a reason for refusal.

Affordable housing and housing mix

- 6.16 The application makes provision for 40% affordable housing which accords with policy H17 of the adopted Local Plan and this can be secured by legal agreement. This being an outline application there is no proposed mix of house types. At detailed stage officers would expect the market housing mix to closely reflect the expectations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (April 2014) with the affordable housing mix complying with the housing officers recommendation.

Design and Layout

- 6.17 The NPPF provides that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment (paragraph 60). It gives considerable weight to good design and acknowledges it is a key component of sustainable development.
- 6.18 A number of local plan policies seek to ensure high quality developments and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties (Policies DC1, DC6 and DC9). In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.
- 6.19 This is an outline application with only access to be considered. The details concerning layout, scale and external appearance of the dwellings are reserved matters and would be considered should a reserved matters or a detailed application be submitted; they
- 6.20 are not part of the consideration of this outline application. It is not therefore, intended to address design and layout in any detail in this report.
- 6.21 Principle DG26 of the design guide states that density should be appropriate to the location, and it requires a range of densities for larger development proposals. Policy H15 of the adopted local plan requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. The application proposes a density of some 22 dwellings per hectare. Housing immediately adjacent to the site in Greycourt Road and Friars Close has a density of some 13ha being of a lower density. However, this existing development is mainly large dwellings and a mix of house sizes would be expected on the application site. This is an edge of village location which justifies a lower density to ensure a residential development knits into the semi-rural character of the area. In this regard officers consider significant landscaping belts and open spaces will be required to break the appearance of the development, soften the sites edges and provide a buffer including noise buffer to the A420, and space will be required around Rhymes House to protect its setting and the living conditions of its residents. At this stage officers are unconvinced the framework plan accompanying the application or the sketch layout in the design and access statement are appropriate means for informing development of this site. It is therefore the case that the site may not accommodate 116 dwellings and the figure it might accommodate could be less than this. The outline consent is seeking approval for 'up to' 116 dwellings. Therefore, the grant of planning permission does not endorse that a total of 116 dwellings can be achieved on this site merely that a figure between 1 and 116 could be achieved.

Residential Amenity

- 6.22 Adopted local plan policy DC9 seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment. Protecting amenity is a core principle of the NPPF. Design principles DG63-64 of the Design Guide pertain to amenity, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.23 As no firm details of housing layout or house types accompany this outline application, as they are reserved matters, it is not possible to consider the impact on existing residential amenity. The most appropriate stage to do this would be at detailed application stage or submission of reserved matters. Officers will, as mentioned above, expect space around Rhymes House to protect the living conditions of its occupants and care will be required to minimise impacts for residents of Cleycourt Road and Friars Close whose dwellings back on to this site and the dwellings including Swanhill Farmhouse on the south west boundary particularly as those dwellings are at a lower level to the site. The illustrative framework plan and a planting strategy show open spaces and landscaping to the east and west boundaries. The space on the eastern site edge will at least be expected in a detailed scheme whereas wider and increased landscaping will be expected on the western side of the site not only to protect residential amenity but also to ensure the development knits into the semi-rural character of the area. As mentioned, open space and further planting will be expected around Rhymes House to protect its setting and the living conditions of its occupants.
- 6.24 The site adjoins in part the A420 with traffic using the road generating considerable noise that is heard across this site. The applicant has undertaken a noise survey which identifies noise from traffic using the A420 and Townsend Road are in excess of this Council's targets for garden areas during the day and internal areas in the day and at night. Mitigation is proposed in the form placing outdoor living spaces on the screened side of dwellings away from the A420 and Townsend Road and close boarded fencing to gardens. Living rooms and bedrooms should be located on the screened side of dwellings. Acoustic glazing can be used. It is also suggested that a noise attenuation bund and fence could be provided beside the A420 with an open space 'standoff' between the bund and the dwellings. The applicant's acoustician gives an example of a 30m 'standoff' and a 4.3m high barrier to the A420 should reduce noise to reasonable levels. A 4.3m barrier in the form of a fence or wall would not be appropriate visually but a graded earth bund could be reasonable with a further 30m standoff being additional open space to a graded and planted earth bund.
- 6.25 Concerns have been expressed by interested parties that traffic can queue on this part of the A420 creating noise. I note that the applicant's acoustician advises further noise testing should be undertaken at reserved matters stage and a scheme appropriately mitigated. This is considered to be necessary, as circumstances could change between now and the reserved matters stage. Noise from traffic is not considered insurmountable issue and should planning permission be granted it is recommended that a planning condition be imposed requiring a further noise survey at reserved matters stage to inform the design and layout of the dwellings and necessary mitigation which could include an earth bund to the A420 and sufficient open space as a standoff area. This may have an impact on the number of dwellings provided on site with the figure potentially being fewer than 116.
- 6.26 The applicant has also submitted an air quality report which has been revised at the request of council officers. The report predicts pollutant concentrations on site but these are below annual mean air quality objectives and considered not significant or to require any mitigation. Some representations indicate traffic on the A420 can queue past this site with consequences for air pollution. At reserved matters stage it is recommend that a further air quality assessment should be undertaken to ensure air

pollution either remains at acceptable levels or mitigation can be designed in to the scheme. This can be required by planning condition.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 6.28 The NPPF seeks to enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (paragraph 109). This is not a valued landscape in NPPF terms. The site is part of the wider Lowland Vale landscape. The proposal will extend the village into open countryside at its edge and erode the present rural and open appearance of the site. The new access will be especially noticeable for those passing the site and the change would be visually substantial for those passing the site.
- 6.29 No public rights of way cross the site and there are few in the vicinity from which the site would make a significant contribution in views to users. From the public right of way passing Stallpits Farm to the north of the site and north of the A420, views of the site are limited due to vegetation on both sides of the A420 and topography. In the limited views of the site available, it is seen in the context of the A420 itself and housing at the edge of the village. Effects for users of this right of way are not considered unreasonable.
- 6.30 A footpath crosses fields south east of the site and some 185m from the site. The site is seen in the context of dwellings and a car repair workshop that exists on the southern side of Townsend Road and which appear in the foreground of the limited views available. The effects for users of the footpath is not unreasonable.
- 6.31 Other views of the site are available from local roads including Townsend Road in approaching the village from the west and from Bourton Road including the railway bridge. The western part of the site in particular is visible in these views as that part of the site rises towards the village edge. Rhymes House is visible and seen as a freestanding house divorced from the village. Housing at the village edge is not prominent. Existing dwellings and the commercial unit on the south side of Townsend Road and immediately west/south west of the site are visible appearing as a small group of dwellings beyond the village. Despite the presence of Rhymes House and the other dwellings and buildings neighbouring the site, the land is seen and reads as part of the countryside at the edge of Shrivenham. Its loss to housing would be noticeable as would the extension of Shrivenham beyond its present built up limits. There would be some localised visual harm and also the loss of the site to housing would have some limited localised harm for the Lowland Vale landscape.
- 6.32 The landscape and visual harm needs to be weighed in the planning balance against the benefits of the proposal and also against the A420 junction improvements at the Townsend Road junction safeguarded by policy CP21 of the draft local plan. This work would be west of this site but within its context.
- 6.33 Some interested parties suggest the proposal would consolidate the gap between Bourton and Shrivenham. The edge of Bourton is some 1,200m from the south western edge of Shrivenham and this site. The proposal would not unacceptably erode this gap.
- 6.34 Housing on the site would be visible with the views from these local roads and in part interrupted by existing field boundary hedges and trees. Should permission be granted it will be necessary as part of any detailed application or reserved matters application to provide significant landscaping and open spaces to ensure the development knits into the semi-rural character of the area.
- 6.35 The site is approximately 4.7km north of the AONB. The site is not prominent in any

view from the AONB and there are no public views across the site which could reasonably be considered such that the site is part of the setting of the AONB.

Open Space, Landscaping and Trees

- 6.36 Adopted Local Plan Policy H23 of the adopted Local Plan requires a minimum of 15% of the residential area to be laid out as open space. The framework plan provides at least 15% open space. As mentioned above officers will expect greater areas of open space and landscaping on site.
- 6.37 Boundary hedges and trees can be retained and protected during development. The exception is vegetation including two trees that will be removed to provide the access. These trees (an oak and field maple) are not protected by a preservation order. The oak is almost dead and recommended for clearance. The field maple is not an important tree in the vegetation fronting Townsend Road. Their loss will be visual and this is addressed in the previous section of this report. There is no objection in principle to the loss of these trees. Should permission be granted significant additional landscaping will be required on site which is expected to be in excess of that suggested in the illustrative planting strategy submitted in support of the application.

Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

- 6.38 The NPPF provides that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be appropriately flood resilient and resistant (paragraph 103). It states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution (Paragraph 109).
- 6.39 Adopted local plan policy DC9 provides that new development will not be permitted if it would unacceptably harm the amenities of neighbouring properties or the wider environment in terms of, amongst other things, pollution and contamination. Policy DC12 provides that development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the quality of water resources as a result of, amongst other things, waste water discharge. Policies DC13 and 14 are not considered to be consistent with the NPPF, because they do not comply with paragraphs 100 to 104 which require a sequential approach to locating development and provide that flood risk should not be increased elsewhere.
- 6.40 A Thames Water sewer impact survey confirms that there are potentially two options for upgrading the foul system to accommodate the development through either on-line storage or pipe upgrades. A planning condition can require this work prior to occupation of any dwelling.
- 6.41 The site lies beyond any fluvial flood risk area, and is categorised by the Environment Agency as being in Flood Zone 1 which are areas least susceptible to flooding and in flood risk terms the most suitable locations for housing development. Some concerns have been expressed with regard to potential surface water run-off causing flooding particularly for properties below the site. The surface water drainage strategy is to control the surface water discharge from the development to mimic the pre development greenfield runoff rates prior to discharge into a local ditch to the south west of the site. In turn this will generate attenuation volumes which will be retained within an attenuation pond / basin on site. This should ensure minimal surface water run-off flood risk and I note that the drainage bodies have no objections. An appropriate surface water drainage strategy to include SUDS can be provided and secured by condition.

- 6.42 A contamination survey accompanies the application and confirms negligible risk and the Council's environmental protection team advise they have no objection.

Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

- 6.43 Adopted local plan policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely. The NPPF (Paragraph 32) requires plans and decision to take account of whether:-
- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
 - safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
 - improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.
- 6.44 Paragraph 32 goes on to state: *“Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”*
- 6.45 The applicant has updated its transport assessment. The highway authority has not raised any concerns. Access to Townsend Road is shown in a position that limits potential conflict for those accessing commercial premises opposite the site. The access is designed to an acceptable width with pavements either side, Adequate vision splays can be achieved from the proposed access and these can be secured by planning condition.
- 6.46 The proposal will generate additional traffic through the village. The highway authority has not raised any concerns in this respect. In addition, the proposal will generate additional traffic movements on to the A420. Some concern has been expressed with regard to cumulative impacts with other housing developments including potential for 8,000 dwellings and commercial uses east of Swindon. Highway implications of this potential development together with expected growth in the Vale of White Horse District have been subject to discussions between Swindon Borough Council, this Council, OCC and Highways England with traffic predictions modelled for the A420. The east of Swindon development area (Eastern Villages), is allocated in the adopted Swindon local plan as the highway implications including those for the A420 are considered reasonable.
- 6.47 Car parking should be provided in accordance with the Council's parking standards and the location of parking should be provided in accordance with advice in the Council's 2015 adopted Design Guide.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 6.48 Paragraph 117 of the NPPF refers to the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, whilst Paragraph 118 sets out the basis for determination of planning applications. Paragraph 118 states that *“...if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused...”*
- 6.49 The site is not designated for is biodiversity interest. The applicant's ecological appraisal advises that there is limited botanical interest with the plant species present being typical of the habitats present. It concludes that some boundary trees have potential for roosting bats and consequently the applicant's ecologist undertook an assessment of relevant trees and found no evidence of roosting bats and the trees unsuited for providing natural bat roosts. Survey work also indicates the site is unsuited to reptile use and it does not provide important foraging for badger. At the request of

officers following representations advising that Great Crested Newt (GCN) use a pond in an adjacent garden and other water bodies in the area the applicant has commissioned a GCN survey which investigated four garden ponds (access to a fifth pond was denied) and other nearby waterbodies including the Wiltshire and Berkshire canal. The finding of the survey indicate that there could be a GCN presence in the canal some 270m from the site with no GCN found in garden ponds. The site consists of an arable field and closely cropped horse paddocks and is unlikely to provide optimal GCN habitat as is the case for the land between the canal and the site. The council's ecologist has reviewed the survey work and has no objection to this proposal.

- 6.50 The nearest site of national importance for biodiversity is Tuckmill Meadow some 1.2km north of the site and which is unaffected by this proposal.
- 6.51 Opportunity exists within the site and particularly the open spaces that should be provided and within the hedgerows and trees to provide biodiversity improvements including wildflower meadows and bird and bat nesting and roosting boxes.

Historic Environment and Archaeology

- 6.52 Policy HE1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that developments preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, including the setting. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Officers have given significant importance and weight to this requirement. The site is approximately 520m west of the Shrivenham conservation area and separated from it by existing housing. There is no line of sight between the conservation area and the site and there is no effect on its setting. The Bourton conservation area is approximately 1.1km from the site with limited opportunity for views between the two. This site does not play an important role in the setting of the conservation area and at this distance there is no adverse harm to its setting.
- 6.53 Policy HE4 of the local plan seeks to protect the setting of listed buildings. The closest listed buildings to this site are the grade II listed Cottage on the B400 opposite the allotments and some 400m west of the site, the canal bridge some 770m south east of the site on Station Road, Bourton Church Bridge some 900m south of the site and the Bouton Bridge approximately 1km to the south west.
- 6.54 Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Considerable importance and weight should be given to this requirement, as confirmed in the case of Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited and East Northamptonshire District Council English Heritage National Trust the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
- 6.55 The settings of these listed buildings are not experienced in views out from the site. There are some limited views towards the site and of the site from the canal bridge, Bourton Church Bridge and Bourton Bridge. In these limited views the site is seen in the context of the edge of Shrivenham including the adjacent housing. With the distances between the site and these listed buildings and the open land between the site and the listed bridges remaining, the impact on their setting is negligible.
- 6.56 Rhymes House and Swanhill Farmhouse are not listed buildings. Rhymes House has an isolated setting which would be harmed but this harm is not unreasonable and would not be sufficient to outweigh the benefits of the proposal.

- 6.57 Policy HE10 of the adopted Local Plan states that development will not be permitted if it would cause damage to the site or setting of nationally important archaeological remains, whether scheduled or not. There are no scheduled remains affected by the proposal and the County Archaeologists advises there are no known archaeological features in the immediate area. The County Council archaeologist advises indicate that the site has some archaeological potential but that this potential can be investigated through archaeological investigation and this can be required by planning conditions.
- 6.58 It is concluded that there is no substantial harm to any historic asset.

Viability, affordable housing and Section 106 contributions

Policy Background

- 6.59 The NPPF advises that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests (paragraph 204):
- i) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - ii) Directly related to the development; and
 - iii) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- Policy DC8 of the Adopted Local Plan provides that development will only be permitted where the necessary physical infrastructure and service requirements to support the development can be secured.
- 6.60 As discussed above, the application provides for 40% of the dwellings as affordable housing.
- 6.61 On 6 April 2015 a change in legislation was introduced by the Government which now prevents the pooling of more than five financial contributions to any one infrastructure project. Consequently this rules out requests for contributions towards, Special Educational Needs, the central library, waste management, museum resources.
- 6.62 The NPPG provides further guidance on how to apply the tests mentioned above and notes the following:
1. Planning obligations assist in mitigating the impact of development which benefits local communities and supports the provision of local infrastructure.
 2. Planning obligations should not be sought where they are clearly not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
 3. Planning obligations must be fully justified and evidenced. Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, planning obligations should not prevent development from going forward.

Parish Council and Sports Provision

- 6.63 The Parish Council in consultation with villagers has identified a need for infrastructure improvements in the village including the village hall, recreation ground clubhouse, other sports and recreation uses. The Parish Council has costed these projects and has requested contributions based on the increase in size of the village by the addition of this development (13%) towards providing the facilities. The development will place further pressure on village facilities and through its work the contributions requested by the Parish Council are considered reasonable, justified and proportionate, and therefore, CIL compliant.

- 6.64 The Vale leisure team has requested a number of contributions towards recreation facilities outside the village and particularly new facilities at The Steeds, Great Coxwell. Some of these cannot be requested due to pooling e.g. Faringdon artificial pitch and a contribution of over £101,424 towards a new pavilion at Great Coxwell is not considered CIL compliant being unrelated to this development and moreover, there is no pavilion to fund. Other requests including those towards tennis facilities, youth activities and MUGA, parish hall improvements are in line with the Parish Council's requests and are considered CIL compliant being justified, reasonable and proportionate to this development. In addition, this development will place increased pressure on district leisure centre facilities which for this area are the facilities at Faringdon leisure centre. A costed project for improving changing facilities at Faringdon leisure centre has been identified and it is considered reasonable, justifiable and proportionate that this proposal contributes £130,000 towards this new facility.

Shrivenham Primary School

- 6.65 Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) as education authority object as the Shrivenham primary school is at capacity and could not be expanded to provide accommodation for the increased number of pupils (32 pupils) this proposal could create. A resolution exists to permit a primary school on the strategic site north of Shrivenham (application no P13/V1810/O) and this could accommodate the increase in pupils of primary school age. However, OCC advise that until such time as suitable land has been transferred to them, OCC cannot provide a solution to the demand for additional places that this development will place on Shrivenham Primary School.
- 6.66 Officers have queried this advice and to ascertain the planning weight that should be attached to this objection expressed, officers have sought clarification as to whether OCC would defend this objection with costs if appealed by the applicants. No clarification on this point has been given to date. Therefore, officers are left to apply their own planning judgement to this objection. Ultimately, this matter of primary school provision is, to a considerable extent, in the control of OCC in completing the s.106 legal agreement for that application (P13/V1810/O). It is wholly reasonable to be of the view that there is a solution already negotiated by OCC which this development could justifiably contribute towards by a financial payment towards providing a new school. Officers are not convinced the County Council's case is sustainable at appeal and has advised the relevant OCC team accordingly.
- 6.67 In their response on this application OCC also advise that *"should they be required to pay for any land necessary to expand Shrivenham Primary School a contribution towards that cost proportionate to the number of pupils generated by the development will be required"*. OCC advise this contribution should be £821,856. This is based on the OCC's Property consultant's calculation *"at £4,623,000 (@3Q12 values) excluding land, equivalent to £25,683 per pupil place. A policy compliant mix of dwellings generates a demand for an additional 32 pupil places. On this basis a contribution of £821,856 (@3Q12 values) would be required"*. It is understood this figure is based on a building designed to a 2FE specification having measures seeking to achieve a 60% carbon reduction with BREEAM Very Good.
- 6.68 In discussion with officers the applicant has challenged this amount and officers consider this amount has not been justified against the 3 statutory tests. Officers have requested details of the new Shrivenham primary school from OCC but these have not been forthcoming. The £821,856 mentioned in OCC's consultation response has not been justified and from recent correspondence the figure does not appear to have been finalised. The County Council is obliged to provide school places and it has known about the District Council housing needs for some time. Provision of a new primary

school is in their control in completing the s.106 for application no. P13/V1810/O.

- 6.69 In the absence of guidance from OCC on a reasonable and justifiable primary school contribution officers have reviewed other sources of information to understand what would be reasonable and proportionate to assist the planning considerations in terms of the 3 statutory tests. Two key reputable sources have been reviewed being Government guidance and BICS. Government guidance is from the 'Education Funding Agency' (EFA) which has a new formula (2014) to aid practitioners in understanding costs for primary schools. The other is BICS annual reports on costs, which is universally used by all practitioners in understanding and predicting construction costs.
- 6.70 The EFA gives a cost of £1,113m² but it is noted that it excludes external works, professional fees and so on. Their formula for new primary schools is 350m² + 4.1m² per pupil place x £1,113. Based on 32 pupils this suggests a cost of some £535,575.60.
- 6.71 Having put this to the County Council officers are advised *"the EFA funding multiplier is not appropriate for circumstances such as this; as you say, it clearly excludes external works, particular circumstances and fees. These are definitely "particular circumstances": Shrivenham Primary School is not able to expand on its current site, and therefore extensive work has been undertaken to develop a solution which will sustainably serve the needs of the village, i.e. a second site for the school. Clearly a new building on a new site is going to be significantly more expensive than the rate EFA quotes.*
- 6.72 *Furthermore, the cost is calculated in the context of the Priority School Building Programme's PFI programme, which aims to achieve significant savings through bulk-procurement of school rebuilding projects, thus benefiting from economies of scale. The cost assumes the use of standardised designs, which would not meet the unique needs of Shrivenham's split site solution.*
- 6.73 *It is worth noting that not only does OCC's extensive experience of school building projects not support the EFA cost, it is also not in line with analysis carried out by The National Audit Office (2013 Capital funding for new school places)".*
- 6.74 Officers have also received from a consultant quantitative surveyor based on BCIS Mean (5 year sample version of 24 schools built in this time) that confirmed a figure of £2,873m². This already incorporates BREEAM and other factors not covered by the Government formula. Using BCIS calculation based on a new school accommodating 210 children and amounting to 1,215m² indicates each pupil accounts for 5.79m² (1,215/210). Thirty two pupils would therefore, require 185.28m² of floor space (5.79x32). BCIS costs for school construction is £2,873 per m². This results in a calculation of £532,309.44 (£2,873 x 32). Interesting both sources CIS and the EFA give figures that are similar whilst the OCC figure is much higher. Consequently having given consideration to BICS calculations it would suggest a reasonable figure could be £532,309.44 based on 32 pupils.
- 6.75 Officers note that the EFA formula does not include aspects that OCC include. However, the BCIS data does include all the necessary variables and is a valid, robust and accepted source of information. The BCIS data provides data from completed builds which is the most accurate data. There are other issues to amounts sought by OCC that cannot be justified. BREEAM Very Good and 60% carbon reduction are not required under planning legislation and policy and there not reasonable in planning terms. Such expectations are covered by Building Regulations Part L. The expectation for primary school site and build to be 2FE to future proof growth is not reasonable in

planning terms. These requirements are OCC requirements and increase the cost of the construction disproportionately to what is reasonable in scale and kind to the development.

- 6.76 Therefore, to ensure that amount sought for primary school is proportionate to the development in scale and kind and to therefore meet the 3 statutory tests officers have based their judgment on BCIS in this case.

Faringdon Community College

- 6.77 Faringdon Community College would need additional capacity to accommodate the expected additional pupil generation and a financial contribution is considered justified. The financial contribution towards Faringdon Community College is based on “23 pupil places (including 3* 6th would be £404,813 (index linked to from 1st Quarter 2012 using PUBSEC Tender Price Index). This is based on DfE advice for secondary school extension weighted for Oxfordshire and including an allowance for ICT and sprinklers - £17,455 per pupil place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base and £18,571 per pupil place at 1st Quarter 2012 price base for sixth form places (the cost includes an allowance for sprinklers and ICT)”. It is understood that this contribution would be towards a second phase of expansion at the school. No details of the second phase of expansion are provided and it is unclear as to how these costs relate to the costs of that expansion in 2015 prices. Therefore, it is challenging for officers to clearly quantify if the amount sought is reasonable to scale and kind of the development because it is not clear what the amount is to be spent on exactly. The expansion is justified as a result of increased pupil numbers from this development and the costs are based on Department of Education advice albeit from 2012 on works that have not been clearly defined. In the absence of any other figures relating to school extensions and the lack of detail on the actual works, officers are prepared to support this request subject to a number of conditions to ensure CIL compliance and avoid challenge. The £404,813 can only be spent on phase 2 of the school expansion. Once known the OCC will confirm the nature of that expansion, how it increases school capacity and state the costs. This will ascertain that the amount sought is only spent on this expansion, whatever form it takes and the associated cost relates to scale and kind to the development. Lastly, to relate to the development the amount sought will be spent within 5 years of the date of commencement of works. If the costs of the expansion are lower, which could be a possibility, this authority will seek to use the funds for providing affordable housing. The s.106 agreement will reflect this.

Transport

- 6.78 The County Council has requested a contribution towards public transport which will be to pump prime route 66 service from 3 to 4 buses per hour service. Officers also note that a detailed request has been made by the Parish Council to support a local community bus. The details behind this programme are legitimately and so part of the amount should include the community bus service recognised as a requirement by the Parish Council.
- 6.79 The highway authority advise of the need for improved junction access to the A420. I note that in respect of application no. P13/V1810/O which relates to 240 dwellings on part of the draft local plan 2031 north Shrivenham strategic housing site, that the highway authority in its response advised that the proposed strategic site would fund access improvements to the A420 which could be a new junction off Highworth Road. As only part of that proposed strategic site has been subject to a planning application only part funding is to be achieved so far. In the absence of the remainder of that site coming forward at present this proposal should make a financial contribution towards

Vale of White Horse District Council – Committee Report – 28 October 2015

A420 junction provision/improvements. It is noted that land for a possible junction is safeguarded by policy CP21 of the draft local plan 2031 with that site being to the west of the application site. However, the actual location for junction provision remains undecided at present.

- 6.80 Bus stops are proposed in front of the site and it is reasonable to expect shelters to be provided to encourage use and protect passengers. A shelter can be provided on the highway verge on the north side of Townsend Road and this is shown on the submitted access plan. However, it is unclear whether space exists within the highway to provide a shelter on the southern side of Townsend Road without interfering with pedestrian use of the pavement. The £14,000 requested by the County Council is based on their experience in providing and maintaining bus shelters. It is a reasonable request, proportionate and justified based on two shelters. Should a shelter not be provided on the southern side of Townsend Road within 3 years of the commencement of development this authority will seek to use the funds for providing affordable housing. The s.106 agreement will reflect this.
- 6.81 Officers recommend that the s.106 is an agreement between this Council, the landowner and applicant. All sums sought will need to be pro rata depending on how many dwellings are eventually approved.
- 6.82 With the above in mind and based on 116 dwellings the following developer contributions are considered fair and proportionate and should be subject to a legal agreement to secure them should planning permission be granted:-

Vale of White Horse District Council	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
Waste collection and waste bins for this development	£19,720
Shrivenham village hall improvements	£22,360
Outdoor tennis in Shrivenham	£24,937
Youth/MUGA/play area in Shrivenham	£15,340
Football including junior pitches in Shrivenham	£18,495
Shrivenham recreation ground pavilion	£19,240
New changing facilities at Faringdon leisure centre	£130,000
Exercise equipment & trim trail	£2,210
s.106 monitoring	£3,010
Total	£255,312
Oxfordshire County Council	
	<i>Proposed Contributions</i>
Bus services including community bus service in the village	£116,000
Travel plan monitoring	£1,240
Revoking a traffic regulation order to remove double white lines on Townsend Road	£1,000
Installation costs and commuted maintenance of two bus shelters and the erection of two Premium Route pole/flag/information case units	£14,000
A420 junction improvements	Unspecified at this stage

Faringdon community college	£404,813
Primary school provision in the village	£532,309.44
Total	£1,069,362.444
Overall Total	£1324,674.44

7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 In view of the council's housing land supply shortfall, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and permission should be granted unless *“any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole”* (NPPF paragraph 14). Paragraph 7 of NPPF identifies three mutually dependant dimensions to sustainable development; it should fulfil an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.
- 7.2 The proposed development would perform an economic role, at least in the short term, in that it would provide employment during the construction phase. It would also create investment in the local and wider economy through the construction stage and new residents and their spending. Through increasing the housing stock, it would contribute to an expansion of the local housing market and could potentially improve the affordability of open market housing. In the Highworth Road, Faringdon appeal case (proposed up to 94 dwellings) it is noted that the Secretary of State considered that the *“benefits of the scheme would include the provision of much needed market and affordable housing to contribute towards acknowledged substantial shortfalls, and would generate considerable economic benefits of the type arising from housing development”* and that he gave these benefits significant weight (application no. P13/V1366/O, appeal reference APP/V3120/A/13/2210891).
- 7.3 The scheme would have a social role as it will provide in general additional housing that the District needs together with much needed affordable housing units.
- 7.4 The proposal will have some limited environmental implications resulting from localised landscape harm and visual harm to those passing the site with the change from open fields to a housing development. There would be some limited biodiversity impacts but mitigation can be put in place to address these through provision of open spaces within the site, new planting and provision of bird and bat boxes resulting in an environmental benefit.
- 7.5 This is a reasonably accessible site and the new bus stops will assist in providing access to the bus service along through the village and beyond to the wider services offered by Swindon and Oxford.
- 7.6 Balanced against these benefits are localised visual and landscape harm and loss of an area of grade 2 and grade 3 agricultural land. The visual and landscape harm is very localised and unavoidable in developing new housing. Scope exists as part of a detailed scheme to secure wider areas of open space and landscaping compared to those depicted on the illustrative framework plan. The economic and social benefits of providing new housing outweigh the localised harm. Loss of this relatively small area of agricultural land is also considered to be outweighed by the economic and social benefits of providing much needed housing and providing housing in a reasonably accessible location.
- 7.7 Overall, and in view of the emphasis in the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of

housing, the development is considered to amount to sustainable development, and whilst there will be some adverse effects, these do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Consequently, the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure affordable housing and developer contributions.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that authority to grant planning permission is delegated to the head of planning, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the committee, subject to:

- 1. A S106 agreement being entered into with the district council in order to secure contributions towards local infrastructure and to secure affordable housing; and**
- 2. Conditions as follows:**
 - 1. Commencement of development – 12 months after reserved matters approval.**
 - 2. Reserved matters to be submitted within 18 months of the outline consent.**
 - 3. Approved plan – access only.**
 - 4. Landscaping scheme required.**
 - 5. Landscaping implementation.**
 - 6. Tree protection to be provided.**
 - 7. Onsite open space provision.**
 - 8. On site open space management.**
 - 9. Sustainable drainage scheme to be agreed and implemented.**
 - 10. Foul drainage implemented prior to occupation.**
 - 11. Water supply implemented prior to occupation.**
 - 12. Bus stop provision and locations to be agreed.**
 - 13. Vehicular and pedestrian and cycle access, and vision splays as approved plan.**
 - 14. Archaeological watching brief.**
 - 15. Implementation of a programme of archaeological work.**
 - 16. Construction method statement and traffic management plan to be agreed.**
 - 17. Bat box provision.**
 - 18. Further noise survey and mitigation to be agreed.**
 - 19. Further air quality survey and mitigation to be agreed.**
 - 20. Slab levels to be agreed.**

Informatives

- 1. Market housing mix to complement the SHMA.**
- 2. Affordable housing mix to accord with housing team requirements.**
- 3. Bird nesting.**
- 4. More open space and landscaping expected and no commitment to any indicative layout, scale referenced in the application submission or to this site being able to accommodate 116 dwellings.**

Author: Adrian Butler

Email: adrian.butler@southandvale.gov.uk